

Tekmeria

Vol 15 (2020)

(2019-2020)

γεγεννησθαι. μνηνεται ουν απο μετοικων τε τιτων και ακο-
λουθων περι μεν των 'Ερμῶν αὐθέν, ἄλλων δὲ ἀγαλμάτων
περικοπαί τινες προύτερον ὑπὸ νεωτέρων μετὰ παιδιᾶς και
οἶνον γεγεννησθαι. ΕΘΝΙΚΟ ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ • ΙΝΣΤΙΤΟΥΤΟ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΚΩΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ
ΤΟΜΕΑΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΡΩΜΑΪΚΗΣ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ
NATIONAL HELLENIC RESEARCH FOUNDATION • INSTITUTE OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH
SECTION OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITY και
αὐτὰ ὑπολαμβάνοντες οἱ μάλιστα τῷ Ἀλκιβιάδῃ ἀχθόμενοι
ἐμποδῶν ὄντι σφίσι μὴ αὐτοῖς τοῦ δήμου βεβαίως προεστάναι,
και νομισαντες, εἰ αὐτὸν ἐξελεύσειαν, πρῶτοι ἂν εἶναι, ἐμεγά-
λυνον και ἐβόων· ὅτι δὴ μὲν ἐξ αὐτοῦ γὰρ τε μυστικὰ και
ἡ τῶν 'Ερμῶν περιεκτικὴ ἀρετὴ αὐτῶν ὅτι οὐ
μετ' ἐκείνων ἐπράχθη, ἐπιλέγοντες τεκμήρια τὴν ἄλλην αὐτοῦ
ἐς τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα οὐ δημοτικὴν παρανομίαν. ὁ δ' ἐν τε
τῷ παρόντι πρό- ΣΥΜΒΟΛΕΣ ΣΤΗΝ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΡΩΜΑΪΚΟΥ
ΚΟΣΜΟΥ • CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF THE GREEK
AND ROMAN WORLD • CONTRIBUTIONS A L'HISTOIRE DU
MONDE GREC ET ROMAIN • BEITRÄGE ZUR GESCHICHTE
DER GRIECHISCHEN UND RÖMISCHEN WELT • CONTRIBUTI
PER LA STORIA DEL MONDO GRECO E ROMANO και ἐτοιμος ἦν
πρὶν ἐκπλεῖν κρ- ΑΘΗΝΑ • 2021 • ATHENS τῷ μένους ἦν (ἥδη
γὰρ και τὰ τῆς πα- ΕΘΝΙΚΟ ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ • ΙΝΣΤΙΤΟΥΤΟ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΚΩΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ
ΤΟΜΕΑΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΡΩΜΑΪΚΗΣ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ
NATIONAL HELLENIC RESEARCH FOUNDATION • INSTITUTE OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH
SECTION OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITY και εἰ μὲν τούτων
τι εἴργαστο, δίκην δοῦναι, εἰ δ' ἀπολυθείη, ἄρχειν· και
ἐπεμαρτύρετο μὴ ἀπόντος πέρι αὐτοῦ διαβολὰς ἀποδέχεσθαι,
ἀλλ' ἥδη ἀποκτείνειν, εἰ ἀδίκῃ και ὅτι σωφρονέστερον εἴη
μὴ μετὰ τοιαύτης αἰτίας, πρὶν διαγνώσι, πέμπει αὐτὸν ἐπὶ
τοσούτῳ στρατεύματι. οἱ δ' ἐχθροὶ διειδότες τό τε στράτευμα
μὴ εὖνουν ἔχῃ, ἦν ἥδη ἀγωνίζηται, ὅ τε δῆμος μὴ μαλα-
κίζηται θεραπεύων ὅτι δι' ἐκείνων οἱ τ' Ἀργεῖοι ξυνεστράτευον
και τῶν Μαντινέων τιμές, ἀπέτρεπον και ἀπέσπευδον, ἄλλους
ρήτορας ἐνιέντες οἱ ἔλεγον νῦν μὲν πλεῖν αὐτὸν και μὴ
κατασχεῖν τὴν ἀναγωγῇ κρίνεσθαι ἐν ἡμέραις
ρήταις, βουλούμενοι ἐκ μείζονος διαβολῆς, ἦν ἔμελλον ῥῆον
αὐτοῦ ἀπόντος ποριεῖν, μετάπεμπτον κομισθέντα αὐτὸν ἀγω-
νίσασθαι. και ἔδοξε πλεῖν τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην.
Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα θέρους μεσοῦντος ἥδη ἡ ἀναγωγὴ ἐγίγνετο

Double Guardianship and Hellenistic Monarchy: Protecting the Person of Infant Kings

Dionysios Filias

doi: [10.12681/tekmeria.26962](https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.26962)

Copyright © 2021, Filias Dionysios



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

To cite this article:

Filias, D. (2021). Double Guardianship and Hellenistic Monarchy: Protecting the Person of Infant Kings. *Tekmeria*, 15, 139–186. <https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.26962>

Double Guardianship and Hellenistic Monarchy: Protecting the Person of Infant Kings*

Introduction

In his account of the different types of kingship, Aristotle refers to *παμβασιλεία*, the kind of absolute rule that resembles the administration of a household or *οἶκος*.¹ Already attested in Homeric epics and Herodotus' *Histories*, the concept of state as a household became explicit in the Greek political thought of the fourth century.² Plato and Xenophon were among the philosophers who compared ideal political leaders to household managers³ and, of course, Plato's disciple Aristotle could be no exception. Since ideal leadership appears as a philosophical concept, it is reasonable to consider that, unlike the other forms of kingship described by Aristotle, the *παμβασιλεία* is a fictitious regime.

* My sincere thanks to Professor S.E. Psoma (University of Athens, Greece) for her comments that greatly improved this article.

For ancient texts and translations the Loeb editions are used, unless otherwise indicated in the bibliography. The abbreviations used are those of the *OCD*⁴ for ancient works, *SEG* for epigraphical publications, and the *AJA* for periodicals.

1. Arist. *Pol.* 3.1285b: πέμπτον δ' εἶδος βασιλείας, ὅταν ἡ πάντων κύριος εἷς ὢν, ὥσπερ ἕκαστον ἔθνος καὶ πόλις ἐκάστη τῶν κοινῶν, τεταγμένη κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομικὴν. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ οἰκονομικὴ βασιλεία τις οἰκίας ἐστίν, οὕτως ἡ παμβασιλεία πόλεως καὶ ἔθνους ἐνὸς ἡ πλειόνων οἰκονομία. (But a fifth kind of kingship is when a single ruler is sovereign over all matters in the way in which each race and each city is sovereign over its common affairs; this monarchy ranges with the rule of a master over a household, for just as the master's rule is a sort of monarchy in the home, so absolute monarchy is domestic mastership over a city, or over a race or several races).

2. Brock 2013, 25.

3. Pl. *Plt.* 258e: πότερον οὖν τὸν πολιτικὸν καὶ βασιλέα καὶ δεσπότην καὶ ἔτ' οἰκονόμον θήσομεν ὡς ἐν πάντα ταῦτα προσαγορεύοντες...; (Shall we then assume that the statesman, king, master, and householder too, for that matter, are all one, to be grouped under one title?); Xen. *Mem.* 3.4.7: ὡς οἱ ἀγαθοὶ οἰκονόμοι ἀγαθοὶ στρατηγοὶ ἂν εἶεν. (That a good business man would make a good general).

Indeed, several scholars tend to view *παμβασιλεία* as a theoretical construction of Aristotle. In their commentary on *Politics*, P. Accattino and M. Curnis call *παμβασιλεία* “forma teorica”.⁴ In his study on the *Politics*, R. Weil refers to the *παμβασιλεύς* as “un monarque de rêve”,⁵ and several other writers have argued against the hypothesis of an actual type of government described by Aristotle.⁶

However, this view has been challenged. C. Zizza draws attention to the fact that, as a philosopher historian who wrote about the constitutions of several Greek states, Aristotle would have not lacked the sources, instruments and methods of investigation when he presented his theory on *παμβασιλεία*, but he admits that it is difficult to establish with certainty how Aristotle became aware of the historical events he refers to.⁷ On the other hand, D.B. Nagle is more positive that Aristotle’s fifth form of monarchy was inspired by the political reality that emerged as a result of Alexander’s rule over the Greek *poleis* and the *ethne* of the Macedonian kingdom.⁸ Finally, W.S. Greenwalt identified *παμβασιλεία* with Macedonian monarchy pointing to specific features of Macedonian kingship that manifest its character as household management, such as royal ownership of natural sources, royal marriages as politics and the prerequisite for a king of being member of the ruling dynasty.⁹

Reading Greenwalt’s observations, anyone acquainted with Hellenistic kingship could assume that, had Aristotle lived a century or two later, he would have used the same words to describe the monarchic states that succeeded Alexander’s empire. The story of Attalus III of Pergamon, who bequeathed his kingdom to Rome,¹⁰ is typical of an ideology that regarded the king as the head of all branches of administration, the master over the life

4. Accattino, Curnis 2013, 221.

5. Weil 1960, 352.

6. See e.g. Johnson 1990, 164, and Mulgan 1977, 87, who also argue against the possibility of Aristotle having thought of real life rulers.

7. Zizza 2017, 44.

8. See Nagle 2000.

9. Greenwalt 2010, 156-160.

10. Plut. *Tit. Gracch.* 14.1: ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦ Φιλομήτορος Ἀττάλου τελευτήσαντος Εὐδήμος ὁ Περγαμηνὸς ἀνήνεγκε διαθήκην ἐν ᾗ κληρονόμος ἐγγράπτο τοῦ βασιλέως ὁ Ῥωμαίων δῆμος; Just. *Epit.* 36.4.5: *Huius testamento heres populus Romanus tunc instituitur.*

and death of his subjects, lord and beneficiary of all the revenues of the land.¹¹

Even if we accept that royal ownership of land was limited in practice, since there were other important landowning organizations (such as the temples) –as J.G. Manning thinks of the Ptolemaic kingdom–¹² in theory, the king was the owner of all the lands under his rule. As for the other “household” features mentioned by Greenwalt, inter-dynastic marriages served political purposes¹³ and, despite dynastic strifes and rebellions, royal blood played an important role in ascension to the throne. But, in addition to being indicative of the Hellenistic type of kingship, Attalus’ story attests to a significant fact: the adoption of practices related to domestic management by the royalty.

Along with last wills and testaments,¹⁴ an institution “borrowed from private relations and projected into the context of a monarchy”, to use K. Buraselis’ words, is that of the guardianship of minors.¹⁵ Associated with kingship from an early time, guardianship of infant kings followed a set of established rules and traditions that resemble those of Greek family law, embracing also the possibility of multiple guardianship. Attested in ancient sources as the result of the problems surrounding Alexander the Great’s succession, double guardianship is a practice that gained ground in Ptolemaic monarchy during the second century BC. According to N. Kaye, it might echo the adoption of the Classical Athenian model of guardianship of minors, introduced to the Hellenistic culture in the court of Alexandria along with other fourth-century institutions.¹⁶ Indeed, multiple guardianship was an Athenian private law practice, but, either as part of the *polis* legal traditions or as a monarchic practice, double guardianship appears to have served an important purpose: the protection of the ward’s person.

In this article, I am going to argue on the origins of double guardianship and its connection with the protection of minors, as well as on the adaptation of this institution in the context of Hellenistic monarchy.

11. Ehrenberg 1969, 163.

12. Manning 2011, 302.

13. On inter-dynastic marriages in the Hellenistic kingdoms, see Seibert 1967.

14. On some general information about the wills of the Hellenistic kings, see Kosmetatou 2012.

15. Buraselis 2017, 60.

16. Kaye 2017, 89.

Guardians in a *polis* context and royal guardianship: maintaining and protecting

Guardianship in Greek *poleis* was provided both for male and female orphans. There are obviously elements common to the protection of male orphans and that of female ones; however, there are also elements of differentiation linked above all to the matrimonial destiny reserved for women. From a terminological point of view, we usually speak of *ἐπίτροποι* when we refer to guardians of male orphans,¹⁷ the word *κύριος* being the term used for the guardian of any woman including female orphans.

Most of the evidence on guardianship of minors comes from Athens, the *polis* whose political and legal system served as a model for many other Greek *poleis*. In Athens, guardians were appointed by a male adolescent's father, usually by provisions in his will. In the absence of such provisions, the law gave a close relative (usually an agnate) the right to exercise the duties of the guardian. And, in case of conflicts between close relatives, the *eponymous archon* would have intervened in the dispute, probably by bringing the case to court.¹⁸ A guardian's functions were twofold, related both to the person and to the property of the ward.¹⁹ He provided his ward with housing, food, clothing and education and represented him in legal affairs, while he also had to see that the ward's property was properly kept and employed.²⁰ These duties were expected to produce two results: (a) the survival of the ward so as to reach his majority, and (b) the maintenance of the property that he would take charge of as an adult.

Given the functions of a guardian in a household context, it is easy to observe how royal houses embraced guardianship and adapted it to their needs. The royal guardian is almost invariably an agnate of the orphan ruler. In Sparta, the lawgiver Lycurgus acted as guardian of his brother's son,²¹ while Pausanias, the cousin of young Pleistarchus, the son of the heroic king Leonidas I,

17. Maffi 2017, 96.

18. On appointment of guardians of male orphans in Athens, see Harrison 1968, 99-104.

19. Harrison 1968, 104.

20. MacDowell 1978, 93-94.

21. Hdt. 1.65.4: Λυκοῦργον ἐπιτροπεύσαντα Λεωδῶτew, ἀδελφιδέου μὲν ἑωυτοῦ βασιλεύοντος δὲ Σπαρτιητέων.

was the guardian of the infant king.²² The Macedonian king Philip II was guardian to his nephew Amyntas IV²³ and so was Attalus II to his nephew Attalus III, king of Pergamon.²⁴ Moreover, as regent (“deputy king”), a royal guardian represents the minor in legal affairs, that is the administration of his realm, and maintains his property, which is not an ordinary household but a kingdom preserved (and enlarged) through taxation, diplomacy and, of course, wars! Regarding Spartan royal guardianship, the limited jurisdiction of the king (religious and military)²⁵ meant that the guardian would act mainly as a substitute for the commander-in-chief, the position reserved for the kings.²⁶ But was a royal guardian also responsible for the survival of an infant monarch?

Literary sources of Classical antiquity are not very descriptive, but, concerning Sparta, a term used to coin the guardians of kings might be enlightening as far as their duties are concerned. According to Plutarch, royal guardians were known as *πρόδικοι*,²⁷ a term whose existence in Classical Sparta is confirmed by Xenophon’s reference to Aristodemus, guardian of king Agesipolis I (reigned 395-380 BC).²⁸ The word *πρόδικος* stands for an advocate or defender, and it appears as a designation of the state advocates sent by Calymna to represent their *polis* against Cos before Cnidian judges around 300 BC.²⁹ Furthermore,

22. Hdt. 9.10.2: ἐγίνετο μὲν ἡ ἡγεμονίη Πλειστάρχου τοῦ Λεωνίδεω: ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν ἦν ἔτι παῖς, ὁ δὲ τούτου ἐπίτροπός τε καὶ ἀνεψιός. Κλεόμβροτος γὰρ ὁ Πausανίεω μὲν πατὴρ Ἀναξανδρίδεω δὲ παῖς οὐκέτι περιῆν.

23. Just. Epit. 7.5.9-10: *Itaque Philippus diu...tutorem pupilli egit.*

24. Strab. 13.4.2: ἐπίτροπον δὲ κατέστησε (Eumenes II) καὶ τοῦ παιδὸς νέου τελέως ὄντος καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἄτταλον.

25. On the jurisdiction of the Spartan kings, see Arist. Pol. 3.1285a.

26. In 479 BC Pausanias was appointed by the ephors commander-in-chief of the Spartan armed forces that fought at Plataea, Hdt. 9.10.1. In 394 BC Aristodemus, member of the royal family and guardian of the infant king Agesipolis, led the Spartan army in the battle of Nemea, Xen. Hell. 4.2.9.

