Vir doctus Anatolicus 211–233

Altay COŞKUN*

Ptolemaioi as Commanders in 3rd-Century Asia Minor and Some Glimpses on Ephesos and Mylasa during the Second and Third Syrian Wars

Abstract: During the rules of Ptolemy II Philadelphos and Ptolemy III Euergetes, several sources attest namesakes operating in western Asia Minor in distinguished positions. On this basis, scholars have so far identified mostly two or even one single prominent representative(s) of the House of the Ptolemies. The prevailing unitarian reconstruction regards him as Ptolemy, son of Lysimachos and Arsinoe II, and at the same time as the adoptive son and designated successor of Ptolemy II; he is believed to have functioned as Ptolemaic commander-in-chief of the Aegean fleet in the 260s BC, before revolting in Ephesos in 259; pardoned by his adoptive father, he would have retired to a principality in Telmessos until his recall by Euergetes in 246. He tends to be identified with 'Ptolemy the Brother' mentioned in the correspondence between the local dynast Olympichos and the citizens of Mylasa in ca. 244. 'Ptolemy the Son' is reported to have been killed in Ephesos by Athenaios, just as a certain 'Ptolemy epiklesin Andromachos' (P. Haun. 6). If indeed identical, his murder occurred after the last attestation of 'Ptolemy of Telmessos' in ca. 239. This and similar reconstructions have always been fraught with numerous inconsistencies and anomalies, but can now firmly be rejected based on more reliable reconstructions of Seleukid-Ptolemaic interactions under Antiochos II, Antiochos Hierax and Seleukos II. As a result, we should distinguish four namesakes: first, Ptolemy, son of Arsinoe II and Lysimachos, who vanished from our sources in the 270s. Second, 'Ptolemy the Son', born to Arsinoe I and full brother of Euergetes, who died in a revolt in Ephesos while Antiochos II was about to capture the city in 258. Third, 'Ptolemy epiklesin Andromachos' was a natural son of Philadelphos, thus identical with 'Ptolemy the Brother' of Euergetes; he was the father of Ptolemy, son of Andromachos and priest of Alexander and the Theoi Adelphoi in Alexandria 251/50; he also died in Ephesos sometime after 244. Fourth, 'Ptolemy of Telmessos' was another son of Philadelphos and Arsinoe I, later adopted by Arsinoe II, as attested by Theokritos. These new identifications substantially impact our reconstruction of major events and changes of power in 3rd-century Asia Minor as well as of the dynastic histories of the Seleukids and Ptolemies.

Keywords: Ptolemies; Seleukids; Asia Minor; Ephesos; Telmessos.

A recent investigation of the relations between the Seleukids and Ptolemies has questioned the traditional narrative of the Second (261–253) and Third (246–241) Syrian Wars as well as of the War of Brothers, which until now has been dated to 241/227. It has been shown that the marriage between Antiochos II and Berenike, the daughter of Ptolemy II Philadelphos, which was intended to seal the newly established peace in 253/52, did not entail the rejection of Laodike, his first wife, or their sons Seleukos (II) and Antiochos (Hierax), since bigamy was widespread at Macedonian courts. Laodike as the murderer of Antiochos, Berenike and her son has been demonstrated to be a Ptolemaic fabrication covering up the aggressions of Ptolemy III Euergetes. It was this son of Philadelphos who seized the opportunity to reset the balance of power after his father and Antiochos had both died by July 246. The Third Syrian War effectively broke out later in July or early in August: Sophron, the *strategos* of Ephesos where the Aegean fleet of the Seleukids was harboured, betrayed Laodike and joined forces

* Assoc. Prof. Dr. Altay Coşkun, Classical Studies, University of Waterloo, Waterloo ON, Canada, N2L 3G1 (acoskun@uwaterloo.ca).

