

*Reprinted from*

# PHOENIX



*The Classical Association of Canada*

*La Société canadienne des Etudes classiques*

*University of Toronto Press*

## STOLOS THE ADMIRAL<sup>1</sup>

ROGER S. BAGNALL

THE SUBJECT OF THESE PAGES has been known for many years but never studied in detail. He served Ptolemy IX Soter II as courtier and high official in the earlier part of that king's reign. In what follows I present the texts of inscriptions in which Stolos figures, four of them as published, two of them with new restorations. They are listed in what I take to be their chronological order; this scheme is defended in the commentary that follows.

1. Statue base from Cyrene: P. M. Fraser, *Berytus* 12 (1958) 113, no. 7, with photograph, plate XIII, 7 (*SEG* 18. 730); G. Pugliese-Carratelli (from copy of G. Oliverio), *Quaderni di Archeologia di Libia* 4 (1961) 31, no. 11a, with photographs, 32, figs. 21 and 22.

Βασιλέα Πτολεμαίου  
Θεὸν Σωτήρα τὸν ἐγ βασιλέως  
Πτολεμαίου τοῦ δευτέρου Εὐεργέτου  
Στόλος τῶν πρώτων φίλων καὶ ἀρχεδέατρος  
εὐνοίας ἔρεκεν τῆς εἰς αὐτόν.

2 ἐκ Fraser ἐγ Oliverio, *SEG*  
5 αὐτόν edd.

The editors have uniformly given αὐτόν a rough breathing, αὐτόν; the motive formula would thus refer to the king's goodwill toward Stolos. But εὐνοία is not used of the king in Ptolemaic dedications; it is the virtue of a subject. L. Robert has recently pointed out that motive phrases can concern either the virtue of the person honoured or the attitude of the person honouring.<sup>2</sup> It is in the latter sense that I understand the motive

<sup>1</sup>The preparation of this article in Athens at the American School of Classical Studies was made possible by a Canada Council Doctoral Fellowship and a travel grant from the School of Graduate Studies of the University of Toronto. I am indebted to Mr. K. Tsakos, epimelete in the Eighteenth Archaeological District, and to the staff of the Delos Museum for their kind assistance during my visit to Delos to take a squeeze of number 3 below; I am also indebted to W. K. Pritchett and E. Vanderpool for photographing the squeeze and discussing it with me. P. M. Fraser, Wallace McLeod, and T. B. Mitford have read the typescript at various stages and helped to improve it. I am particularly grateful to Thomas Drew-Bear, who read the final draft and discussed many points in it with me.

<sup>2</sup>*Hellenica* 13 (1965) 39-40; Robert cites the study of E. Nachmanson (*Eranos* [1911] 180-196). *IDelos* 1530, discussed below, similarly records the feeling of the dedicant, not the virtue of the person honoured.

on moderation and committed themselves to overreaching and tychistic projects.

The note of moral exhortation suggests that man has a free choice between alternative ways of life, and thus that he is not in the grip of the original necessity which created the cosmos and him and endowed him with the arts. From the ethical point of view man seems to emerge as an island of freedom,<sup>68</sup> a floating island, perhaps, in a sea of necessity. If so, then Democritus' system is either dualistic or self-contradictory. But the example of chance in the ethical thought of Democritus has shown how freedom, if it has any place at all in Democritus, should be understood. Man is free to trust to luck through wilful disregard for or ignorance of the laws of nature, given by necessity. But he is powerless to change the facts of necessity, and from this point of view his freedom is an illusion, like the appearance of colour. His freedom is merely subjective and of infinite unconcern to the rest of the universe. The atomic theory, which accounted so well for the various appearances of the same phenomena to various people—tragedies and comedies are composed of the same alphabet<sup>69</sup>—also accounted for a specious freedom.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

<sup>68</sup>Schmid/Stählin, *op. cit.* (above, n. 23) 281.

<sup>69</sup>Arist. *Gen. Corr.* 314a 21 ff. (=2.74.13 ff.).

formula of this inscription: Stolos honours the king to show his own loyalty toward the monarch.