27. Plut. Lyc. 3.1: τοὺς δὲ τῶν ὀρφανῶν βασιλέων ἐπιτρόπους Λακεδαιμόνιοι πρόδικους ὠνόμαζον.

28. Xen. Hell. 4.2.9: Ἀριστόδημον τοῦ γένους ὄντα καὶ πρόδικον τοῦ παιδός. See also n. 26.

29. *IKnidos* I 221, A.2, ll. 9-10: νῦν δὲ καὶ ἡ πόλις ἡ Κα]λυμνίων τοὺς πρόδικου|[ς ἀπέ-στειλε κομίζοντας ἀντιγραφά]ν.

according to inscriptions spanning from the fourth to the second century BC, a board of *πρόδικοι* and a board of *πρόβουλοι* served as state councils of an oligarchic regime in Corcyra.³⁰ In Athens, this term never appears in Athenian forensic speeches, yet, in his *Agamemnon*, Aeschylus uses the word *πρόδικοι* in the sense of defenders or avengers of the Greek army for the men of the house of Atreids.³¹ From the above information, we may conclude that the term *πρόδικος* could mean the defender of the state's or people's interests and, considering the role of Spartan guardians in leading the army against Sparta's enemies, it could be argued that *πρόδικοι* were, in fact, the protectors of Sparta. However, since in the only classical source on contemporary Sparta that refers to a Spartan royal guardian, Xenophon, the word *πρόδικος* is associated with a king, we may assume that a *πρόδικος* is a guardian of a king, not of Sparta as a whole.

Yet, the picture of a caring guardian, who protects his ward until the latter reaches adulthood and becomes *de facto* ruler of his realm, was sometimes a far cry from the actual role of the men who held guardianship. Sources on Sparta present guardians in the capacity of administrators, not in that of foster fathers for the young kings: the self-exile of Theras, the first Spartan royal guardian, who left Sparta because he could not endure the rule of his adult nephews, reveals an attitude significantly different from that of a loving relative.³² As for the Macedonian kingdom of the Argeads, where royal duties were not limited to army administration but covered every aspect of the kingdom's political and religious life, the situation was even more difficult for young rulers. Although a principle of succession of the first born to a king had been established,³³ the

30. IG IX 1 682, ll. 10-13 (late 4th cent. BC) is the oldest epigraphic reference to these boards in Corcyra: τὰν δὲ προξενίαν γράψαν|τας εἰς χαλκὸν ἀνθέμεν | εἰ καὶ προβούλοις καὶ προ|δίοις δοκῇ καλῶς ἔχειν. See Gehrke 1985, 88 with n. 2, who thinks of the existence of *prodikoi* and *probouloi* as evidence of a Corcyran oligarchic regime. But, see also Robinson 2011, 124, who points to lack of fifth-century epigraphic references to these two boards.

31. Aesch. Ag. 451: προδίοις Ἀτρείδαις.

32. Hdt. 4.147.2-3: ἐπιτροπαίην εἶχε ὁ Θήρας τὴν ἐν Σπάρτῃ βασιληίην...οὕτω δὲ ὁ Θήρας δεινὸν ποιούμενος ἄρχεσθαι ὑπ' ἄλλων, ἐπεῖτε ἐγέυσατο ἀρχῆς, οὐκ ἔφη μένειν ἐν τῇ Λακεδαιμόνι ἀλλ' ἀποπλεύσεσθαι ἐς τοὺς συγγενέας. See also Plut. Lyc. 3.4, who mentions that the lawgiver Lycurgus, who acted as guardian of his nephew, exercised royal power: ὥς ἐπιτρόπῳ βασιλέως καὶ βασιλικὴν ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντι.

33. On this rule of succession, see Hatzopoulos 1986.

dynastic confusion and the number of serious challenges of legitimacy that appear in the history of the Macedonian kingdom seem to question the stability of succession rules.³⁴ Macedonian royal guardianship appears to have been part of the problem: since royal guardians were members of the royal house, it would be possible for someone to be both king and guardian, combining kingship with the family responsibilities associated with the preservation of the Argead exclusivity to rule through one of its branches.³⁵ Cases of guardians who ascended to the throne soon after their appointment to guardianship, such as Aeropus II, (allegedly) Ptolemy of Alorus and Philip II, inevitably lead to the conclusion that an able guardian of an infant king was often finally and officially accepted as king himself.³⁶

Considering a possible deviation from the duty of protection of the person and the interests of kings, double guardianship probably served as deterrent to untrustworthy regents. Two holders of guardianship were the best alternative to an all-powerful head of the administration tempted to become the official ruler. And, as we are going to demonstrate, this institution was part of the *polis* legal traditions.

Double guardianship in a *polis* setting: the origins of a Hellenistic institution

In ancient societies, where life expectancy was low and famine and wars were endemic, the protection of minors often became a matter of public concern

34. Greenwalt 1989, 21.

35. Anson 2009, 281.

36. Buraselis 2017, 65; Diod. Sic. 14.37.6: τὴν δ' ἀρχὴν διεδέξατο Ὀρέστης παῖς ὦν, ὃν ἀνελὼν Ἀέροπος ἐπίτροπος ὦν κατέσχε τὴν βασιλείαν ἔτη ἕξ; Diod. Sic. 15.71.1: ἐπὶ δὲ τούτων Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Ἀλωρίτης ὁ Ἀμύντου υἱὸς ἐδοιοφόνησεν Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν ἀδελφόν, καὶ ἐβασίλευσε τῆς Μακεδονίας ἔτη τρία. However, we have to notice that there is no coinage in Ptolemy's name and there is no evidence that he was an Argead (for Ptolemy's origin, see Anson 2009, 281-283). Philip II is mentioned by Justin as a regent and guardian of his nephew Amyntas IV before his ascension to the throne (Just. *Epit.* 7.5.10), but this is not confirmed by Diodorus or Aeschines. Hatzopoulos 1996, 306-307, believes that both in Philip's and Antigonos Doson's cases, ascension to the throne appears as evidence of continuity rather than change (the *de facto* ruler became eventually the official ruler). For epigraphic evidence on the ascension of Philip II after the death of his brother Perdikkas III, see Hatzopoulos 1995.

and required the development of legal principles. Practical regulations were introduced to enforce control over the activity of guardians and prevent abuse against those they were meant to take care of.³⁷ Public lawsuits provided by the Athenian legal system, such as the *γραφὴ κακώσεως ὀρφανῶν* (public suit for the maltreatment of orphans),³⁸ attest to the keen interest of the *polis* in the ward's protection.

However, as we may deduce from forensic speeches delivered in defense of abused orphans, the procedure for protecting the ward's interests during minority seem not to have been very effective. Thus, testators as well as philosophers, like Plato (to whom I am going to refer below), realized that the best protection lay in numbers.³⁹ Strange though it may seem, the roots of double guardianship are not in Classical Athens, but in the legislation of Charondas, one of Archaic Greece's most influential lawgivers. Diodorus Siculus reports that one of the laws enacted by Charondas provided for a double guardianship of orphans shared by the next of father's kin and maternal relatives: the first were to manage the orphan's property, while the latter would be charged with bringing up the child. Commenting on this provision, the historian acknowledges Charondas' genius of understanding the different interests of each group and putting the care of the orphans to the hands of those who had no claim in the inherited property.⁴⁰

37. Faraguna 2017, 273.

38. See [Arist.] *Ath.Pol.* 56.6: *γραφαι δὲ...ὀρφανῶν κακώσεως (αὗται δ' εἰσὶ κατὰ τῶν ἐπιτρόπων).*

39. Humphreys 2018, 96.

40. Diod. Sic. 12.15.2-3: *ἔγραψε γὰρ τῶν μὲν ὀρφανικῶν χρημάτων ἐπιτροπεύειν τοὺς ἀγχιστεῖς τοὺς ἀπὸ πατρός, τρέφεσθαι δὲ τοὺς ὀρφανούς παρὰ τοῖς συγγενέσι τοῖς ἀπὸ μητρός. αὐτόθεν μὲν οὖν ὁ νόμος οὗτος οὐδὲν ὀρθῶς περιέχων σοφὸν ἢ περιττόν, ἐξεταζόμενος δὲ κατὰ θάτους εὐρίσκεται δικαίως ὣν ἄξιος ἐπαίνων. ζητουμένης γὰρ τῆς αἰτίας δι' ἣν ἄλλοις μὲν τὴν οὐσίαν, ἑτέροις δὲ τὴν τῶν ὀρφανῶν τροφὴν ἐπίστευσεν, ἐκφαίνεται τις ἐπίνοια τοῦ νομοθέτου περιττή: οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ μητρός συγγενεῖς οὐ προσήκοντες τῇ κληρονομίᾳ τῶν ὀρφανῶν οὐκ ἐπιβουλεύουσιν, οἱ δ' ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς οἰκεῖοι ἐπιβουλεύσαι μὲν οὐ δύνανται διὰ τὸ μὴ πιστεύεσθαι τοῦ σώματος, τῆς δ' οὐσίας εἰς ἐκείνους καθήκουσης, ἐὰν οἱ ὀρφανοὶ τελευτήσωσιν ἢ διὰ νόσον ἢ τινα ἄλλην περίστασιν, ἀκριβέστερον οἰκονομήσουσι τὰ χρήματα, ὥς ἰδίας τὰς ἐκ τῆς τύχης ἐλπίδας ἔχοντες.*

(For [Charondas] provided that the property of orphans should be managed by the

A similar provision about sole heiresses is contained in the Gortynian law collection. The father's next of kin are to administer the heiress' property, when she is not of marriageable age, but her mother or the mother's next of kin are entrusted with the heiress's upbringing.⁴¹ K.J. Hölkeskamp noticed that Charondas' law would be dated well before the middle of the fifth century BC and probably even earlier (thus, close to the date of publication of the Gortynian legislation), but there is no way to determine the *polis* setting where this law was enforced (Catane, the birthplace of Charondas, or perhaps a city that adopted his legislation, such as Thourioi).⁴² Plato's recommended provisions on guardianship of orphans also appear to have been rested on Charondas'

next of kin on the father's side, but that the orphans should be brought up by the relatives on the mother's side. Now at first sight, this law seems to have neither wise nor exceptional content, but when it is examined deeply, it is found to be justly worthy of praise. For when one looks for the reason why he entrusted the property of orphans to one group and their upbringing to another, the lawgiver's outstanding ingenuity becomes apparent. For the relatives on the mother's side, having no claim in the inheritance of the orphans, will not plot against them, while the kin on the father's side are not able to plot against them, not being entrusted with the care of their persons. But, since they inherit the property if the orphans die of disease or some other circumstance, they will administer the estate with greater care, believing that they hold as their own hopes based on fortune).

41. IC IV 72, col. VIII, ll. 40-53: πατρῶϊδ' | κον δ' ἔμ' ἐν, αἱ κα πατὲρ μὲ ἔῃ ἔ | δ' ἐλπίδ' ἐς τῷ αὐ[τῷ] πατρός. τῶν | δὲ κρεμμάτων κα]ρτερὸν ἐμ' ἐν τ[ῷ] ἔργασί[ας τὸς] πατῶν, | [τ]ῷ[δ] <δ> ἐπ[ὶ] κα]ρίας διαλ[αυ]κ[ά]ν | ἐν τὰν ἐμ' ἐν, ἅς κ' ἄ[ν]δρ[ος] ἐ. | vac. αἱ δ' ἀν[ό]ρῳ ἰάτται μὲ εἶ ἔπ[ὶ] βάλλῶν, τὰν πατρῶϊδ' κα]ρτερὰν ἐμ' ἐν τῶν τε κρεμμάτων καὶ αἱ τῷ καρπῷ, ἅς κ' ἀν[ό]ρος ἐ τ[ῷ] ῥάπεθαι [π]ᾶρ τῷ ματρί | αἱ δὲ μ[ὲ]ν ἄτερ μὲ εἶ, πᾶρ τοῖς [μ]άτρῳσι | τράπεθα[ι].

(Now an heiress is one who has no father or brother from the same father. And as long as she is not of an age to marry, her father's brothers are to be responsible for the administration of the property, while she takes half a share of the produce; but if there should be no groom-elect while she is not of an age to marry, the heiress is to have charge of the property and the produce and is to be brought up by her mother as long as she is not of an age to marry; and if there should be no mother, she is to be brought up with her mother's brothers. Trans. Willetts 1967).

42. Hölkeskamp 1999, 143.

enactments: he proposed a legal guardianship of the two nearest of kin from the paternal side, two from the maternal and a friend of the deceased.⁴³

Even if we accept Plato's knowledge of Charondas's laws, it is more likely that the great philosopher had Athenian guardianship practices in mind as a model. Thanks to the forensic speeches delivered by abused orphans after reaching adulthood, we are aware of cases of multiple guardianship. The most famous of all is that of the three guardians of Demosthenes, Aphobus, Demophon and Therippides, appointed by his father's will and indicted by the orator for mismanagement.⁴⁴ Yet, double guardianship appears to have been the rule: Nausimachus and Xenopeithes, known from a Demosthenic speech, were under the guardianship of two men, their uncles Xenopeithes and Aristaechnus,⁴⁵ while Pasicles, son of the banker Pasion, had both his stepfather Phormion and another man named Nicocles as guardians.⁴⁶ Finally, the speaker of the speech *On the Estate of Hagnias* (Isae. 11) delivered this text against the accusations of his co-guardian.

But, how is multiple guardianship related to the protection and survival of the person of the ward? Apparently, what comes to mind is that when one of the guardians misbehaved or maltreated his ward, then, in all likelihood, another guardian would force the misbehaving adult to respect his ward. But, cases of multiple guardianship in Athens provide us with an interesting piece of information. We know that the ward would have to live with his guardian, an arrangement especially appropriate when the guardian had married the ward's mother and become his stepfather.⁴⁷ Certainly, this was a usual

43. Pl. *Leg.* 924b: ἐὰν δὲ ἡ τὸ παράπαν μὴ διαθέμενος τελευτήσῃ τις ἡ τῆς τῶν ἐπιτρόπων αἰρέσεως ἐλλιπής, ἐπιτρόπους εἶναι τοὺς ἐγγύτατα γένει πρὸς πατρός καὶ μητρός κυρίους, δύο μὲν πρὸς πατρός, δύο δὲ πρὸς μητρός, ἓνα δ' ἐκ τῶν τοῦ τελευτήσαντος φίλων.

44. They are known from Dem. 27-31.

45. They appear in Dem. 38. See, however, Humphreys 2018, 97 with n. 8, where she criticizes Davies 1971, 416, who assumed that Aristaechnus was maternal uncle of his wards.

46. Dem. 36.8: ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν ὁ Πασίων ἐτετελευτήκει ταῦτα διαθέμενος, Φορμίων οὐτοσί τὴν μὲν γυναῖκα λαμβάνει κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην, τὸν δὲ παῖδ' ἐπετρόπευεν; Dem. 45.37: εἴτα λέγει περιών, ὡς ἐμαρτύρησε μὲν Νικοκλῆς ἐπιτροπεῦσαι κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην, ἐμαρτύρησε δὲ Πασικλῆς ἐπιτροπευθῆναι κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην.

47. Harrison 1968, 105.

provision in appointment of more than one guardians. The stepfather was entrusted with his stepchildren's care, while another guardian, usually someone not related to the orphan, was appointed to be only administrator of the orphan's property or (usually) of a part of it. Demosthenes refers to such an arrangement regarding his guardians: he speaks of Demophon's marriage to his sister, of Aphobus' marriage to his mother, and of the interest on 70 μναῖ received by Therippides, the one not related to his family, in order, as Demosthenes notes, not to mismanage his property.⁴⁸ Demosthenes' reference to management by Therippides means that he was charged with property affairs of the orphan boy.

Therefore, what appears to have been associated with double guardianship is a division of labor that would increase the chances of an orphan to reach majority and take command of his household. The stepfather would be a foster father mainly responsible for his stepson's upbringing, while the other guardian, as an outsider with no claims to the inheritance, would be only a property administrator. And it seems that similar thoughts were behind double guardianship in a royal context.

Protectors of the person of the king and double guardianship: the case of Alexander's successors

In his *Epitome*, Justin refers to king Tharypas of the Molossian state in Epirus (430-392 BC) whose guardians were particularly interested in the young ruler's survival and education.⁴⁹ If this piece of information (written much later than the period the events described occurred) is correct, it is significant for two reasons: it bears witness both to multiple guardianship in Classical times in a rather primitive kingdom and to care for the protection and upbringing of an infant ruler. But, since there is no explicit evidence on double guardianship before Alexander's succession, we will have to consider the guardians of the two heirs to the great king's throne.

48. Dem. 27.5: κακείνῳ (Therippides) μὲν ἔδωκεν ἐκ τῶν ἐμῶν ἑβδομήκοντα μνᾶς καρπώσασθαι τοσοῦτον χρόνον, ἕως ἐγὼ ἀνὴρ εἶναι δοκιμασθείην, ὅπως μὴ δι' ἐπιθυμίαν χρημάτων χειρόν τι τῶν ἐμῶν διοικήσειεν: Δημοφῶντι δὲ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀδελφὴν καὶ δύο τάλαντ' εὐθὺς ἔδωκεν ἔχειν, αὐτῷ δὲ τούτῳ τὴν μητέρα τὴν ἐμὴν καὶ προῖκ' ὀγδοήκοντα μνᾶς.

49. Just. *Epit.* 17.3.9-10: *Per ordinem deinde regnum ad Tharybam descendit, cui, quoniam pupillus et unicus ex gente nobili superesset, intentiore omnium cura seruandi eius educandique publice tutores constituuntur.*

The situation that followed Alexander's death was unique. As already said, before Alexander's death when someone had to exercise the royal power on behalf of an infant king, other male members of the royal family were called to rule over the kingdom as regents. The fact that the guardians were of Argead origin gave rise to usurpations of the throne by ambitious regents who, after a period of *de facto* kingly rule, they eliminated their wards and officially ascended to the throne. But, at the time Alexander died (323 BC), there were no male relatives capable to act in their own name,⁵⁰ and the customary law of the Macedonian kingdom did not provide a solution to a problem like that.⁵¹ Alexander's heirs were Arrhidaeus, his incapable half-brother,⁵² and Alexander's unborn son (Alexander IV). The state of play gave rise to rivalries between Alexander's companions who seized the opportunity to claim royal power for themselves. But who were the companions?

In Macedonia, the king took both political and administrative decisions personally but in consultation with his closest advisers, initially known as *ἐταῖροι* (companions), and then later, when Alexander the Great extended this title to cover thousands of his soldiers, as *φίλοι* (friends). These advisers were personally selected by the king, though it was usual for a new king initially to continue to listen to advisers of his predecessor.⁵³ Alexander the Great kept his father's companions Parmenion and Antipater among his circle of trust. Although N.G.L. Hammond denies to regard these advisers as aristocrats (pointing out that the only aristocrats in the kingdom were the members of the Argead house),⁵⁴ most of the royal companions originated from specific families and their participation in the king's councils was not because of their affectionate intimacy with the king –given that many of them were hostile to the kings– but because of their position in the kingdom.⁵⁵

It is well known from the sources that according to the rules of the Macedonian kingdom, sons of royal companions (called *βασιλικοὶ παῖδες*, “royal

50. Meeus 2009, 289-290.

51. On the absence of a written body of laws in Macedonia, see O'Neil 2000, 424 with n. 4.

52. On Philip III Arrhidaeus, see Carney 2001.

53. Errington 1990, 221.

54. Hammond 1989, 54.

55. Hatzopoulos 1996, 333.

pages”) remained at the court and were trained as commanders together with the royal offspring.⁵⁶ Apart from preparing the future administrators and army commanders, the presence of the young aristocrats as hostages at the court would guarantee their loyalty and that of their families, but provoked tensions which sometimes ended up in regicide.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, it is undeniable that many of them were able to establish friendly, almost brotherly, ties with kings. So their position in the administration of Alexander’s empire was justified by their proximity to the king. Rivalries between the companions, which led to the War of the Diadochi, in the first place resulted in the emergence of a new institution: the double kingship of Arrhidaeus (named Philip after his ascension to the throne), supported by the infantry, and Alexander IV, supported by the cavalry. Given, however, that both of these kings were unable to rule the kingdom Alexander had bequeathed to them, guardianship was considered by the companions a necessary tool for the administration of the kingdom.

From our sources, it appears that an experiment in collegial guardianship emerged, corresponding to the double kingship,⁵⁸ but ambiguity dominates the relevant reports in the literary material. Justin reports a suggested quadruple guardianship for Alexander’s child by Leonatus, Perdikkas, Craterus and Antipater.⁵⁹ Curtius Rufus seems to agree with Justin and reports that Perdikkas and Leonnatus were appointed as guardians of the child, while Antipater and Craterus were to administer affairs in the European part of Alexander’s empire.⁶⁰ Leonnatus does not appear anywhere in the Greek sources to act in

56. Arr. *Anab.* 4.13.1: ἐκ Φιλίππου ἦν ἤδη καθεστηκὸς τῶν ἐν τέλει Μακεδόνων τοὺς παῖδας ὅσοι ἐς ἡλικίαν ἐμειρακιεύοντο καταλέγεσθαι ἐς θεραπείαν τοῦ βασιλέως. Curtius Rufus (*Curt.* 8.6.2) compares the position of these youths to that of slaves: *Mos erat, ut supra dictum est, principibus Macedonum adultos liberos regibus tradere ad munia haud multum servilibus ministeriis abhorrentia.*

57. Koulakiotis 2005, 172-173.

58. Buraselis 2017, 68.

59. Just. *Epit.* 13.2.14: *Placuit itaque Roxanes expectari partum, et, si puer natus fuisset, tutores Leonatum et Perdiccam et Crateron et Antipatrum constituunt confestimque in tutorum obsequia iurant.*

60. Curt. 10.7.8-9: *E quibus Pithon consilium Perdiccae exequi coepit tutoresque destinat filio ex Roxane futuro Perdiccam et Leonnatum, stirpe regia genitos. Adiecit, ut in Europa Craterus et Antipater res administrarent.*

that capacity, however proclamation of Arrhidaeus as a king by the infantry led to appointing Craterus as protector (προστάτης) of Philip Arrhidaeus' kingdom, as Arrian reports.⁶¹ On the other hand, Diodorus says that Alexander's military commander Perdiccas, the man who had received Alexander's ring by the dying king, was named "curator (ἐπιμελητής) of the kingdom".⁶² In a fragment of an anonymous historian, Perdiccas is called "guardian (ἐπίτροπος) and curator of the royal affairs".⁶³ Although this institution appears as a reaction to the complexities of succession in Alexander's empire (and to the same complexities in the kingdoms of the Diadochi), Kaye points to the different bases of power represented by each guardian as the reason for the companions' decision.⁶⁴

At this point we have to note that, as Hammond rightly points out, Greeks had no term for the word "regent"⁶⁵ and, thus, terminology in our sources is not very helpful to scholars who attempt to identify titles and functions of a regent. While Roman historians speak of *tutores* (the Latin term for guardians), in Greek sources several terms are used in the sense of a deputy administrator of a kingdom: *προστάτης*, *ἐπίτροπος* and *ἐπιμελητής* (the latter being Diodorus' favorite word for the regents in the time of early Diadochi) are all terms that indicate a person that acts as administrator on behalf of a king. Yet, it seems that Greek historians, who lived before the Roman era, preferred the word *ἐπίτροπος*,⁶⁶ which appears as the title of every deputy leader that runs a state under absolute rule. Regents who appear as delegates of tyrants are called by Herodotus by this title: Micythus, a servant of tyrant Anaxilaus, became *ἐπίτροπος* of the *polis* of Rhegium after Anaxilaus' death, while Aristagoras, a relative

61. FGrH 156, 1.3: Κρατερὸν δὲ προστάτην τῆς Ἀρριδαίου βασιλείας.

62. Diod. Sic. 18.2.4: κατέστησαν...ἐπιμελητὴν δὲ τῆς βασιλείας, Περδίκκαν, ὃ καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τὸν δακτύλιον τελευτῶν δεδώκει.

63. FGrH 155, 1.2: ἡρέθη ἐπίτροπος καὶ ἐπιμελητὴς τῶν βασιλικῶν πραγμάτων ὁ Περδίκκας.

64. Kaye 2017, 89.

65. Hammond 1989, 99.

66. Polybius uses the terms *ἐπίτροπος*, *ἐπιτροπεία*, *ἐπιτροπή*, and *ἐπιτροπεύειν* for guardianship of infant rulers several times. Thucydides (2.80.6) refers to Sabylinthus, one of Tharybas' guardians, as *ἐπίτροπος*. Herodotus calls the guardians of Spartan kings *ἐπίτροποι* (see nn. 21, 22).

of the Milesian tyrant Histiaeus (late sixth century), acted as ἐπίτροπος of Miletus when Histiaeus was kept by Darius I of Persia at Susa.⁶⁷

As we have seen, in Greek legal terminology the word ἐπίτροπος stands for the guardian of a minor either in the capacity of a foster father or a property manager, but were these regents or one of them acting as guardian of the persons of the two kings? Being a compromise between commanders with different interests, the double guardianship also applied to the needs of governing a huge state like the kingdom Alexander ruled at the time of his death: two regents were better than a head of the state coping with every aspect (finances, military policy and diplomacy) of an unprecedented Macedonian empire. However, it is interesting to see that Perdiccas is reported by Diodorus (whose source is Hieronymus of Cardia, a contemporary of Alexander the Great and his early successors) to have been charged with the command of the army and the protection (προστασία) of the kings.⁶⁸ Diodorus uses three times the terms ἐπιμελητής (curator) and ἐπιμέλεια (care) of the kings in the introduction of the 18th Book of his *Library*,⁶⁹ and the frequent use of the same terminology seems to demonstrate an actual title. Moreover, Curtius reports that, according to the decision made by the companions, Perdiccas would remain by Philip's side and command the troops who followed the king.⁷⁰

This terminology reveals that Perdiccas' functions included the duty of protecting the kings, the positions of Perdiccas and Craterus being connected with a division of labor between the two regents: Perdiccas was commander-in-chief and guardian of the kings, while, according to Justin, Craterus was the administrator of the royal treasury,⁷¹ perhaps an abbreviation of Craterus'

67. Hdt. 7.170.4: ὁ δὲ Μίκυθος οἰκέτης ἐὼν Ἀναξίλειω ἐπίτροπος Ῥηγίου καταλέλειπτο; Hdt. 5.30.2: τῆς δὲ Μιλήτου ἐτύγχανε ἐπίτροπος ἐὼν Ἀρισταγόρης ὁ Μολπαγόρεω, γαμβρός τε ἐὼν καὶ ἀνεψιὸς Ἰστιαίου τοῦ Λυσαγόρεω, τὸν ὁ Δαρεῖος ἐν Σούσοισι κατεῖχε.

68. Diod. Sic. 18.23.2: ὥς δὲ παρέλαβε τάς τε βασιλικὰς δυνάμεις καὶ τὴν τῶν βασιλέων προστασίαν.

69. Diod. Sic. 18.pr.: ὥς τῶν βασιλέων ἐπιμελητῆς ἡρέθη Πίθων καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ Ἀρριδαῖος, ὕστερον δ' Ἀντίπατρος. Εὐμενοῦς αὖξῃσι παράδοξος καὶ παράληψις τῆς τε τῶν βασιλέων ἐπιμελείας καὶ τῆς Μακεδονικῆς δυνάμεως. Κασάνδρου αὖξῃσι καὶ πόλεμος πρὸς Πολυπέρχοντα τὸν ἐπιμελητὴν τῶν βασιλέων καὶ κοινοπραγία πρὸς Ἀντίγονον.

70. Curt. 10.10.4: *Perdicca ut cum rege esset copiisque praeesset, quae regem sequebantur.*

71. Just. Epit. 13.4.5: *regiae pecuniae custodia Cratero traditur.*

functions.⁷² Buraselis notes that Craterus is not actually called an ἐπίτροπος, because it made no sense to install a guardian for an adult king.⁷³ Nevertheless, Craterus is called protector of Philip's realm, not of his person, which attests to him undertaking only administrative duties. All the terms used in connection with the administrative functions of the regents stress their role as managers, which brings us back to guardianship in the *polis* family law context: the good administrator takes care of his ward's property, but he does not consider himself the owner.

Though after Craterus' death Perdiccas appears to have acted as a sole regent, double guardianship seems to have been considered a successful experiment, since, after Perdiccas' murder in 321 BC, other two companions of Alexander the Great, Pithon and Arrhidaeus (not to be confused with Philip III who also bore this name) were appointed "curators (ἐπιμεληταί) of the kings with full powers (αὐτοκράτορες)".⁷⁴ I. Worthington notes that both of them were odd choices, suggested by Ptolemy, and were probably connected with Ptolemy's plan to eliminate Perdiccas and remain sole ruler of Egypt.⁷⁵ Concerning Pithon, he had supported the army rebellion that led to Perdiccas' fall⁷⁶ and, therefore, he was regarded as Perdiccas' successor. Apparently, their title shows that they were mainly regents with political and military jurisdiction, but Diodorus reports that these two men moved to Triparadeisus in Syria together with the kings, which means that both of them were also entrusted with protecting the persons of the two rulers.⁷⁷ Nevertheless, in the

72. Meeus 2009, 295.

73. Buraselis 2017, 68.

74. Diod. Sic. 18.36.7: οἱ γὰρ Μακεδόνες βουλῆς προτεθείσης περὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίας καὶ συμβουλευσάντος Πτολεμαίου πάντες προθύμως εἴλαντο τῶν βασιλέων ἐπιμελητὰς αὐτοκράτορας Πίθωνα καὶ Ἀρριδαῖον.

75. Arrhidaeus had brought Alexander's body to Egypt (Diod. Sic. 18.36.7: Ἀρριδαῖον τὸν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ βασιλέως κατακομίσαντα) according to Ptolemy's plan of demonstrating himself as the true heir of Alexander: Worthington 2016, 99.

76. Diod. Sic. 18.36.5: διόπερ πρῶτοι τῶν ἡγεμόνων ἀπέστησαν ὡς ἐκατόν, ὧν ἦν ἐπιφανέστατος Πίθων.

77. Diod. Sic. 18.39.1: κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ἀσίαν Ἀρριδαῖος καὶ Πίθων οἱ τῶν βασιλέων ἐπιμεληταὶ ἀναζεύξαντες ἀπὸ τοῦ Νείλου μετὰ τῶν βασιλέων καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως ἦχον εἰς Τριπαράδεισον τῆς ἄνω Συρίας.

introduction of the 18th Book of the *Library*, it seems that Pithon is mentioned separately from Arrhidaeus, which implies a different role reserved for each of the two guardians.⁷⁸ It is possible that a division of labor escaped Diodorus' attention who, then, mentioned the two guardians together.

After the guardianship of Pithon and Arrhidaeus, double guardianship gave way to another all-powerful regent who combined the role of administrator with that of guardian. Antipater, who replaced them in 320 BC according to the decision of the council in Triparadeisus,⁷⁹ is mentioned by Diodorus as curator with full powers,⁸⁰ but Appian calls him successor of Perdiccas to the position of “protector (προστατεύσας) of the kings”, probably because the two regents who preceded him performed their tasks for a very short period.⁸¹ Before his death, Antipater appointed one person, Polyperchon, as “curator (ἐπιμελητήν) of the kings”.⁸² W.L. Adams considers this appointment “an unprecedented practice, as regents had normally been named by kings, and in the aftermath of Alexander's death, by the army”, and he goes on saying that “however, the army was now scattered due to the Diadochi wars and not able to be fully reassembled”.⁸³ It is true that the assembled army (or parts of it) appears in sources as the body that acknowledged the appointment of regents after Alexander's death,⁸⁴ a right of the army assembly that, as M.B. Hatzopoulos notes, never became extinct and was revived whenever an appropriate case presented itself.⁸⁵ It is possible, however, that in this case the omission of the description of the usual procedure was deliberate, and that Diodorus wanted to stress the important role of Antipater in the kingdom affairs.