2. Statue base from Cyrene: G. Oliverio, *Documenti dell' Africa Italiana* 1 (1932) 71, no. 9, with photograph, Tav. VIII, fig. 13 (*SEG* 9. 62); photograph (smaller and less clear) in P. M. Fraser, *Berytus* 12 (1958) pl. XIII, 7a.

Βασιλέα Πτολεμαῖον Θεὸν Σωτήρα  
τὸν ἐγ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου Θεοῦ Εὐεργέτου  
Στόλος Θεώνος τῶν πρώτων φίλων  
ὁ ἀρχεδέατρος καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἡνιῶν  
εὐεργεσίας ἔνεκεν τῆς εἰς ἑαυτὸν.

3 πρώτων Oliverio πρώτων *SEG*  
5 εὐ(εργ)εσίας Oliverio. On his photo-  
graph, both rho and gamma appear like  
crude epsilons.

3. Fragment of statue base from Delos: F. Durrbach and A. Jardé, *BCH* 29 (1905) 219, no. 76; *IDélos* 1535. Collated and squeeze taken by me in Delos Museum, December, 1970; photograph of the squeeze, plate 1.

[Βασιλέα Πτολ]εμαῖον [Θεὸν Σωτήρα]  
[τὸν πρεσβύτα]τον ὄν [βασιλέως Πτο-]  
[λεμαίου τοῦ] δευτέρ[ο]ν [Εὐεργέτου]  
[Στόλος Θεώ]νος Κυ[ ca. 10 ]  
[τῶν πρώτων φί]λων ὁ ἀρχ[εδέατρος]  
[καὶ ναύαρχος κ]αὶ ἐπιστο[λαγράφος]  
[τεταγμένος] δὲ καὶ ἐπ[ὶ τῶν ἡνιῶν]  
[εὐεργεσίας ἔ]νεκεν τῆ[ς εἰς ἑαυτὸν,]  
[Ἄπόλλωνι υ Ἄρτ]έμιδι υυ [Λητοῖ].

The length of lines (26–28 letters) is guaranteed by the restoration of the end of line 2 and the beginning of line 3, while the amount lost to the left is fixed at 10–12 letters by the beginning of line 1; in both places the restorations were made by F. Durrbach and A. Jardé. Neither they nor P. Roussel and M. Launey, the editors of *IDélos*, however, drew the necessary conclusion that line 1 was to be restored [Θεὸν Σωτήρα] rather than their [Σωτήρα].

The restoration of the name of the dedicant of the inscription depends on his titlature; we turn therefore to lines 5–7. Durrbach and Jardé restored [τῶν πρώτων φί]λων and [τεταγμένος] correctly, and were followed by Roussel and Launey, who were able to draw on our number 4 to make further restorations: ἐπιστο[λαγράφος] in place of Durrbach and Jardé's ἐπιστο[λογράφος] and (in a note to *IDélos* 1534 rather than in the text of

this inscription) ἐπ[ὶ τῶν ἡμιῶν] in line 7. With the length of lines securely established in lines 1-2, however, it is possible to restore ἀρχ[εδῆαρος καὶ ναβαρχος] also on the model of *IDélos* 1534; the phrase fits the lacunae and the titles fall in the same order as the titles in *IDélos* 1534.

This collection of titles is unique in Ptolemaic history; and our inscription falls into the very reign when Stolos son of Theon, bearer of these titles, was active. It is therefore very likely that he was the dedicant. The letters of line 4 can be seen on the photograph to be more widely spaced than those of the other lines, and the restoration [Στόλος Θέω]νος therefore fits both the remaining letters on the stone and the space available to the left.

At the end of the preserved portion of this line, the previous editors read Κτ— without any sign of hesitation. My study of the stone, however, showed that the remaining traces of the second letter by no means clearly indicated a tau. The serif at the base of an upright stroke survives, with the lower part of that stroke (badly chipped), apparently spaced so that the stroke should come in the middle of the letter space rather than at left or right. Above and to the left is the tip of a horizontal stroke. The stone is broken on this letter, cleanly along a diagonal line where the upper left stroke of an upsilon would have fallen. Tau seems excluded, because the cross-bars of all taus in this inscription have serifs at each end; the small horizontal stroke on this stone has no such serif. It appears to me, then, that the upper trace, if it is original (as I believe it to be) is very likely the remnant of a serif on an upsilon.