78. Diod. Sic. 18.pr.: ὡς τῶν βασιλέων ἐπιμελητῆς ἡρέθη Πίθων καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ Ἀρριδαῖος, ὕστερον δ' Ἀντίπατρος.

79. On the dates of Perdiccas' death and the council of Triparadeisus, see Boiy 2007, 133-136.

80. Diod. Sic. 18.39.3: οἱ δὲ Μακεδόνες ἐπιμελητὴν εἵλαντο τὸν Ἀντίπατρον αὐτοκράτορα.

81. App. Syr. 52: καὶ ἐξ Ἀντιπάτρου τοῦ μετὰ τὸν Περδίκκην προστατεύσαντος τῶν βασιλέων.

82. Diod. Sic. 18.48.4: ὁ δ' Ἀντίπατρος ἐσχάτως ἤδη διακείμενος ἀπέδειξεν ἐπιμελητὴν τῶν βασιλέων Πολυπέρχοντα καὶ στρατηγὸν αὐτοκράτορα.

83. Adams 2010, 212.

84. See e.g. n. 80.

85. Hatzopoulos 1996, 279.

Polyperchon tried to revive double guardianship by asking Eumenes of Cardia to cooperate with him in the capacity of “curator (ἐπιμελητής) of the kings”.⁸⁶ Though this suggestion derives from Polyperchon’s need for alliances with other powerful commanders in a time of conflicts between Alexander’s former companions, the reasons for a decision like that would have included Polyperchon’s care for the two kings. When he was appointed, Polyperchon was old and incapable of maintaining his wards alone. A second person by his side and a division of labor would have allowed Polyperchon to focus on administration and war, and would have provided the two kings with an extra protector, when he was busy with state affairs.

Yet, a passage from Diodorus, just a few lines before Polyperchon’s suggestion to Eumenes, seems to present a rather unknown type of guardianship. After his appointment, Polyperchon asked Olympias, the mother of Alexander the Great, to take care of her grandson in Macedonia, undertaking his protection (προστασία),⁸⁷ a suggestion that poses the question: was a royal woman allowed to act as guardian? And if so, is that related to double guardianship?

The case of Olympias: royal mothers and double guardianship in ancient Macedonia

Let us return to Charondas’ law and the importance of maternal side’s guardians. This law seems to echo a general conception of early Greek societies about the relationship between a man and his mother’s next of kin. The role of maternal relatives to the upbringing of an infant has been stressed by J. Bremmer, who provided a number of cases associated with Greek mythical kings raised in the environment of a mother’s kin.⁸⁸ The importance of maternal kinship in prehistoric Aegean has been established by a number of scholars⁸⁹ with cases of heroes who inherited kingship through marriage to a

86. Diod. Sic. 18.57.3: ἔπεμψε δὲ καὶ πρὸς Εὐμενῇ, γράψας ἐπιστολὴν ἐκ τοῦ τῶν βασιλέων ὀνόματος, ὅπως... καὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ κοινοπραγῶν ἐπιμελητῆς εἶναι τῶν βασιλέων.

87. Diod. Sic. 18.49.4: Πολυπέρχων δὲ παραλαβὼν τὴν τῶν βασιλέων ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ συνεδρεύσας μετὰ τῶν φίλων Ὀλυμπιάδα μὲν σὺν τῇ τῶν συνέδρων γνώμῃ μετεπέμπετο, παρακαλῶν τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου υἱοῦ παιδὸς ὄντος παραλαβεῖν καὶ διατρίβειν ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ τὴν βασιλικὴν ἔχουσιν προστασίαν. See also Meeus 2009, 301-302.

88. See Bremmer 1983.

89. See Zolotnikova 2009, 64-68 and, especially, n. 37 with relevant bibliography.

king's daughter manifesting the matrilocal character of the family in Bronze Age Greece.⁹⁰

But, apart from care for the education and upbringing of mythical young princes, some of the maternal relatives acted also as regents and guardians for infant kings. Pausanias refers to a number of maternal guardians for legendary rulers of ancient Thebes. Nycteus, the father-in-law of Polydorus, king of Thebes, who became guardian to young Labdacus, son of Polydorus and Nycteus' daughter. Nycteus was succeeded by his brother Lycus, which means that guardianship could be reserved for the maternal side.⁹¹ Creon, the famous hero of the Theban cycle of literature, served as regent of Thebes and guardian of his nephew's son Laodamas, the grandson of his sister Iocaste and king Oedipus.⁹² Yet, if we have to mention a case with some degree of historicity, it is more safe to refer to the Spartan royal guardian Theras, who, according to Herodotus, was the maternal uncle of the two sons of the first Dorian king of Sparta, Aristodemus I.⁹³ Reasons for Theras' guardianship were probably not different from those attributed by Diodorus to the enactment of Charondas' law: a maternal grandfather had no claim to the throne, although lack of male paternal relatives is a possibility.

In the Macedonian kingdom, a state that could never be ruled by women, the status of the mother of a king's son seems to have been of limited significance.⁹⁴ Since guardianship could result in ascension to the throne, fear for non-Argead usurpers meant that maternal relatives were not in the list of possible guardians for infant kings. Yet, a number of instances seems to provide information on the queen mother's protective power over kings during their minority. From the time of ancient Macedonian monarchy, the mother of a king's son was responsible for his survival and ultimate ability to reach the throne. As E. Carney notes,⁹⁵ "royal mothers and sons were natural allies,

90. See Finkelberg 1991, who discusses these cases.

91. Paus. 2.6.2: Λάβδακον γὰρ τὸν Πολυδώρου τοῦ Κάδμου παῖδα ἔτι αὐτός τε ἐπετρόπευεν ὁ Νυκτεὺς καὶ τότε ἀπέλιπεν ἐπιτροπεύειν ἐκείνῳ (Lycus).

92. Paus. 1.39.2: Κρέων γάρ, ὃς ἐδυνάστευε τότε ἐν Θήβαις Λαοδάμαντα ἐπιτροπεύων τὸν Ἑτεοκλέους.

93. Hdt. 4.147.2: ἦν δὲ ὁ Θήρας οὗτος, γένος ἐὼν Καδμεῖος, τῆς μητρὸς ἀδελφεὸς τοῖσι Ἀριστοδῆμου παισὶ Εὐρυσθένει καὶ Προκλέε.

94. Psoma 2012, 80.

95. Carney 2000, 31.

while natural fathers and sons natural enemies”, a mentality clearly depicted in Olympias’ attempts to place her son Alexander on the Macedonian throne.

But was it possible for a royal woman like Olympias to be called to guardianship? A. Meeus noticed that regents, acting as administrators of the state, and especially as leaders of the armed forces, performed their duties at a distance from their ward, while a guardian had to be close to him, a situation too logical given the limited possibilities of communication in antiquity. In a situation like that the guardian/caretaker of the young king should have been a member of his family. Roxane, mother of the infant king Alexander IV, was a foreigner of Iranian origin, which meant that she was excluded from guardianship. Thus, Olympias as a family member could act as a co-guardian to her grandson with Polyperchon,⁹⁶ the latter keeping the role of the regent. This suggestion by Polyperchon was naturally the result of his need for political alliances. Olympias was an enemy of Antipater’s son Cassander, the main obstacle to Polyperchon’s claim to guardianship, and a prestigious person among the kingdom’s aristocracy. But, apart from that, appointment of women as guardians originated from an established tradition that Polyperchon took into consideration.

Guardianship of minors by their mothers was not unknown to kingdoms that bordered on Macedonia. In the Molossian state of Epirus, women could independently own and alienate property and act without male guardians,⁹⁷ and it is very likely that they could act as guardians of their children. In a 370-68 BC decree concerning grant of Molossian citizenship, the beneficiaries are a woman and her children.⁹⁸ Although not mentioned explicitly, a woman privileged enough to pass citizenship to her children could also act as their guardian during their minority, and it is highly likely that the legal situation of ordinary Molossian women had a parallel in the situation of the royal women.⁹⁹ Olympias, who was of Molossian origin, was acquainted with such a type of guardianship. And if Carney is correct, her daughter Cleopatra (and then

96. Meeus 2009, 301-302.

97. On the place of women in Epirus in relation with administration of the *oikos* in the absence of their husbands, see Cabanes 1976, 407-413.

98. SEG 48, 676, ll. 3-6: Φιλίσται τᾷ Ἀντι|μάχου γυναικὶ ἐξ Ἀρρώνου | ἐδόθη πολιτεία, αὐτᾷ | καὶ ἐκγόνους.

99. Carney 2006, 7.

Olympias herself) had acted as guardian of her children and regent in Epirus, after her husband Alexander I died.¹⁰⁰

As for Macedonia, unlike the small number of royal women, the numerous women who lived in the cities and the countryside remain unknown to scholars.¹⁰¹ However, two inscriptions reveal that ordinary women of Classical Macedonia were granted some significant rights. According to a 357/6 BC deed of sale from Amphipolis, a widow (whose name is not mentioned) and her offsprings sold a property consisting of a house, a field, a lot of land, probably the surrounding area behind the house, and a space of five feet, which appears to have served as family vault in this property of the suburbs of Amphipolis.¹⁰² S. Le Bohec-Bouhet points to the anonymity of the widow and to the presence of her children as co-owners as indications of limited legal freedom,¹⁰³ but another deed of sale from Kellion of Chalcidice, also dated around the mid-fourth century, demonstrates the high level of independence of Macedonian women. In this deed, a woman is mentioned as the sole buyer of a house.¹⁰⁴ Considering the above information, it could be concluded that guardianship of minors was probably a duty within the scope of a Macedonian woman's activities.

Meeus mentions as a possible guardian Eurydice, the widow of Amyntas III and mother of Philip II, who appears to have married Ptolemy of Alorus, the latter becoming regent and guardian of her son Perdiccas III.¹⁰⁵ Carney notes

100. On sources that attest to a regency by Cleopatra, see Carney 2000, 89.

101. Le Bohec-Bouhet 2006, 187.

102. Hatzopoulos 1991, 24-28 no. III, ll. 1-9 (= SEG 41, 557): Π[ο]λυκ[ρά]τε[ρ]ος παρὰ τῆς Σωστράτου γυ[ν]αικὸς καὶ τῶν παίδων τῶν Σωστράτου ἐπρίατο τὸν ἐπὶ ἀκλινὸν καὶ τὸν ψιλὸν καὶ | τὰ ἐξόπισθε πάντα τῆς οἰκίας καὶ τῇ πεντάπουν τὰ[ύ]της ὑφελὼν πρὸς ἐντάφια τοῦ πατρὸς. (Polykrates bought from the wife and children of Sostratos the house with seven couches and the field and everything found behind the house and the five-foot [vault], with the exception of the part reserved for the burial of their father. English translation based on the French one provided in Hatzopoulos 1991, 25-26).

103. Le Bohec-Bouhet 2006, 194-195.

104. SEG 38, 670, ll. 2-4: Βιτταλὼ Διονυσιφάνεος | παρὰ Φιλίππου τοῦ Ἀννίκαντος τὴν οἰκίαν ἐμ πόλει. For commentary on this inscription, see Hatzopoulos 1988, 19-23.

105. Meeus 2009, 298; Schol. in Aeschin. 2.29: οὗτος ἦν ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Ἀλωρίτης, δὲ ἀνελὼν Ἀλεξάνδρον τὸν Ἀμύντου, συλλαβομένης αὐτῷ πρὸς τοῦτο Εὐρυδίκης τῆς μητρὸς Ἀλεξάνδρου, καὶ γήμας τὴν Εὐρυδίκην καὶ ἐπιτροπεύσας Περδίκκου καὶ Φιλίππου παίδων

Eurydice's deep involvement in politics in order to secure her sons' interests during Ptolemy's regency, which was faced with a rather hostile attitude by ancient historians.¹⁰⁶ Plutarch's reference to Eurydice's care for her sons' education shows that from an early time royal queens were involved in the upbringing of the future rulers and, thus, in the protection of their royal sons during their minority.¹⁰⁷ Meeus points to the inability of ancient writers to grasp this kind of role of a royal woman,¹⁰⁸ but Eurydice's role as guardian of her son may be deduced from a reference of the orator Aeschines to Ptolemy of Alorus: Aeschines says that Ptolemy was established as "guardian (ἐπίτροπος) of state affairs", but not guardian of Perdiccas himself,¹⁰⁹ apparently, because the protector of the person of the young ruler was not Ptolemy, but his wife, Perdiccas' mother. Eurydice was from Lyncestis, an area neighboring to Epirus and Macedonia, so it is likely that such institutions were a commonplace in these neighboring kingdoms.

Another possible candidate for a mother guardian is a woman named Cleopatra, wife of Perdiccas II (reigned 448-413 BC), who also appears to have been married to a royal guardian. Based on the fact that Perdiccas' older son and stepson of Cleopatra, Archelaus, was married to a woman named Cleopatra, G.H. Macurdy and J. Whitehorne assumed that Archelaus married his stepmother in order to stabilize his claims to the throne.¹¹⁰ Archelaus appears in Plato's *Gorgias* to have acted in the capacity of guardian (a position he claimed after the murder of the rightful guardian, his uncle Alcetas), when he killed his infant brother and legitimate ruler in order to become a king himself.¹¹¹

όντων ἐθασίλευσεν ἔτη ε', καὶ ἀποθνήσκει ἀναιρεθείς, Περδίκκου αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπιβουλὴν συστήσαντος. Although this is the only piece of evidence on a marriage between Eurydice and Ptolemy, see Lane Fox 2011, 261, who argues that this is probably a true event.

106. See Carney 2000, 42-46.

107. Pl. *Mor.* 14.b: Εὐρυδίκην, ἥτις Ἰλλυρίδῃ οὔσα καὶ τριβάρβαρος, ὅμως ἐπὶ τῇ μαθήσει τῶν τέκνων ὁψὲ τῆς ἡλικίας ἤψατο παιδείας.

108. Meeus 2009, 298.

109. Aeschin. 2.29: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἶπον περὶ Πτολεμαίου, ὃς ἦν ἐπίτροπος καθεστῆ-
κὼς τῶν πραγμάτων.

110. Macurdy 1932, 15-16; Whitehorne 1994, 21-22.

111. Pl. *Grg.* 471c: ὕστερον τὸν ἀδελφόν, τὸν γνήσιον τοῦ Περδίκκου ὄν, παῖδα ὡς ἐπτέτη, οὗ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐγίγνετο κατὰ τὸ δίκαιον, οὐκ ἐβουλήθη εὐδαίμων γενέσθαι δικάως

Carney supported the view of Archelaus' guardianship combined with a marriage to the royal mother by citing a similar case in Hellenistic Macedonia: the case of Antigonus Doson, uncle and guardian of the Antigonid king Philip V, who married Philip's mother (unfortunately there is disagreement in the sources about her name)¹¹² and was eventually proclaimed king by the Macedonians.

According to Eusebius, Antigonus did not bring up any of the children born to him, in order to be succeeded by Philip.¹¹³ If this reference is correct, it is a unique case. Unlike the Argead royal guardians who reserved kingship for their sons, Antigonus remained only the administrator of the kingdom, a household manager like his counterparts in the Greek *polis*. On the other hand, Philip's mother probably claimed the old queen mother's right to act as guardian for her son. A letter by Antigonus Doson concerning the guardianship of Asclepiades, son of his friend Nicarchus, sheds some light on female guardianship in Hellenistic Macedonia. Nicarchus appointed his wife and his son's mother as guardian and administrator of his household.¹¹⁴ This provision departs from the Athenian legal traditions and is widely attested in the Hellenistic legal context. Epigraphic sources show that the Hellenistic women could not only be formally exempted from male guardianship, but, in addition, they could be designated as guardians of their children.¹¹⁵ We may conclude that the role of queen as guardian of her children and, in the context of Hellenistic monarchy outside the Greek mainland, as regent had contributed to a higher degree of female autonomy in the Greek *poleis*.¹¹⁶

ἐκθρέψας καὶ ἀποδοὺς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐκείνῳ. For the guardianship of Alcetas and Archelaus, and Archelaus' legitimacy of birth, see Hatzopoulos 1986, 283-285.