Stolos was an Athenian, as we know from *IDélos* 1533 and 1534 (numbers 4 and 5, below), but we read here instead Κυ[ ]. Two hypotheses are possible, that Stolos is using a second ethnic, or that we have the remains of his Athenian demotic. Since Delos was an Athenian colony during the period of this inscription, we must bear in mind the possibility that Stolos, as an Athenian, might use his demotic on the island—as many other Athenians did. This usage appears to be governed by no recognizable principles of when to use the ethnic, when the demotic. P. Roussel's statement made more than half a century ago is still valid: "On ne peut faire état de l'emploi du démotique opposé à celui de l'appellation générale d'Ἀθηναῖος."<sup>3</sup>

One may compare, for example, the similar use of an Athenian demotic in *IDélos* 1554, where Attalos II honors his σύντροφος Apollonides son of Theophilos, a Pergamenian, whom Attalos calls here not Pergamenian, but Ἀλαιεύς, alluding to Apollonides' honorary Athenian citizenship. Attalos' motive must be an emphasis in this Athenian island on the Athenian ties of Apollonides; Stolos' object was the same.

A number of Athenian demotics begin with Κυ—; of them Κυδαθηναίεύς is most nearly suitable to fill the space available here (a total of about

<sup>3</sup>P. Roussel, *Délos Colonie Athénienne* (Paris 1916) 36, n. 2.

PLATE 1



SQUEEZE OF *IDélos* 1535

12 letters). This city deme was among the most populous in Attica. It is possible, therefore, that line 4 ended Κυ[δαθηναίεῖς].

A second possible restoration should be considered. Κυ[ ] in an inscription of a man who is elsewhere importantly associated with Cyrene suggests Κυ[ρηναῖος] as a possible restoration here. Stolos would in this case be using an otherwise unattested honorary citizenship given him by Cyrene, an interesting fact in view of his later use of his ethnic Ἀθηναῖος in our inscriptions 4 and 5 (below) on Delos. If I am right in suggesting below that number 3 was erected about the years 107–106, when Soter had been ejected from Egypt and then Cyprus, a stress on the loyalty of Cyrene to the king and his officials would not be out of place. The alternative explanation, that Stolos was Cyrenaean by birth, and Athenian by honour, is unlikely. There would have been scant motive for Athens to grant its citizenship to a Ptolemaic courtier in a period when the dynasty lacked influence abroad and when the royal family was so clearly disunited. It is conceivable that Soter himself might have been honoured by Athens for his donations, but such honours for Stolos would be unparalleled in the period after the death of Philometor in 145 and the withdrawal of Ptolemaic forces from the Aegean.

A certain conclusion is not possible, but two considerations seem to me to make Κυ[δαθηναίεῖς] more likely: (1) Stolos is attested as an Athenian; it is the more economical hypothesis to assume that he so designated himself here, in a place where Athenian connections would be of some importance; and (2) Stolos uses his ethnic in none of the Cyrenaean inscriptions; had he been honoured with Cyrenaean citizenship, one would expect him to publicize this fact in his dedications in Cyrene itself; and number 6 (below) at least falls after the date of any supposed grant of citizenship manifested in this Delian dedication.

In the place of the motive formula, the previous editors read [εὐνοίας ἐν]εκεν. The nine letters restored do not fill the space. Nor does a subject honour a Ptolemy for εὐνοια. [εὐεργεσίας ἐν]εκεν, with 12 letters, is thus a certain restoration.

4. Statue base from Delos: P. Roussel, *BCH* 32 (1908) 430–431, no. 43 (F. Durrbach, *Choix d'Inscriptions de Délos* [1921] no. 127); *IDélos* 1534.

Στόλον Θέωνος Ἀθηναῖον  
τὸν συγγενῆ βασιλέως Πτο-  
λεμαίου τοῦ δευτέρου Σωτή-  
[ρο]ς καὶ ἀρχεδέατρον καὶ ναύ-  
[αρχ]ον καὶ ἐπιστολαγράφον, τετα-  
γμένον δὲ καὶ πρὸς ταῖς ἡνίκαις  
Σίμαλος Τιμάρχου Σαλαμίνιο[s]  
τὸν ἑαυτοῦ φίλον ἢ Ἀπόλλωνι  
1 Ἀθηναῖος *IDélos* (typographical error)

5. Statue base from Delos, with a dedication by Stolos to Simalos and an elegiac poem honouring the latter: G. Fougères, *BCH* 11 (1887) 253, no. 4 (F. Durrbach, *Choix d'Inscriptions de Délos* [1921] no. 128; dedication only: M. L. Strack, *Dynastie der Ptolemäer* [Berlin 1897] 263, no. 135; *OGIS* 173); *IDélos* 1533.

Στόλος Θέωνος Ἀθηναῖος  
ὁ συγγενῆς βασιλέως  
Πτολεμαίου τοῦ δευτέρου  
Σωτήρος υ Σίμου  
ἑμίχου υ Σαλαμίου  
τὸν υ ἑαυτοῦ υ φίλον  
Ἀπόλλωνι

The elegy honouring Simalos, which I do not print here, lauds his hospitality and his ancestral ties to Athens, Rome, and Egypt. F. Durrbach's commentary covers the close connection of Simalos' family to Athens and Delos, where the young men of the family were educated.

6. Fragment of a statue base from Apollonia (Cyrenaica): G. Pugliese-Carratelli, "Supplemento Epigrafico Cirenaico" 204, *Annuario* n.s. 23-24 (1961-1962) p. 334, transcription in majuscules without photograph. Cf. H. Hauben, *ZPE* 8 (1971) pp. 32-33 (restoration of text).

[Βασιλέα Πτολεμ]αίον [Θεόν Σω-]  
[τῆρα βασι]λέως Πτολε[μαί-]  
[ου τοῦ] δευτ[έρ]ου Εὐερ[γέτου]  
[Στόλ]ος Θέ[ωνος ὁ συ]γγ[έν]ης  
[καὶ] ναύαρχ[ος εὐεργεσίας]  
[ἔνεκεν] τῆ[s εἰς ἑαυτόν].

The editor suggested Πτολεμ]αίον in line 1 and ναύαρχ- in line 6. Hauben's independent restoration of the inscription, published after this article had been submitted, differs from mine in certain respects: Hauben omits Θεόν, placing all of Σωτήρα in line 1 and beginning line 2 with τὸν ἐγ. Although this is not impossible, the omission of Θεόν is unlikely in view of its use in the other Cyrenaean inscriptions (as Mitford points out to me). τὸν ἐγ, on the other hand, is unnecessary. It may be noted that nowhere does Stolos refer to his master simply as "Soter."

Hauben includes all of Πτολε[μαίου] in line 2, but this gives him two letters too few in the lacuna at the beginning of line 3. (Hauben remarks that we need to know more about the disposition of the text; but I take it that the editor's facsimile is meant to show the relative positions of the letters.) In line 4, I accept Hauben's restoration of the second half of the line with some misgivings, for the second lacuna should, by comparison

with other lines, hold only five or six letters, not seven. Hauben's restoration ends with *ναβαρ[χος]*, but *εὐεργεσίας* is the only restoration to fit both the sense required and the space available and may therefore be restored.

The history of the quarter-century after the death of Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II in 116 B.C. is confused and much argued. It is not my purpose here to take up once again the numerous problems, but to examine what contribution a clearer definition of the career of Stolos can make to our knowledge.

Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II died on 28 June 116 B.C.<sup>4</sup> By the following April at the latest, his first queen and co-regent, his sister Kleopatra II, had disappeared, and the younger Kleopatra (III) was associated with Ptolemy IX Soter II on the throne as the *θεοὶ Φιλομήτορες Σωτήρες*. The mother was listed first in dating formulae. It was an uneasy association, and in 114/3 Ptolemy Alexander, Soter's younger brother, declared himself king in Cyprus, where he had been *strategos* (governor) since Euergetes' death. He no doubt enjoyed his mother's support in his action. The situation thus endured, with some fluctuation, until 107, when Soter was expelled from Egypt and Alexander ruled in his place. Soter left behind his second wife Kleopatra Selene, his sister, whom his mother had forced him to marry in place of his first wife (and also his sister) Kleopatra IV about 115. Soter fled to Cyprus, but, quickly expelled from that island, fled to Syria. The next year (106/5), however, he returned to Cyprus and held it until his death some twenty-five years later. Kleopatra III was murdered in 101 by her son Ptolemy X Alexander, who thereafter ruled Egypt with his wife Berenike until he, too, was expelled in 88 at the return of Soter.

It has not been a matter of general agreement who controlled Cyrene during this period. Justin (39.5.2) tells us that Euergetes left Cyrene to Ptolemy Apion, his son by the concubine Eirene. Most scholars have accepted this testimony, some even concluding that Apion was installed as governor before 116. W. Otto has shown that the latter position is untenable.<sup>5</sup>

Somewhat later, it is generally agreed that Apion is the "king ruling in Cyrene" in the Roman law on pirates of ca. 100 B.C.<sup>6</sup> He is known to have

<sup>4</sup>The dates and reconstruction given here are based on A. E. Samuel, *Ptolemaic Chronology* 148-151; W. Otto and H. Bengtson, *Zur Geschichte des Niederganges des Ptolemäerreiches* (Abhand. Bayer. Akad., N.F. 17 [1938]); and T. B. Mitford, *JHS* 79 (1959) 124-129.

<sup>5</sup>W. Otto, *Zur Geschichte d. Zeit des 6. Ptolemäers* (Munich 1934) 118, n. 1.

<sup>6</sup>I accept the date of the editor, G. Colin (*BCH* 48 [1924] 58 ff.), whose treatment does not seem to me to be significantly challenged by any of the voluminous bibliography listed under *SEG* 3. 378, where the text is reprinted. The reference in question (B. 9) is in a context indicating kings in Alexandria, Cyprus, and Cyrene.

died in 96 and bequeathed his kingdom to Rome, declaring its cities free.<sup>7</sup> Some further information may be gained, I think, from an inscription not generally associated with Apion, *IDélos* 1530:

[Βασιλεὺς Πτολε]μα[ῖος βασιλ]έ[ω]ς [Πτολεμαίου]  
 [Εὐ]εργέτου βασίλισσαν Κλεοπάτραν Εὐεργέτιν  
 [τ]ῆν τοῦ πατρὸς μὲν γυναῖκα, ἑμαντοῦ δ[έ]  
 ἀνεψιάν, εὐχαριστίας ἕνεκεν τῆς εἰς αὐτήν,  
 [Ἄπόλλωνι] Ἀρτέμιδι Δητ[οῖ]

Apion was the son of Euergetes, and hence, though illegitimate, precisely a cousin of Kleopatra III, who was the daughter of Euergetes' brother Ptolemy VI Philometor and his sister, Kleopatra II. He is in fact the only possible candidate for the dedicant of this statue if *ἀνεψιά* is taken literally, for Ptolemy Soter and Ptolemy Alexander were sons of Kleopatra III—I take it that lines 3–4 are meant specifically to distinguish Apion from the other sons of Euergetes—while Memphites, whom Mitford has suggested, was Kleopatra's half-brother rather than her cousin. And the fact that the dedicant of *IDélos* 1530 identifies himself only as King Ptolemy, son of Euergetes, giving himself no throne name, recalls that Apion is called (in dedications in Cyrene after his death) τῷ βασιλεύσαντος ἀμῶν Πτολεμαίω, without any throne name.<sup>8</sup> With all other contenders ruled out, the dedicant must be Apion, about whom and whose position we know, after all, relatively little. The date of the inscription must fall before Kleopatra III's death in 101. For a more precise dating we must turn to other evidence.