112. On her identity (and her identification with the Epirote princess Phthia), see Le Bohec 1993, 143-149.

113. Euseb. *Chron.* 1.238: ὁ δὲ παίδων γενομένων ἐκ τῆς Χρυσήιδος οὐκ ἀνεθρέψατο, τὴν ἀρχὴν τῷ Φιλίππῳ παρασώζων, ᾧ δὲ καὶ παρέδωκεν ἀποθνήσκων.

114. SEG 60, 585, ll. 13-19: ἥ τε οὖν ἐπιτροπὴ κατὰ | τὴν διαθήκην τὴν ἀπολειφθεῖσαν | ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ... Ἀντιπολίδι τῇ γυναικὶ ἀποδοθήτω μενούσῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ οἴκου | καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ διοικούσῃ κατὰ τὴν | τοῦ τετελευτηκότος βούλησιν. On this inscription, see Tziafalias, Helly 2010, 94-104.

115. Velissaropoulos-Karakostas 2011, vol. I, 241-244.

116. Le Bohec-Bouhet 2006, 195.

Carney points to the attractions of a marriage to a royal widow (access to the heir for purposes of easy elimination),¹¹⁷ and if we consider that she acted as protector of her children's interests, then, in cases like the aforementioned, we might notice female co-guardians that slipped the attention of ancient writers. At this point, we have to notice the similarity of these marriages with a usual Athenian practice. It seemed common for an Athenian widow to remarry and her children be reared at in the house of their stepfather. Nevertheless, in Athens this man could not act as guardian, unless the orphan/s' father had arranged both marriage and guardianship by will.¹¹⁸ Yet, although Athenian widows could have considerable authority and influence in their deceased husband's house,¹¹⁹ they were not assigned any guardianship functions by law. On the other hand, household practices in the kingdoms north of Athens made room for this right. And if queen mothers or royal women were involved in the protection of the infant kings, this might shed some light on the origins of the double guardianship in a royal context.

One is taken aback by the fact that other regents did not pursue a collaboration with the royal grandmother. Nevertheless, since some of them tried to establish links with other women of the royal family, I believe that they were aware of the old traditions. We know that Perdiccas attempted to marry Cleopatra, Alexander's sister and Olympias' daughter, after his appointment as guardian. And before him, Leonnatus, one of the candidates for young Alexander IV's guardianship, had been approached by Cleopatra for the same reason.¹²⁰ It is quite intriguing to see this marriage to a possible guardian (Cleopatra being after her marriage to the regent Perdiccas the protector of her nephew) as part of an old tradition that gave the opportunity to ambitious regents to reach kingship.¹²¹ Then, the duty that Perdiccas was assigned seems

117. Carney 2000, 22.

118. Humphreys 2018, 96.

119. See Cudjoe 2010, 79-85.

120. According to Plut. *Eum.* 3.5, Leonnatus showed Eumenes letters from Cleopatra that revealed her intention of marrying him: καί τινας ἐπιστολὰς ἔδειξε Κλεοπάτρας μεταπεμπομένης αὐτὸν εἰς Πέλλαν ὡς γαμησομένης.

121. Diod. Sic. 18.23.3: ὁρεγόμενος γὰρ βασιλείας ἔσπευδε τὴν Κλεοπάτραν γῆμαι, νομίζων διὰ ταύτης προτρέψεσθαι τοὺς Μακεδόνας συγκατασκευάζειν αὐτῷ τὴν τῶν ὅλων ἐξουσίαν.

to reveal his plan of becoming a member of the royal family. No matter what his exact title was, all the sources agree that Perdiccas undertook the responsibility for the protection of the kings. And, as we saw, the *ἐπίτροπος* of the king was invariably a male member of the royal house. Thus, the reasons for the hostile attitude of other companions, such as Antipater and Antigonus, towards Perdiccas –expressed by challenging his authority and finally murdering him– become very clear: Perdiccas used regency as a means to ascend to the throne.

As for the rest of the regents, it is not difficult to understand why they were not able to forge a relationship with female members of the royal family. Pithon and Arrhidaeus exercised their duties as regents and guardians of the kings for a very short time. They appear to have resigned because of Eurydice, wife and niece of Philip III (being also Alexander's niece), who appears to have acted on behalf of her husband in matters of initiated action and policy to the point of surpassing the two guardians' authority.¹²² Eurydice seems to have served as a guardian of her husband, but, since there is no other example of female regency and guardianship to an adult ward, we may not consider her position an official one. However, she was an Argead (the daughter of Alexander the Great's sister Cynane) and that would have appealed to the Macedonian soldiers. But, apart from Eurydice's popularity, the short tenure of the two men points to the temporary character of their positions.

Regarding Antipater, his deteriorating relationship with Olympias set a barrier to a joint guardianship of the regent and the royal grandmother or her daughters, which explains lack of a suggestion similar to that of Polyperchon. But, apart from that, Antipater had other plans. Very soon after Alexander's death, Antipater initiated the pattern of marriage alliances by offering his daughters to some of the former companions.¹²³ Obviously, Antipater aimed at creating a dynasty in the place of the Argeads and it was his son Cassander who, through his marriage to Alexander's sister, would become the first

122. Diod. Sic. 18.39.2: Εὐρυδίκης τῆς βασιλίσσης πολλὰ περιεργαζομένης καὶ ταῖς τῶν ἐπιμελητῶν ἐπιβολαῖς ἀντιπραττούσης οἱ μὲν περὶ τὸν Πίθωνα δυσχρηστούμενοι καὶ τοὺς Μακεδόνas ὀρῶντες τοῖς ἐκείνης προστάγμασιν αἰεὶ μᾶλλον προσέχοντας συνήγαγον ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ἀπέλειπαντο. On Eurydice's involvement in the policies of the age of Diadochi, see Carney 2000, 132-136.

123. Carney 2000, 131.

king of the short-lived Antipatrid dynasty. Hatzopoulos notes that Cassander, who married Alexander's sister Thessalonice, would have become the tutor of young Alexander IV after the execution of Philip III and his wife Eurydice by Olympias, and that as a guardian he acquired a life-long right to kingship which allowed him to finally ascend to the throne.¹²⁴ Although it is not explicitly mentioned, one would think of a co-guardianship of Cassander and Thessalonice that gave Cassander the opportunity to become a king.

Taking all the above information into consideration, we may assume that in the customary royal legal traditions of the Macedonian kingdom there was a "constitutional" provision for a double guardianship of royal women and male guardians. Royal women kept for themselves the duty of protecting the young rulers, while the male guardians remained mainly administrators of the kingdom on behalf of the young rulers, though –unfortunately for their wards– most of them endeavored to reach kingship! And, as we are about to show, the important role of queen mothers as protectors of their children becomes more explicit in the case of the double guardianship of Hellenistic kings.

Double guardianship and protection of the king's person in the Ptolemaic kingdom: the guardianship of Ptolemy V and the foster father of the king

The setting of a later situation where the death of a king offered the occasion for new experiments in collegial guardianship of an infant successor¹²⁵ is the Ptolemaic kingdom of late third century BC. King Ptolemy IV died in 205 survived by an orphan child, Ptolemy V, and his wife and mother of his heir, Arsinoe III. Following the usual practice of the Hellenistic monarchs, Ptolemy IV had already designated Ptolemy V as co-ruler.¹²⁶ However, since all the other kings were succeeded by adult sons, the new situation appears to have triggered the ambitions of two courtiers, Agathocles and Sosibius.

But who were these courtiers? Every king in the Hellenistic era was surrounded by an entourage consisted of men mainly known as φίλοι (friends).

124. Diod. Sic. 19.52.1: Κάσανδρος δέ, κατὰ νοῦν αὐτῷ τῶν πραγμάτων προχωρούντων, περιέλαμβανε ταῖς ἐλπίσι τὴν Μακεδόνων βασιλείαν. διὸ καὶ Θεσσαλονίκην ἔγχευε, τὴν Φιλίππου μὲν θυγατέρα, Ἀλεξάνδρου δὲ ἀδελφὴν ὁμοπάτριον, σπεύδων οἰκεῖον αὐτὸν ἀποδεῖξαι τῆς βασιλικῆς συγγενείας; Hatzopoulos 1996, 277 with n. 4.

125. Buraselis 2017, 69.

126. On the co-regency of Ptolemies IV and V, see Murnane 1977, 95-96.

Alexander's successors inherited from the great Macedonian king the practice of selecting their courtiers personally on the basis of loyalty and merit.¹²⁷ The fact that the title of the members of the court of the Hellenistic rulers was φίλοι and not ἐταῖροι, as in the case of the advisers of the Argead kings, seems to originate from the time of Alexander's early successors who lacked royal status and, therefore, their entourages consisted not of royal companions but of personal friends.¹²⁸ Concerning their role in the kingdoms, these friends were, as H.S. Lund notes, "true Renaissance men", who served as military commanders, ambassadors, councilors, treasurers or governors of administrative districts of the kingdoms.¹²⁹ As in the case of royal companions, intimate relationship was established between the king and some of his courtiers, so it comes as no surprise that the most influential of them could sometimes be called to serve as guardians of infant kings.

Indeed, the two courtiers, Agathocles and Sosibius, had exercised their influence on Ptolemy IV to the point of becoming, as our sources state, the true administrators of the kingdom.¹³⁰ But it seems that this was not enough, for they resorted to more drastic measures. Polybius offers a detailed account of the machinations they employed to be appointed guardians: the murder of the late king's widow and the proclamation of young Ptolemy V as king under their protection after reading a false testament of the dead king to the gathered royal troops.¹³¹ But why the two men favored a double guardianship?

127. Strootman 2014, 117.

128. Billows 1990, 247-248.

129. Lund 1992, 179.

130. Both Polybius and Plutarch mention Sosibius as the true head of the state during Ptolemy IV's reign (Polyb. 5.35.7: οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Σωσίβιον –οὗτος γὰρ μάλιστα τότε προεστάτει τῶν πραγμάτων; Plut. *Cleom.* 34.2: ὁ δὲ τῶν ὅλων προεστηκώς καὶ προβουλεύων Σωσίβιος). Agathocles is cited as one of the most influential courtiers by both Polybius (5.63.1: οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἀγαθοκλέα καὶ Σωσίβιον, οἱ τότε προεστώτες τῆς βασιλείας) and Justin (*Epit.* 30.2.5: *Agathocles regis lateri iunctus ciuitatem regebat*).

131. Polyb. 15.25.1-2, 5: ὅτι Σωσίβιος ὁ ψευδεπίτροπος Πτολεμαίου ἐδόκει γεγονέναι σκευὸς ἀγχίνουν καὶ πολυχρόνιον, ἔτι δὲ κακοποιὸν ἐν βασιλείᾳ...ἀρτῦσαι φόνον...θυγατρὶ Βερενίκης Ἀρσινόῃ. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα διάδημα τῷ παιδί περιθέντες ἀνέδειξαν βασιλέα, καὶ διαθήκην τινὰ παρανέγνωσαν πεπλασμένην, ἐν ᾗ γεγραμμένον ἦν ὅτι καταλείπει τοῦ παιδὸς ἐπιτρόπους ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀγαθοκλέα καὶ Σωσίβιον.

Obviously, the two men were partners in crime, so they reserved the highest positions of the state for themselves. However, their option is probably related to the possible Athenian influence on family law of the Greeks who lived in the Ptolemaic kingdom, and especially Alexandria.

From antiquity, it has been argued that the laws of the *polis* of Alexandria (the capital of the Ptolemaic empire) were based on the Athenian laws. Although the influence of the Athenian laws on the legal system of Alexandria has been exaggerated in ancient sources,¹³² it is true that some elements of Athenian legal procedure were introduced to Alexandrian legislation, as it appears from the *Dikaionmata* papyrus (*dikaionmata* were legal texts used to support a litigant).¹³³ It is not unlikely that several legal practices from Athens might have been brought to the Ptolemaic kingdom by Demetrius Phalereus when he arrived at the court of Ptolemy I as a legal adviser in 307 BC.¹³⁴ Multiple guardianship is attested in two third-century papyri,¹³⁵ so it is possible that the two courtiers were acquainted with this kind of legal practice. Being an established institution, double guardianship would appeal to the Greek population of the kingdom, especially the Greek or Hellenized residents of the capital Alexandria. But what actually led the two men to choose double guardianship is the death of the queen mother.

Queen mothers in Hellenistic empires were usually acting as co-rulers with their sons, being also their guardians during their infancy. In Seleucid realm there were some important examples of women acting as advocates for their sons and even as regents.¹³⁶ The examples of Cleopatra I Syra, who acted as regent for her son Ptolemy VI (we are going to discuss about her son's guardianships below), and Cleopatra VII, who ruled as a co-regent of her son Ptolemy XV Caesarion, attest to a similar practice in Ptolemaic Egypt. In the

132. On the influence of Athenian and Greek legislation on Alexandria's laws, see Fraser 1972, vol. 2, 109-115.

133. Fraser 1972, vol. 2, 110-111. The *Dikaionmata* papyrus is the *P.Hal.1*.

134. Ael. V.H. 3.17: Δημήτριος δὲ ὁ Φαληρεὺς...καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ δὲ συνὼν τῷ Πτολεμαίῳ νομοθεσίας ἤρξε.

135. *P.Lond.* 7.2017, l. 1 (242/1 BC) and *P.Enteux.* 32, ll. 1-3 (218 BC).

136. Carney 2012, 314. A very interesting study which presents all relevant cases on queen regency in the Seleucid kingdom has been conducted as a Master Degree Thesis at the University of Waterloo by S. Reda (2014).

capacity of her son's protector, Arsinoe, the widow of Ptolemy IV, was a possible obstacle in Sosibius' and Agathocles' plans,¹³⁷ but what are the origins of this practice? It is true that in pharaonic Egypt, women were expected to deputize for their husbands and raise the children during their husband's absence. Royal wives were no exception, but they were called to rule the country or act as regents on behalf of their infant sons.¹³⁸ Certainly, the Ptolemaic policy towards the native population was marked by the clever attempt of the Ptolemies to adapt the ancient Egyptian royal ideology, and, perhaps, some of the institutions that accompanied it, to the court of Ptolemies. However, as G. Hölbl points out, the king –like the people of his kingdom– had two faces, a pharaonic and a Greek-Macedonian.¹³⁹

As J. Méléze-Modrzejewski –the great historian who studied law and justice in Hellenistic states– noticed, despite the possibility of influence of local legal practices on Greek law, Greek legal practices were not amalgamated with local traditions.¹⁴⁰ In the Egyptian *chora*, the Greeks played the role of colonials essentially uninterested in the Egyptian organization of the land, unless it compromised its rentability¹⁴¹ and, although the formation of the Ptolemaic state marked the return to a pharaonic dynastic model,¹⁴² as R.A. Hazzard notes “the Ptolemies, proud Macedonians, spoke their native dialect on special occasions and only learnt Egyptian under the last Cleopatra”.¹⁴³ This is definitely not the only Macedonian feature preserved in the Ptolemaic court, at least during the time of the first Ptolemies. It is typical of the survival of Macedonian customs that the two guardians announced their appointment before the armed forces, just like the regents of Alexander's empire. Guardianship of minor kings by queens is probably another practice brought from the Ptolemies' motherland. Although depicted in the same way as the ancient female rulers of Egypt¹⁴⁴ and bearing titles similar to those of ancient Egyptian queens, the queens of

137. Buraselis 2017, 69.

138. Tyldesley 2016, 275.

139. Hölbl 2001, 307–308.

140. Méléze-Modrzejewski 2011, 360.

141. Criscuolo 2011, 167.

142. Manning 2010, 80.

143. Hazzard 2000, 87.

144. On this depiction, see Quaegebeur 1978.

Ptolemaic Egypt were descended from Alexander's Diadochi. In my opinion, although I cannot wholly dismiss the influence of pharaonic practices on the prominence of Ptolemaic queens,¹⁴⁵ it is more likely that early queens, such as Cleopatra I, kept alive the old Macedonian tradition of the protection of their sons than that they adopted an Egyptian royal practice that has not been in effect for almost a millennium of years.¹⁴⁶

At any rate, what leads us to the possibility of a guardianship by Arsinoe III is her relationship to the late king: Arsinoe was the sister of Ptolemy IV. From the reign of Ptolemy II, who married his sister Arsinoe II,¹⁴⁷ the dynasty increasingly practiced endogamy, a feature of Ptolemaic monarchy that had attracted the attention of scholars who provided a number of possible reasons for it: religious (the identification of the rulers with the incestuous marriage of the Egyptian gods Isis and Osiris), political (fear for foreign claimants and adoption of an old pharaonic practice that appealed to native populations) or symbolic (as an indication of royal luxury).¹⁴⁸ No matter what led the Ptolemaic royal house to practice endogamy, a queen of the same blood with her husband-king was a much stronger candidate for the guardianship of the infant ruler and the regency than an outsider from another royal dynasty. And it is this special relationship between many kings and queens of Ptolemaic kingdom that eventually allowed powerful queens after the mid-second century BC, like Cleopatras II, III and VII, to become actual rulers or co-rulers with male members of their family in the likes of ancient Egyptian queens.¹⁴⁹

145. On the significant position of queens in the Ptolemaic kingdom, see Vandorpe 2010, 168-169.

146. The last female regent for an infant ruler in pharaonic Egypt is perhaps Tausret (died ca. 1189 BC), regent for her stepson Siptah, who eventually became a pharaoh. On her reign, see Callender 2012, 25-47. As for the Macedonian elements in Hellenistic monarchy, R. Strootman (2014, 1) points out that in the Hellenistic kingdoms of Near East "the Macedonian and Greek element played a pivotal role too and probably more so than recent scholarship has suggested".