It appears, first, that Soter was recognized in Cyrene during the period before his expulsion from Egypt. The well-known inscription bearing a decree of Cyrene and a letter and *prostagma* of Soter and Kleopatra Selene is dated to year 9, during a period when the papyri indicate that Ptolemy Alexander was temporarily associated with his mother on the throne in Egypt in place of Soter.<sup>9</sup> The pair are also possibly honoured by

<sup>7</sup>Livy, *ep.* 70. Full citation of the ancient sources and an intelligent discussion of Apion's life may be found in H. Volkmann's article in *RE* 23 (1959) cols. 1737–1738, no. 29.

<sup>8</sup>For the suggestion of Memphites, child of Euergetes and Kleopatra II, see T. B. Mitford, *JHS* 79 (1959) 109, n. 54, following W. Otto and H. Bengtson. The phrase τῷ βασιλεύσαντος ἀμῶν Πτολεμαίω occurs complete in *Arch Anz* 1962, col. 437, and incomplete in *Annuario* n.s. 23–24 (1961–1962) 347, no. 246, in both of which a courtier of the late king, Aiglanor son of Damatrios of Cyrene, is honoured in his home city.

<sup>9</sup>The text was first published by G. Oliverio in *Documenti dell' Africa Italiana* 1.2 (1936) 259–265, and reprinted as *SEG* 9. 5, where much bibliography is listed. Despite the various attempts to upset the date of 109/8, it seems secure; see the arguments of W. Otto, *Ptolemaica* (Sitzb. München [1939] 3), 16–27. For the Egyptian documents, see the study of A. E. Samuel (above, n. 4).

the city of Cyrene in a recently published inscription.<sup>10</sup> It seems clear that Soter and Kleopatra Selene were in some form of conflict with Kleopatra III when both of these inscriptions were erected.<sup>11</sup>

From somewhat later, an inscription from Ptolemais in the Cyrenaica begins with the phrase [β]ασιλεύοντος Π[τολεμαίου] Θεοῦ Σωτήρος (ἔτους) ι'.<sup>12</sup> A statue base may honour only one sovereign of a pair, but it is not likely that a dating formula would have omitted either Kleopatra had one of them been associated with Soter at this date in the rule of the Cyrenaica. Since it was probably late in the tenth year that Soter was expelled from Egypt,<sup>13</sup> we can be confident that he controlled Cyrene at the time of his expulsion and at least slightly afterward, as he had done before. It appears certain, therefore, that Cyrene served as a support for Soter during at least the latter part of his struggle with his mother between 115 and 107 and perhaps for some time after. This control had ceased by about 102 at the latest, by which time Kleopatra III had, I surmise, succeeded in replacing Soter in Cyrene with Ptolemy Apion, for I take it that this is that action for which Apion thanks her in *IDélos* 1530—surely a slap in Soter's face, dedicated as it was in a sanctuary of which Soter was a significant benefactor and which was controlled by a city with which Soter was on good terms.<sup>14</sup> It is hard to see how else Apion could have secured the ouster of Soter than by the military support of Kleopatra III.

We can now turn to the six documents of Stolos and try to fit them into this chronological context. A first point to be noticed is that all of them refer only to Soter himself, never to his mother or to either wife. This omission may not be taken as a certain sign that all date from periods of "secession" or from after Soter's expulsion in 107; they may reflect more simply a partisan contentiousness during the struggle. The omission of all the Kleopatras from the motive formula of number 1 shows that Stolos did not care to express his *eunoia* toward any of them, a much more serious matter than simply not honouring them with statues. The fact that all of the dedications are in this form suggests a date late in the struggle, since we have seen Kleopatra Selene as an ally of Soter—no doubt with

<sup>10</sup>Edited by L. Gasperini in S. Stucchi, *Cirene 1957-1966* (Quaderni dell' Istituto Italiano di Cultura di Tripoli 3 [1967]) 170, no. 20, with photograph, 169, fig. 204.

<sup>11</sup>The inscription cited by T. B. Mitford, *JHS* 79 (1959) 118, to support his argument that the use of Θεοῦ Σωτήρος need not indicate a period of conflict between Soter and his mother, gives her name first, which is not the case in the present text.

<sup>12</sup>G. Pugliese-Carratelli, "Supplemento Epigrafico Cirenaico" 209 (*Annuario* n.s. 23-24, [1961-1962] 337, with photograph, fig. 153.)

<sup>13</sup>Cf. A. E. Samuel (above, n. 4) 151.

<sup>14</sup>The evidence on this point is briefly summarized in the commentary to *IDélos* 1531, a dedication of 111/0 by Soter to Apollo and the demos of Athens.

the aim of securing more firmly her own independence from her mother—in his contest with Kleopatra III as late as 108. The Cyrenaeans seem to have honoured Selene and Soter together.

Secondly, the progression of Stolos' titles should help us. The first two dedications, both from Cyrene, show him as a first friend and *archedeatros*—a kind of head of household for the king—and then as head of the reins, evidently another court and household title, rather than a governmental one.<sup>15</sup> The Delian inscription now restored (number 3) shows a sudden addition of two functions, *epistolagrophos* and nauarch. It is followed by Stolos' promotion to the court rank of kinsman.<sup>16</sup> We know that the series must terminate by 102 at the latest, for after this time Stolos could scarcely have placed number 6 in Apollonia.

There is one logical occasion for this massive promotion of a courtier to the high ranks of nauarch and *epistolagrophos*: the expulsion of Soter from Egypt. It is very likely that Soter maintained his own court circle around him during the years of joint rule with his mother; indeed, he could hardly do otherwise and have any political base. As long as there was in theory one government, however, he would not be able to have his own admiral: he might not even have had his own *epistolagrophos*. But when the final break came, he would have had suddenly to create his own apparatus from almost nothing. It was an occasion when a number of courtiers must finally have received important positions after years of chafing under a regime in which Kleopatra III certainly held the upper hand and probably filled all the more important posts with her own appointees.

If these surmises are correct, our inscriptions 1 and 2 should come from late in the period of joint rule, perhaps in 108 or 107. After the break, Stolos was swiftly elevated; his Athenian origin was used to good advantage to cement the ties with Athens cultivated earlier. His Athenian citizenship and probably his demotic are stressed in the dedications on Delos. From being the chief courtier and household manager for Soter,

<sup>15</sup>Both titles are discussed in the commentary to *IDélos* 1534, where reference is made to W. Dittenberger's discussion *ad OGIS* 169 and to P. Collomp's *Recherches sur la chancellerie et diplomatique des Lagides* (Paris 1926) 9–49, and in more detail by F. Durrbach, *Choix d'Inscriptions de Délos* (1921) 206–207. Another *archedeatros* of the reign of Soter II (in *OGIS* 169) is unfortunately not precisely datable. But he, like the *archedeatros* of *OGIS* 181, is a "kinsman," a fact that emphasizes the disparity even at this stage between Stolos' offices and his court rank, a disparity that was to become so noticeable after his later promotions.

<sup>16</sup>The holding of the *nauarchia* by a "first friend" is unparalleled and remarkable. The use of [τῶν] πρώτων φίλων in *OGIS* 160 is an error for ὁ συγγένης, as Dittenberger already saw; cf. T. B. Mitford, *Inscriptions of Kourion* (Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 83 [1971]) 95, on such errors.

half-brother Ptolemy Alexander to do some years later<sup>20</sup>—in leaving his kingdom to Rome.

Stolos appears but briefly in history; we cannot document a span of activity much outside 108–103. Within these few years he enjoyed great power and trust from Ptolemy IX; he must have played a crucial role in the reconquest of Cyprus and the holding of Cyrene. He disappears from history with Soter's control of Cyrene, perhaps a casualty of its last defence.

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY, TALLAHASSEE

<sup>20</sup>For the will of Ptolemy Alexander, it suffices to refer to E. Badian's article in *RhM* 110 (1967) 178–192.