147. Paus. 1.7.1: οὗτος ὁ Πτολεμαῖος Ἀρσινόης ἀδελφῆς ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐρασθεὶς ἔγγημεν αὐτήν.

148. On reasons for Ptolemaic endogamy, see Ager 2005, 16-27.

149. Regarding co-rule in Egypt, Minas-Nerpel (2015, 809) notes that both ancient Egyptian and Ptolemaic queenship "was complementary to kingship" and that "no queen could exist without a king". Yet, Cleopatra II claimed to be sole ruler of the

Considering the importance of the queen mother Arsinoe III as a protector of her offspring, there should be a replacement for the person entrusted with bringing up and protecting the young ruler Ptolemy V. And it was found: Polybius reports that after the announcement of the guardianship, Agathocles put the child under the care of his mother Oenante and his sister Agathoclea.¹⁵⁰ Agathocles presented himself as a foster father, the head of a foster family charged with the upbringing and protection of the child, which would, of course, give him the opportunity to get more acquainted with the young monarch and remain an influential counselor in the royal court. On the other hand, both Polybius and Plutarch refer to Sosibius as the main administrator of the state during the reign of Ptolemy IV,¹⁵¹ and it is a logical necessity to regard him as the *de facto* ruler of the state during Ptolemy V's minority. This points to a division of labor between the guardians similar to that in the age of Alexander's first successors. One guardian is expected to protect the person of the young monarch along with other possible duties of administrative nature (perhaps Agathocles' jurisdiction included some aspects of administration, but Polybius did not mention anything else), while the other as a regent had to deal only with matters of state policy.

The second double guardianship for Ptolemy V, that followed the fall of Agathocles and Sosibius, included Tlepolemus and Sosibius the Younger and is a similar case. In the context of Polybius' account, Tlepolemus is called an ἐπίτροπος responsible for the administration of the kingdom and the treasury,¹⁵² while Sosibius was responsible for the survival of the young ruler. According to Polybius, after the overthrow of his former guardian Agathocles, the young king was taken to the house of Sosibius.¹⁵³ A few chapters below,

kingdom and started a new era where, as Hölbl (2001, 197) points out, "the reckoning of dates solely on the basis of a woman's rule represented an extremely audacious innovation".

150. Polyb. 15.25.12.

151. See n. 130.

152. See Polyb. 16.22.7, who says that the members of the royal court accused Tlepolemus of acting not as ἐπίτροπος but as heir: πάντων...συγκατατιθεμένων τῶν περὶ τὴν αὐτὴν διὰ τὸ τὸν Τληπόλεμον καὶ τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὰ χρήματα μὴ ὡς ἐπίτροπον, ἀλλ' ὡς κληρονόμον χειρίζειν.

153. Polyb. 15.32.8.

Sosibius is reported to be the keeper of the royal seal and responsible for the protection of the king's body, which confirms that he acted as a protector of the child king continuing the practice of his predecessor in that position.¹⁵⁴ Here, for one more time we are aware of the distinctive roles of the two guardians: Tlepolemus was the administrator of the state, while Sosibius was the man entrusted with Ptolemy's survival.

The hostile attitude of Sosibius the Younger towards Tlepolemus led the latter to deprive the former of his duties and become the only guardian of the kingdom and of Ptolemy V.¹⁵⁵ After Tlepolemus, another courtier, Aristomenes from the Acarnanian *polis* Azyleia, became Ptolemy's guardian.¹⁵⁶ It seems that double guardianship of Tlepolemus and Sosibius the Younger was followed by accumulation of power by all-powerful guardians. Nevertheless, another person seems to have cooperated with Aristomenes: Polycrates of Argos, the viceroy of Cyprus. P.G. Elgood considers Polycrates a co-regent along with Aristomenes chosen by him as the man in charge of finances¹⁵⁷ (this duty reminds me of Craterus' responsibility for the royal treasury during the reign of Alexander IV and Philip III). Polycrates appears to have been the most important of the royal men who supported the proclamation of Ptolemy V as a king, despite his minority (he was only 12 years old at that time), which means that he held a high position in the royal court, perhaps as regent.¹⁵⁸

Nevertheless, if we accept the possibility of a double guardianship, is there any evidence on the role of one of these men as protector of the young king?

154. Polyb. 16.22.2: ἐδόκει γὰρ οὗτος τοῦ τε βασιλέως προεστάναι φρονιμώτερον ἢ κατὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν, τὴν τε πρὸς τοὺς ἐκτὸς ἀπάντησιν ἀξίαν ποιεῖσθαι τῆς ἐγκεχειρισμένης αὐτῷ πίστεως: αὕτη δ' ἦν ἡ σφραγὶς καὶ τὸ τοῦ βασιλέως σῶμα.

155. Polyb. 16.22.11: ἔλαβε καὶ τὴν σφραγίδα παρὰ Σωσιβίου, καὶ ταύτην παρειληφώς ὁ Τληπόλεμος λοιπὸν ἤδη πάντα τὰ πράγματα κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ προαίρεσιν ἔπραττεν.

156. See n. 159.

157. Elgood 1943, 159. See also Taylor 2013, 103, who calls both Aristomenes and Polycrates regents. On Polycrates' responsibilities for the government of Cyprus and for the royal finances, see Polyb. 18.55.6: οὐ μόνον διεφύλαξε τῷ παιδί τὴν νῆσον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πλῆθος ἰκανὸν ἤθροισε χρημάτων.

158. Polyb. 18.55.4: χρησάμενοι δὲ ταῖς παρασκευαῖς μεγαλομερῶς, ἐπετέλουν τὴν πρᾶξιν ἀξίως τοῦ τῆς βασιλείας προσχήματος, πλεῖστα Πολυκράτους δοκοῦντος εἰς τὴν ἐπιβολὴν ταύτην αὐτοῖς συνηργημέναι.

Diodorus reports that Aristomenes was loved like a father by the young king,¹⁵⁹ an expression implying that he acted as the king's foster father. Furthermore, in his work *Περὶ τῆς Ἑρυνθοῦς Θαλάσσης*, Agatharchides of Cnidus (ca. 215 to after 145 BC) cites a dialogue between a courtier who is an ἐπίτροπος and a young ruler of the Ptolemaic kingdom who is his ward. What is interesting is that the courtier says that he was entrusted both with the administration of the kingdom and the protection of the king's body.¹⁶⁰ This dialogue has been identified with a conversation between Aristomenes and Ptolemy V,¹⁶¹ and we have to admit that the role of this guardian reminds us of the duty of Sosibius the Younger.

No matter how reliable the evidence on the third case of double guardianship may be, the rest of the sources manifest that the king's presence in a courtier's household was indicative of the duty of preserving the young monarch as a foster father. This observation leads us to the next set of cases.

Tutors and double guardianship in the Ptolemaic kingdom

Ptolemaic Egypt was the setting of two other cases of double guardianship. Again, infant kings who appear to have lacked the protective power of the queen mother were provided with two guardians, but a new feature is added to the institution of double guardianship: tutors, the men in charge of a young ruler's education and upbringing, were appointed to perform the duties of the guardian.

Although mainly attested in the Ptolemaic and Seleucid courts, the office of τροφεύς, as is the title of the tutor in Greek sources, was already a position of great honor at the court of Philip II of Macedonia which was connected with the education of young princes and the young nobles of the kingdom.¹⁶²

159. Diod. Sic. 28 fr. 14: Ἀριστομένην δὲ τὸν ἐπίτροπον αὐτοῦ γεγεννημένον καὶ πάντα καλῶς διωκτικῶτα τὴν μὲν ἀρχὴν ἡγάπα καθαπερεὶ πατέρα καὶ πάντα ἔπραττεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκείνου γνώμης.

160. GGM: Agatharchides, *De Mari Erythreo Libris Excerpta* 17: Ἐγὼ δ' ἄφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἡ τύχη μὲ κατέστησεν ἐπίτροπον τοῦ σώματος τοῦ σοῦ, νέου παντελῶς ὄντος, καὶ τῆς ὅλης βασιλείας, ἀπ' ἐκείνης εὐθὺς μέγαν ἐμαυτῷ πόνον ἐπέβαλον. On Agatharchides of Cnidus, see OCD⁴, 35.

161. See Verdin 1983, 414-416.

162. Strootman 2014, 140.

Thanks to Plutarch, we are aware of Alexander's chief tutors, Leonidas of Epirus, a kinsman of his mother Olympias, and Lysimachus of Acarnania.¹⁶³ The office is also attested in Antigonid Macedonia: Diogenes Laertius refers to Zeno's student Persaeus of Citium, tutor of Alcioneus, son of Antigonus Gonatas, who was sent by the Macedonian king to serve as the philosopher's personal secretary,¹⁶⁴ while Plutarch speaks of the *τροφεῖς* of the children of the last Macedonian king Perseus who joined him in Aemilius Paulus' triumph after his army's defeat by the Romans in the battle of Pydna in 168 BC.¹⁶⁵

The Ptolemaic court had experienced the presence of significant tutors since the time of Ptolemy I, who had appointed the Peripatetic philosopher Strato of Lampsacus as a salaried instructor for his son Ptolemy II.¹⁶⁶ But, in the second century BC, a tutor was going to become more than a simple instructor of a future king. Diodorus speaks of Eulaeus, a eunuch, and a Syrian named Linaeus who acted as guardians of the young Ptolemy VI after the death of his mother Cleopatra I Syra around 176 BC.¹⁶⁷ Cleopatra was the first of the Ptolemaic queens to be regent for a son in his minority, her model for regency being her mother Laodice III, who had been acting as a delegate of her husband, the Seleucid king Antiochus III, when he campaigned against the Parthians between 212 and 206 BC.¹⁶⁸ However, we are not sure if the two guardians were

163. Plut. Alex. 5.4: πολλοὶ μὲν οὖν περὶ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν, ὡς εἰκός, ἦσαν αὐτοῦ τροφεῖς καὶ παιδαγωγοὶ καὶ διδάσκαλοι λεγόμενοι, πᾶσι δ' ἐφειστήκει Λεωνίδα, ἀνὴρ τό τε ἦθος αὐστηρὸς καὶ συγγενὴς Ὀλυμπιάδος, αὐτὸς μὲν οὐ φεύγων τὸ τῆς παιδαγωγίας ὄνομα καλὸν ἔργον ἐχούσης καὶ λαμπρόν, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων διὰ τὸ ἀξίωμα καὶ τὴν οἰκειότητα τροφεὺς Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ καθηγητὴς καλούμενος, ὁ δὲ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ παιδαγωγοῦ καὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν ὑποποιούμενος ἦν Λυσίμαχος, τῷ γένει Ἀκαρνάν, ἄλλο μὲν οὐδὲν ἔχων ἀστέιον, ὅτι δ' ἑαυτὸν μὲν ὠνόμαζε Φοίνικα, τὸν δὲ Ἀλέξανδρον Ἀχιλλέα, Πηλέα δὲ τὸν Φίλιππον, ἡγαπᾶτο καὶ δευτέραν εἶχε χώραν.

164. Diog. Laert. 7.36: Μαθηται δὲ Ζήνωνος πολλοὶ μὲν, ἔνδοξοι δὲ Περσαῖος Δημητρίου Κιτιεύς...τῶν εἰς βιβλιογραφίαν πεμπομένων αὐτῷ παρ' Ἀντιγόνου, οὗ καὶ τροφεὺς ἦν τοῦ παιδὸς Ἀλκυονέως.

165. Plut. Aem. 33.3: εἴτα μικροῦ διαλείμματος ὄντος ἤδη τὰ τέκνα τοῦ βασιλέως ἤγετο δοῦλα, καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς τροφῶν καὶ διδασκάλων καὶ παιδαγωγῶν δεδακρυμένων ὄχλος.

166. Diog. Laert. 5.58: καθηγήσατο Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου καὶ ἔλαβε, φασί, παρ' αὐτοῦ τάλαντα ὀγδοήκοντα.

167. Diod. Sic. 30.15.

168. On Laodice's regency, see Widmer 2008, 70-75.

appointed by Cleopatra before her death. Given that Eulaeus was a eunuch, it is possible that “eunuchs and slaves were easier for Cleopatra to deal with and more amenable to her orders”, as Macurdy notes.¹⁶⁹

The Ptolemaic dynasty had already been acquainted with double guardianship during the infancy of Ptolemy VI’s father, so it does not come as a surprise that this kind of guardianship was provided also for the young ruler. However, in Hieronymus’ commentary on *Daniel’s Book of the Old Testament* (which includes an extract from Porphyry of Tyre translated in Latin), we find an interesting reference to the eunuch Eulaeus: he is called *nutritius*, literally feeder, but here, in the sense of the man responsible for the education and the upbringing of the young ruler.¹⁷⁰ That Eulaeus was the young king’s τροφεὺς is implied by Diodorus, who refers to Ptolemy’s bad upbringing by the eunuch and his close association with him, something that eventually turned him into a coward who decided to escape from his kingdom after the invasion of the Seleucid armed forces in 169 BC.¹⁷¹ But, apart from that, this passage demonstrates the tutor’s closeness to the king that was probably part of his role as protector of the young monarch.

In the first century BC the guardianship of Ptolemy XIII points to another case of combination of the position of tutor with that of the guardian of an infant ruler. Ptolemy, as his sister Cleopatra VII (the last Ptolemaic queen), was the child of Ptolemy XII and an Egyptian woman who probably belonged to a priestly family.¹⁷² Although there is no clear evidence on his mother’s life, it is obvious that, even if she had been alive when Ptolemy was crowned king, her non-royal status (as in the case of Alexander’s wife Roxane) would have led to the appointment of another person as a protector of the young king. Here, we have a multiple guardianship of Achilles, Potheinus and Theodotus, who are called by Plutarch *τιθηνοί*,¹⁷³ a word that, like *τροφεῖς*, means feeders, but in

169. Macurdy 1932, 146-148.

170. Hieron. *Comment. in Dan.* XI 21-24 (= FGrH F 49a): *Eulaius eunuchus nutritius Philometoris et Leneus Aegyptum regerent.*

171. Diod. Sic. 30.17: ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστι τὰς αἰτίας ἀνατιθέναι τῆς τότε δειλίας καὶ ἀγενείας εἰς τὸν σπάδωνα καὶ τὴν ἐκείνου συντροφίαν· ὃς ἐκ παιδὸς τὸ μειράκιον ἐν τρυφῇ καὶ γυναιχείοις ἐπιτηδεύμασι συνέχων διέφθειρεν αὐτοῦ τὴν ψυχὴν.

172. On the origin of Cleopatra VII, see Huss 1990.

173. Plut. *Pomp.* 77.2: Ποθεινὸν τὸν εὐνοῦχον καὶ Θεόδοτον τὸν Χῖον, ἐπὶ μισθῷ

this context it suggests the role of tutors as men responsible for the survival of the infant Ptolemy.¹⁷⁴

Although Theodotus, who was a rhetorician, is mentioned by Plutarch as one of the tutors of the king, Appian reports to a double guardianship (by Achilles and Potheinus) with each of the guardians responsible for a specific aspect of administration: Achilles was the commander-in-chief of the Ptolemaic army, while Potheinus the eunuch was in charge of the royal treasury.¹⁷⁵ Indeed, this division of labor reminds us of that related to the guardianships of Ptolemy V and of the two heirs of Alexander the Great. But, what reveals that only one of them was responsible for the upbringing of the young monarch is a passage from Caesar's account of the Roman Civil wars. Caesar says that Potheinus, who as regent conferred the chief command of the army to Achilles and, thus, made him his partner, was the *nutricius* of Ptolemy XIII, a term that should be identified with *τιθηνός*.¹⁷⁶ Since Caesar wrote about events he had experienced (unlike Plutarch who reports about these events more than a century later), I am more inclined to believe that Potheinus was actually the young king's tutor and the one entrusted with his education and upbringing.

The guardianship of Antiochus V: a competitive guardianship

A rather peculiar situation of double guardianship emerged in the Seleucid kingdom. Justin says that the *people* (a popular assembly in the capital Antioch on the Orontes?) appointed guardians for the young Antiochus V, after his father Antiochus IV died in 164 BC,¹⁷⁷ but earlier sources on Seleucid history give

ῥήτορικῶν λόγων διδάσκαλον ἀνειλημμένον, καὶ τὸν Αἰγύπτιον Ἀχιλλᾶν κορυφαίότατοι γὰρ ἦσαν ἐν κατευνασταῖς καὶ τιθηνοῖς τοῖς ἄλλοις οὗτοι σύμβουλοι.

174. In Suda 574, it has the meaning of a *τροφός* (female nurse). As in the case of the word *τροφεύς*, it came to mean also the tutor: *τιθηνός*: κυρίως ἐπὶ γυναικὸς τῆς τιθηνούσης καὶ τρεφούσης.

175. App. BCiv. 2.12.84: ὁ δὲ ἦν μὲν περὶ τρισκαίδεκα ἔτη μάλιστα γεγονώς, ἐπετρόπευον δ' αὐτῷ τὴν μὲν στρατιὰν Ἀχιλλᾶς, τὰ δὲ χρήματα Ποθεινὸς εὐνοῦχος.

176. Caes. BCiv. 3.108.1-3: *Erat in procuratione regni propter aetatem pueri nutricius eius, eunuchus nomine Pothinus...evocavit atque eundem Achillam, cuius supra meminimus, omnibus copiis prae fecit.* See also Caes. BCiv. 3.112.12: *Pothinus, nutricius pueri et procurator regni.*

177. Just. Epit. 34.3.6: *Reuersus in regnum Antiochus decedit relicto paruulo admodum filio, cui cum tutores dati a populo essent.*

a different account about the guardianship of Antiochus V. Both Flavius Josephus and the First Book of Maccabees report that before Antiochus' death, the king entrusted Philip, one of his courtiers, with the upbringing of the young heir and the preservation of the kingdom for him until his coming of age.¹⁷⁸ Yet, as we learn from the aforementioned sources, young Antiochus V had already a protector who was responsible for his education during his father's absence, a courtier named Lysias.¹⁷⁹ Lysias had been appointed guardian and tutor of the young prince, when Antiochus IV left the capital during his campaign to Persia for accumulation of wealth. During that time, Lysias was also regent, which means that sometimes tutorship could be associated with regency and guardianship of young princes when the monarch was still alive.¹⁸⁰

As in the Ptolemaic kingdom, the reason for this double guardianship was probably the fact that the young king was both fatherless and motherless, although we are not sure about when his mother Laodice IV died.¹⁸¹ Laodice was full sister of her husband Antiochus IV, so, being a member of the royal house (like Arsinoe III of the Ptolemies), she was a strong candidate for the regency and the guardianship of her son. Therefore, as in the case of Sosibius and Agathocles in Ptolemaic Egypt, we cannot dismiss the possibility of a false guardianship that followed the murder of the queen mother. I. Savalli-Lestrade notes that the circumstances of Philip's appointment are very suspicious and

178. Joseph. AJ 12.360: 'Ο δ' Ἀντίοχος πρὶν ἢ τελευτᾶν καλέσας Φίλιππον ἓνα τῶν ἐταίρων τῆς βασιλείας αὐτὸν ἐπίτροπον καθίστησιν, καὶ δοὺς αὐτῷ τὸ διάδημα καὶ τὴν στολὴν καὶ τὸν δακτύλιον Ἀντιόχῳ τῷ παιδί αὐτοῦ ταῦτα ἐκέλευσε κομίσαντα δοῦναι, δεηθεὶς προνοῆσαι τῆς ἀνατροφῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ τηρῆσαι τὴν βασιλείαν ἐκεῖνος; 1 Macc. 6.14-15: καὶ ἐκάλεσε Φίλιππον ἓνα τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ καὶ κατέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ τὸ διάδημα καὶ τὴν στολὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν δακτύλιον τοῦ ἀγαγεῖν Ἀντίοχον τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκθρέψαι αὐτὸν τοῦ βασιλεύειν.

179. Joseph. AJ 12.361: Λυσίας δὲ τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ δηλώσας τῷ πλῆθει τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ Ἀντίοχον, αὐτὸς γὰρ εἶχεν τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν, ἀποδείκνυσιν βασιλέα καλέσας αὐτὸν Εὐπάτορα.

180. 1 Macc. 3.32-33: καὶ κατέλιπε Λυσίαν ἄνθρωπον ἐνδοξον καὶ ἀπὸ γένους τῆς βασιλείας ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων τοῦ βασιλέως ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ Εὐφράτου ἕως τῶν ὀρίων Αἰγύπτου καὶ τρέφει Ἀντίοχον τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἕως τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι αὐτόν.

181. See Savalli-Lestrade 2005, 194-195, who notices that Laodice disappears in the period between the death of Antiochus IV and the return of her older son (by Seleucus IV), Demetrius I, who had been sent as a hostage to Rome.

that this royal friend himself has probably forged and circulated the account of his investiture to legitimize his ambitions.¹⁸²

But was Philip ever protector of Antiochus V? Antiochus IV died during his campaign in Persia and Philip was one of the courtiers who had joined him in war, so it would be difficult for this guardian to immediately take care of his ward. Nevertheless, in the Second Book of Maccabees, Lysias is designated as “relative” (συγγενής) of king Antiochus V,¹⁸³ a title demonstrating the intimate relationship between a monarch and his courtier.¹⁸⁴ From his title we can infer that Lysias was the guardian who was the *de facto* protector of the young ruler after the death of his father and remained at the court with his ward. Savalli-Lestrade pointed to the possibility that Lysias was actually the man who eliminated the royal mother,¹⁸⁵ and I am inclined to believe that, if Laodice was actually murdered, she would have been the victim of a courtier in the royal palace, where she resided. But, the fact that both Lysias and Philip were entrusted with the upbringing of the young king, and not the queen, seems to imply that the queen mother was already dead, when Antiochus IV began his campaign.

This is a rather puzzling situation and, unfortunately, ancient sources are not very descriptive. Nevertheless, no matter how Antiochus V ended up in the custody of two guardians, we may conclude that double guardianship was not in the true intentions of each of the tutors who claimed the role of the protector of the young king for themselves. Philip’s attempt to take over the rule of the kingdom¹⁸⁶ reveals his plan for establishing himself as a king. In all likelihood, this plan began with Philip’s appointment to guardianship and was hindered by Lysias’ proximity to the young heir.

Tutors as guardians: a replacement for a relative?

But why tutors were preferable to other persons as guardians of the young rulers? Being the general supervisors of princes’ education, tutors were carefully

182. Savalli-Lestrade 1998, 61.

183. 2 Macc. 11.1: Λυσίας ἐπίτροπος τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ συγγενής; 2 Macc. 11.35: Λυσίας ὁ συγγενής τοῦ βασιλέως.

184. On this title in the Seleucid court, see Dreyer 2011.

185. Savalli-Lestrade 2005, 195.

186. Joseph. AJ 12.379: Φίλιππος αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς Περσίδος ἦκων ἐδηλώθη καὶ τὰ πράγματα εἰς αὐτὸν κατασκευάζειν.

chosen more for their moral authority and their trustworthiness than their specific competences, and, thus, were very influential courtiers.¹⁸⁷ Considered by the kings persons of high integrity, they were assigned important missions by the monarchs with whom they were associated. The case of Diodorus, the τροφεὺς of the Seleucid king Demetrius I, who was sent to Syria to feel the pulse of the king's subjects before Demetrius' return after being a hostage of Rome,¹⁸⁸ bears witness to the significant place of these men in the royal court. But more impressive is the case of Craterus, tutor of the Seleucid king Antiochus IX. Eusebius reports that, as a young prince, Craterus brought up Antiochus in Cyzicus, where he had resorted to escape from his uncle Demetrius II's future plots against him.¹⁸⁹ Antiochus expressed his gratitude to his tutor for keeping him safe by appointing him to court positions requiring a significant level of trust. According to the inscription on the base of Craterus' statue in Delos, dated between 129 and 117 BC, this courtier was the chief physician and chamberlain of the queen.¹⁹⁰

Indeed, one assumes that real affection existed between tutors and princes, as it is attested in literary and epigraphic sources.¹⁹¹ Therefore, it comes as no surprise that sometimes the guardian of the person of the king, that is the substitute for his mother, was his tutor. Personal contact with the ruler was important for exercising influence on an infant king and it could allow a co-guardian, who acted also as tutor, to acquire a superior position to that of his colleague. As Buraselis points out, it is noteworthy that in the case of Antiochus V, the guardian who was in actual possession of the young successor and officially proclaimed him as new king (with the title of Eupator), that is Lysias, was the final winner in his contest with Philip.¹⁹² Josephus says that

187. Savalli-Lestrade 2017, 103-104.

188. Polyb. 31.13.1: τὸν τροφέα προαπέστειλεν εἰς τὴν Συρίαν ὡτακουστήσοντα καὶ κατοπτρεύσοντα τὰ κεῖ συμβαίνοντα περὶ τοὺς ὄχλους.

189. Euseb. *Chron.* 1.257: Ἀντίοχος ὁ ἐν Κυζίκῳ παρὰ Κρατερῷ τῷ εὐνούχῳ τρεφόμενος διὰ δέος τοῦ Δημητρίου.

190. *ID* IV 1547, ll. 1-6: Κράτερον Κρατέρου Ἀντιοχέα τὸν τροφέα, | Ἀντιόχου Φιλοπάτορος τοῦ ἐγ βασιλέως | Μεγάλου Ἀντιόχου καὶ βασιλίσσης Κλεοπάτρας, | γεγονότα δὲ καὶ τῶν πρώτων φίλων βασιλέως Ἀντιόχου καὶ ἀρχιάτρων καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ κοιτῶνος τῆς | βασιλίσσης.

191. Savalli-Lestrade 2017, 103.

192. Buraselis 2017, 61 with n. 3.

Antiochus had Philip executed, but, since he was still a minor, we have to consider that actually Lysias gave the order.¹⁹³ As for the Ptolemaic kingdom, both of the reported tutor guardians were the chief advisers of their wards. The tutor Eulaeus was the guardian who persuaded Ptolemy VI to abandon his kingdom in view of the Ptolemaic defeat by Antiochus IV of the Seleucids.¹⁹⁴ Regarding Pothinus, the tutor of Ptolemy XIII, both Caesar and Plutarch report that he was the head of state of the Ptolemaic kingdom.¹⁹⁵ Apparently, the powerful courtier assigned to himself the position of the chief minister due to his close relationship with the young king.

Therefore, although tutors were regarded as the closest to a royal relative who could act as protector of the rightful ruler of the kingdom, in reality, tutor guardians came to be men who exploited their closeness of the relationship between them and the kings, so as to become the real heads of the state.

Conclusions

The origins of royal guardianship are to be found in private legal traditions of ancient Greek *poleis*. The purpose of this institution was the preservation of both the monarch and the state during the king's minority. Yet, the existence of ambitious guardians, who took advantage of their position to reach kingship, manifests that the protection of the infant ruler was not always a priority. In view of the problem of usurper guardians, ancient monarchy welcomed the establishment of the institution of double guardianship. This institution resembles the Athenian practice of multiple guardianship which aimed to defend the orphans against improper guardians, but its roots are in pre-classical regulations that favored the involvement of maternal relatives of orphans in their upbringing and protection.

In the Hellenistic age, Alexander's death, the presence of two unable to rule heirs to the Macedonian throne and the subsequent rivalries between the king's companions became the trigger for a type of double guardianship. Evidence presents us with a combination of regency and protection of the king's

193. Joseph. *AJ* 12.386: βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος ὁρῶν ἤδη τὸν Φίλιππον κρατοῦντα τῶν πραγμάτων ἐπολέμει πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ λαβὼν αὐτὸν ὑποχείριον ἀπέκτεινεν.

194. Polyb. 28.21.1: Εὐλαῖος ὁ εὐνοῦχος ἔπεισε Πτολεμαῖον ἀναλαβόντα τὰ χρήματα, τὴν βασιλείαν προιέμενον τοῖς ἐχθροῖς, ὑποχωρεῖν εἰς Σαμοθράκην.

195. Caes. *BCiv.* 3.108.1: *Erat in procuratione regni...* Pothinus; Plut. *Pomp.* 77.2: ὁ δὲ πάντα διέπων τὰ πράγματα Ποθινός.

person, which was necessary due to lack of male relatives who could act as guardians. However, the cases of Olympias, who was called to guardianship of her grandson Alexander IV, and of other royal women in Macedonian history, who appear to have served in a position like that before the age of Alexander the Great, attest to a possible guardianship of infant kings by royal women. This echoes traditions of female guardianship of orphans in the kingdoms of northern Greek mainland. Queen mothers were involved in a special type of double guardianship, where they acted as protectors of their sons, while male guardians remained administrators. However, their presence did not always prevent ambitious regents from reaching kingship. And it is certain that some of the guardians of Alexander's heirs used their position as protectors of the two rulers to establish relationships with women of the royal family.

Nevertheless, it is mainly in the Ptolemaic Egypt where double guardianship became a special feature of the monarchy, the second guardian standing for a replacement to relatives, and especially of queen mothers who acted as protectors of their children. Their role as guardians was probably an indication of the survival of the old Macedonian customary rule that allowed queen mothers to act on behalf of their royal sons in the Hellenistic royal context, but it was also strengthened by the Ptolemaic practice of endogamy: queens, as members of the ruling house, were entitled to the protection of the young heirs. A courtier, who presented himself as a foster father to the infant monarch or was responsible for the young ruler's education, was appointed to guardianship to fill the vacant position of the family member that would normally represent the royal child, while another person was charged with administrative duties. However, the position of a tutor guardian allowed ambitious men, associated with the person of young monarchs, to exercise their influence on their wards and become the main administrators of the realm.

All in all, whether it served the interests of the ward or not, double guardianship remained a special feature of Hellenistic monarchy.

Dionysios Filias
Dr. of History of Law
University of Athens, School of Law
dfilias86@gmail.com

Summary

This article aims to present the institution of double guardianship of infant kings by pointing to the connection between appointment of more than one guardian and protection and upbringing of young monarchs. Multiple guardianship was an established practice in the setting of Greek *poleis*, which aimed at the protection of the ward's person from untrustworthy guardians. In a royal context this institution emerged as a solution to the problems concerning Alexander's succession after 323 BC. Nevertheless, there is a possibility that it was already known in Classical Macedonia in relation to the role of royal women, who acted as protectors of their children along with men who were appointed as regents. During the Hellenistic era double guardianship became very popular in the Ptolemaic kingdom. There it is connected with the loss of the queen mother, who could exercise guardianship for her royal son. Tutorship and guardianship were sometimes combined into one person, something that led influential tutors of young rulers to become the true administrators of the kingdom.

Abbreviations-Bibliography

- Accattino, P., Curnis, M. (eds.) 2013. *Aristotele. La politica: Libro III* (L. Bertelli, M. Moggi [eds.], *Aristotele. La politica*. Vol. 5). Rome.
- Adams, W.L. 2010. "Alexander's Successors to 221 B.C.", in J. Roisman, I. Worthington (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World). Malden, MA – Oxford – Chichester, 208-224.
- Ager, S.L. 2005. "Familiarity Breeds: Incest and the Ptolemaic Dynasty", *JHS* 125, 1-34.
- Anson, E. 2009. "Philip II, Amyntas Perdicca, and Macedonian Royal Succession", *Historia* 58, 276-286.
- Billows, R.A. 1990. *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State*. Berkeley.
- Boiy, T. 2007. *Between High and Low: A Chronology of the Early Hellenistic Period*. (Oikoumene. Studien zur antiken Weltgeschichte 5). Frankfurt.
- Bremmer, J. 1983. "The Importance of the Maternal Uncle and Grandfather in Archaic and Classical Greece and Early Byzantium", *ZPE* 50, 173-186.
- Brock, R. 2013. *Greek Political Imagery from Homer to Aristotle*. New York.
- Buraselis, K. 2017. "Royal *Epitropeia*: Remarks on Kingship and Guardianship in Macedonia and the Hellenistic Kingdoms", in U. Yiftach, M. Faraguna (eds.) 2017, 59-74.
- Cabanes, P. 1976. *L'Épire de la mort de Pyrrhos à la conquête romaine (272-167 av. J.-C.)*. Paris.
- Callender, G. 2012. "Female Horus: The Life and Reign of Tausret", in R.H. Wilkinson (ed.), *Tausret: Forgotten Queen and Pharaoh of Egypt*. Oxford, 25-47.
- Carney, E.D. 2000. *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia*. Norman, OK.
- Carney, E.D. 2001. "The Trouble with Philip III Arrhidaeus", *AHB* 15, 63-89.
- Carney, E.D. 2006. *Olympias: Mother of Alexander the Great*. London.
- Carney, E.D. 2012. "Oikos Keeping: Women and Monarchy in the Macedonian Tradition", in S.L. James, S. Dillon (eds.), *A Companion to Women in the Ancient World* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World). Malden, MA – Oxford – Chichester, 304-315.
- Criscuolo, L. 2011. "Observations on the Economy in Kind in Ptolemaic Egypt", in Z.H. Archibald, J.K. Davies, V. Gabrielsen (eds.), *The Economies of Hellenistic Societies, Third to First Centuries BC*. Oxford, 166-176.
- Cudjoe, R.V. 2010. *The Social and Legal Position of Widows and Orphans in Classical Athens* (Symboles 3). Athens.
- Davies, J.K. 1971. *Athenian Propertied Families, 600-300 B.C.* Oxford.

- Dreyer, B. 2011. "How to Become a 'Relative' of the King: Carreers and Hierarchy at the Court of Antiochus III", *AJPh* 132, 45-57.
- Ehrenberg, V. 1969. *The Greek State*. 2nd ed. London.
- Elgood, P.G. 1943. *Les Ptolémées d'Égypte* (trans. R. Bouviet). Paris.
- Errington, R.M. 1990. *A History of Macedonia* (trans. C. Errington) (Hellenistic Culture and Society 5). Berkeley – Los Angeles.
- Euseb. *Chron.* Schoene, A. *Eusebi Chronicorum*. 2 vols. Berlin 1866-1875.
- Faraguna, M. 2017. "Guardianship in Ancient Societies: Concluding Remarks", in U. Yiftach, M. Faraguna (eds.) 2017, 273-281.
- FGhH. Jacoby, F. *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Berlin 1923.
- Finkelberg, M. 1991. "Royal Succession in Heroic Greece", *CQ* 41, 303-316.
- Fraser, P.M. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 3 vols. Oxford.
- Gehrke, H.-J. 1985. *Stasis: Untersuchungen zu den inneren Kriegen in den griechischen Staaten des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v.Chr.* (Vestigia 35). Munich.
- GGM. Müller, K. (ed.). *Geographi Graeci Minores*. Paris 1855-1861.
- Greenwalt, W.S. 1989. "Polygamy and Succession in Argead Macedonia", *Arethusa* 22, 19-45.
- Greenwalt, W.S. 2010. "Argead *Dunasteia* during the Reigns of Philip II and Alexander III: Aristotle Reconsidered", in E. Carney, D. Ogden (eds.), *Philip II and Alexander the Great: Father and Son, Lives and Afterlives*. Oxford – New York, 151-163 (and endnotes).
- Hammond, N.G.L. 1989. *The Macedonian State: Origins, Institutions and History*. Oxford.
- Harrison, A.R.W. 1968. *The Law of Athens*. Vol. I: *The Family and Property*. Oxford.
- Hatzopoulos, M.B. 1986. "Succession and Regency in Classical Macedonia", in *Ancient Macedonia IV. Papers Read at the Fourth International Symposium Held in Thessaloniki, September 21-25, 1983*. Thessaloniki, 279-292.
- Hatzopoulos, M.B. 1988. *Actes de vente de la Chalcidique centrale* (Μελετήματα 6). Athens.
- Hatzopoulos, M.B. 1991. *Actes de vente d'Amphipolis* (Μελετήματα 14). Athens.
- Hatzopoulos, M.B. 1995. "La lettre royale d'Olévéní", *Chiron* 25, 163-186.
- Hatzopoulos, M.B. 1996. *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings* (Μελετήματα 22). Athens.
- Hazzard, R.A. 2000. *Imagination of a Monarchy: Studies in Ptolemaic Propaganda*. Toronto.
- Hölbl, G. 2001. *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire* (trans. T. Saavedra). London – New York.
- Hölkeskamp, K.J. 1999. *Schiedsrichter, Gesetzgeber und Gesetzgebung im archaischen Griechenland* (Historia Einzelschriften 131). Stuttgart.

- Humphreys, S.C. 2018. *Kinship in Ancient Athens: An Anthropological Analysis*. 2 vols. Oxford – New York.
- Huss, W. 1990. “Die Herkunft der Kleopatra Philopator”, *Aegyptus* 70, 191-203.
- IC IV. Guarducci, M. (ed.). *Inscriptiones Creticae*. Vol. IV: *Tituli Gortynii*. Rome 1950.
- ID IV. Roussel, P., Launey, M. (eds.). *Inscriptions de Délos*. Vol. IV: nos. 1497-2219. Paris 1937.
- IG IX 1. Dittenberger, W. (ed.). *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Vol. IX 1: *Inscriptiones Phocidis, Locridis, Aetoliae, Acarnaniae, insularum maris Ionii*. Berlin 1897.
- I.Knidos I. Blümel, W. *Die Inschriften von Knidos*. Vol. I (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 41). Bonn 1992.
- Johnson, C.N. 1990. *Aristotle's Theory of the State*. London.
- Kaye, N. 2017. “Guardianship and Regnal Politics: Discussion of the Papers of K. Buraselis and A. Mardirossian”, in U. Yiftach, M. Faraguna (eds.) 2017, 87-91.
- Kosmetatou, E. 2012. “Wills of Hellenistic Kings”, in R.S. Bagnall, K. Brodersen, C.B. Champion, A. Erskine, S.R. Huebner (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History* (<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444338386.wbeah09242>) (accessed 19/9/19).
- Koulakiotis, E. 2005. “Domination et résistance dans la cour d’Alexandre: le cas des *basilikoi paides*”, in V.I. Anastasiadis, P.N. Doukellis (eds.), *Esclavage antique et discriminations socio-culturelles. Actes du XXVIIIe colloque international du Groupement international de recherche sur l’esclavage antique, Mytilène, 5-7 décembre 2003*. Bern, 167-182.
- Lane Fox, R. 2011. “The 360’s”, in R. Lane Fox (ed.), *Brill’s Companion to Ancient Macedon: Studies in the Archaeology and History of Macedon, 650 BC-300 AD*. Leiden – Boston, 257-270.
- Le Bohec, S. 1993. *Antigone Dôsôn, roi de Macédoine* (Travaux et Mémoires, Études Anciennes 9). Nancy.
- Le Bohec-Bouhet, S. 2006. “Réflexions sur la place de la femme dans la Macédoine antique”, in A.M. Guimier-Sorbets, M.B. Hatzopoulos, Y. Morizot (eds.), *Rois, cités, nécropoles: institutions, rites et monuments en Macédoine. Actes des colloques de Nanterre (décembre 2002) et d’Athènes (janvier 2004)*. Athens, 187-197.
- Lund, H.S. 1992. *Lysimachus: A Study in Early Hellenistic Kingship*. London – New York.
- MacDowell, D.M. 1978. *The Law in Classical Athens* (Aspects of Greek and Roman Life). London.

- Macurdy, G.H. 1932. *Hellenistic Queens: A Study of Woman-Power in Macedonia, Seleucid Syria, and Ptolemaic Egypt* (Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology 14). Baltimore.
- Maffi, A. 2017. "La tutela sugli orfani nella Grecia classica", in U. Yiftach, M. Faraguna (eds.) 2017, 95-112.
- Manning, J.G. 2010. *The Last Pharaohs: Egypt under the Ptolemies, 305-30 BC*. Princeton.
- Manning, J.G. 2011. "Networks, Hierarchies and Markets in the Ptolemaic Economy", in Z.H. Archibald, J.K. Davies, V. Gabrielsen (eds.), *The Economies of Hellenistic Societies, Third to First Centuries BC*. Oxford, 296-323.
- Meeus A. 2009. "Some Institutional Problems Concerning the Succession to Alexander the Great: Prostaia and Chiliarchy", *Historia* 58, 287-310.
- Mélèze-Modrzejewski, J. 2011. *Droit et justice dans le monde grec et hellénistique* (JJP Suppl. 10). Warsaw.
- Minas-Nerpel, M. 2015. "Ptolemaic Queens in Egyptian Temple Reliefs: Intercultural Reflections of Political Authority, or Religious Imperatives?", in P. Kousoulis, N. Lazaridis (eds.), *Proceedings of the Tenth International Congress of Egyptologists, University of the Aegean, Rhodes, 22-29 May 2008*. 2 vols. Leuven, 809-821.
- Mulgan, R.G. 1977. *Aristotle's Political Theory: An Introduction for Students of Political Theory*. Oxford.
- Murnane, W.J. 1977. *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies* (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 40). Chicago.
- Nagle, D.B. 2000. "Alexander and Aristotle's Pambasileus", *AntCl* 69, 117-132.
- O'Neil, J.L. 2000. "Royal Authority and City Law under Alexander and his Hellenistic Successors", *CQ* 50, 424-431.
- P.Enteux. Guéraud, O. (ed.). *ENTEΥΞΕΙΣ: Requêtes et plaintes adressées au Roi d'Égypte au IIIe siècle avant J.-C.* Cairo 1931-1932.
- P.Hal. 1. Graeca Halensis (ed.). *Dikaiomata: Auszüge aus den alexandrinischen Gesetzen und Verordnungen in einem Papyrus des Philologischen Seminars der Universität Halle (Pap.Hal. 1), mit einem Anhang weiterer Papyri derselben Sammlung*. Berlin 1913.
- P.Lond. 7. Skeat, T.C. (ed.). *Greek Papyri in the British Museum (now in the British Library)*. Vol. 7: *The Zenon Archive*. London 1974.
- Psoma, S.E. 2012. "Innovation or Tradition? Succession to the Kingship in Temenid Macedonia", *Τεκμήρια* 11, 73-87.
- Quaegebeur, J. 1978. "Reines ptolémaïques et traditions égyptiennes", in H. Maehler, V.M. Strocka (eds.), *Das Ptolemäische Ägypten. Akten des internationalen Symposions, 27.-29. September 1976 in Berlin*. Mainz, 245-262.

- Reda, S. 2014. *Interregnum: Queen Regency in the Seleucid Empire* (MA Thesis, Univ. of Waterloo, ON).
- Robinson, E.W. 2011. *Democracy beyond Athens: Popular Government in the Greek Classical Age*. Cambridge.
- Savalli-Lestrade, I. 1998. *Les philoi royaux dans l'Asie hellénistique* (Hautes Études du monde gréco-romain 25). Geneva.
- Savalli-Lestrade, I. 2005. "Le mogli di Seleuco IV e di Antioco IV", *Studi ellenistici* 16, 193-200.
- Savalli-Lestrade, I. 2017. "Βίος αὐλικός: The Multiple Ways of Life of Courtiers in the Hellenistic Age", in A. Erskine, L. Llewellyn-Jones, S. Wallace (eds.), *The Hellenistic Court: Monarchic Power and Elite Society from Alexander to Cleopatra*. Swansea, 101-120.
- Schol. in Aeschin. Dils, M.R. (ed.), *Scholia in Aeschinem* (Bibliotheca Teubneriana). Stuttgart – Leipzig 1992.
- Seibert, J. 1967. *Historische Beiträge zu den dynastischen Verbindungen in hellenistischer Zeit* (Historia Einzelschriften 10). Stuttgart.
- Strootman, R. 2014. *Courts and Elites in the Hellenistic Empires: The Near East after the Achaemenids, c. 330 to 30 BCE*. Edinburgh.
- Suda. Adler, A. *Suidae Lexicon*. 5 vols. Leipzig 1928-1938.
- Taylor, M. 2013. *Antiochus the Great*. Barnsley.
- Tyldesley, J. 2016. "The Role of Egypt's Dynastic Queens", in S.L. Budin, J. MacIntosh Turfa (eds.), *Women in Antiquity: Real Women across the Ancient World*. London – New York, 271-279.
- Tziafalias, A., Helly, B. 2010. "Inscriptions de la Tripolis de Perrhébie: lettres royales de Démétrios II et Antigone Dôsôn", *Studi ellenistici* 24, 71-125.
- Vandorpe, K. 2010. "The Ptolemaic Period", in A.B. Lloyd (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Egypt*. Vol. I. Malden, MA – Oxford – Chichester, 159-179.
- Velissaropoulos-Karakostas, J. 2011. *Droit grec d'Alexandre à Auguste (323 av. J.-C. – 14 ap. J.-C.): personnes-biens-justice* (Μελετήματα 66). 2 vols. Athens.
- Verdin, H. 1983. "Agatharchide et la tradition du discours politique dans l'historiographie grecque", in E. van't Dak, P. van Dessel, W. van Gucht (eds.), *Egypt and the Hellenistic World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven, 24-26 May 1982* (Studia Hellenistica 27). Leuven, 407-420.
- Weil, R. 1960. *Aristote et l'histoire: essai sur la "Politique"*. Paris.
- Whitehorne, J. 1994. *Cleopatras*. London.
- Widmer, M. 2008. "Pourquoi reprendre le dossier des reines hellénistiques? Le cas de Laodice V", in F. Bertholet, A. Bielman Sánchez, R. Frei-Stolba (eds.), *Égypte-Grèce-Rome: les différents visages des femmes antiques*.

- Travaux et colloques du séminaire d'épigraphie grecque et latine de l'IASA 2002-2006*. Bern, 63-92.
- Willetts, R.F. 1967. *The Law Code of Gortyn (edited with introduction, translation and commentary)* (Kadmos Suppl. 1). Berlin.
- Worthington, I. 2016. *Ptolemy I: King and Pharaoh of Egypt*. New York.
- Yiftach, U., Faraguna, M. (eds.) 2017. *Ancient Guardianship: Legal Incapacities in the Ancient World* (Legal Documents in Ancient Societies VI). Trieste.
- Zizza, C. 2017. "La Macedonia e i Macedoni nella *Politica* e nelle altre opere superstiti del *Corpus Aristotelicum*", in S. Gastaldi, C. Zizza (eds.), *Da Stagira a Roma: prospettive aristoteliche tra storia e filosofia* (Studi e testi di storia antica 24). Pisa, 9-54.
- Zolotnikova, O. 2009. "Πολυάνωρ γυνή" ("Wife of Many Husbands"): Ancient Greek Polyandry as Reflected at the Mythic/Epic Tradition", *Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens VI*, 57-72.