I would like to thank Alex McAuley for his helpful feedback, which allowed me to improve a first version of this paper. All remaining shortcomings are of course my own.

with Ptolemy Andromachos, Euergetes' admiral in the Aegean. As a result, not only Berenike and her son, but also Laodike were killed by October. Immediately thereafter, Ptolemy Andromachos won over Hierax and his uncle Alexander to confront Seleukos who was at the time returning from Babylon at the head of a strong army. This sparked the War of Brothers, which was an integral part of the Third Syrian War. Euergetes exploited Seleukos' distraction in order to expand deeper into Karia and invade Kilikia. And it was Seleukos' defeat at Ankyra in October 246 that emboldened the king of Egypt to invade Syria and Mesopotamia. Buttressed by the resources of his eastern satrapies, Seleukos regained Babylon by mid-245 and, not much later, he won the 'Beautiful Victory' further up the Euphrates which gained him his *cognomen* Kallinikos and gave him access back into Syria. However, it was not after accepting Hierax as king of Asia Minor in 242 that his rule of Seleukid Syria was unchallenged and that Euergetes had to accept a peace that would honour the status quo.[1]

The revised chronology of the Third Syrian War and the War of Brothers (which is detailed out in an appendix to this article) has far-reaching ramifications that affect several other chapters of early Hellenistic history. The current paper will explore the roles and identities of certain Ptolemaioi that are attested in leading positions in western or southern Asia Minor during the mid-3rd century. Imperial history will be combined with local perspectives: fresh insights will be gained on the fates of Ephesos and Mylasa during the Second and Third Syrian Wars. Passing mention will also be made of the Lykian cities of Telmessos and Xanthos.

1) Olympichos, the Dossier of Labraunda, and the Liberation of Mylasa

An epigraphic dossier from Labraunda first published by J. Crampa comprises eight letters written by, addressed to, or communicated through Olympichos.[2] As a magnate from Alinda in northern Karia, he managed to extend his influence during the Third Syrian War by lending active support to Seleukos II, who appointed him *strategos*.[3] Seven of these letters deal with a protracted dispute between the citizens of Mylasa and the priest of Zeus Labraundos (a certain Korris in the 240s and Hekatomnos in the 220s) about the income of some of the estates belonging to the sanctuary. The correspondence attests to the control of both the city and the sanctuary by Sophron, the Seleukid *strategos* based in Ephesos,[4] and "Ptolemy, the Brother of King Ptolemy" as well as by Olympichos. Thereby, Seleukos (II), Anti-

[1] Porphyr. FGrH 260 F 32.6–8; F 43; Just. 27; Trog. Prol. 27; Polyaen. 4.17; 8.50; with Coşkun ca. 2015a and ca. 2015b; cf. also Piejko 1990; Grainger 1997; 2010; van der Spek/Finkel, BCHP 11. On Laodike in the context of Macedonian and Seleukid polygamy, cf. also Martinez-Sève 2002/3; Ramsey, forthcoming.

[2] ILabraunda 1–8 = Crampa 1969 no.1–8. ILabraunda 1; 3 = Austin 2006, 179a; b; ILabraunda 4 = IMylasa I 23 = Austin 2006, 179c. ILabraunda 1; 3–7 = Virgilio 2003 no. 20–25 (pp. 272–282); cf. Robert – Robert 1970, 448–455 (no. 542–548). One may add a fragmentary honorific inscription from Labraunda (I 9, which I suggest to date 244/242, see below; Kobes 1996, 138 dates to after 241), the only document that attests the title *strategos* (I 9 ll. 4–5; Kobes 1996, 112 presents unreliable sources for the title). On the dates, see below, with nn. 7–8.

[3] Polyb. 5.90.1 mentions Olympichos among the "dynasts" of Asia Minor who helped out Rhodes after the earthquake in 227/26. – Due to problematic assumptions about Laodike (see also nn. 8; 64; 79) and Hierax (see also nn. 5; 10; 14; 22; 27; 62; 66; 79) as partly outlined in the introduction, previous biographic treatments need revision. The most detailed accounts are Crampa 1969, esp. 86–96, and Kobes 1996, 98–100 (probably *philos* of Seleukos); 109 ("gleichzeitig Amtsträger und Lokaldynast"); 109–110 (successor of Sophron and Ptolemy the Brother, but *strategos* only of Karia, probably established late in 246 or early in 245); 112; 136–139 (discussion of the independent ambitions and formal dependence on Seleukos); 139–144 (effective independence under Hierax, but gradual subjection under Doson or Philip); 193–195 (military occupation of Mylasa until 220s; invasion of *chora* of Iasos under Philip); 257–259 (*euergesiai*). For short overviews of Olympichos' life, cf. Billows 1995, 94–96; Grainger 1997, 110 (chronologically vague); 2010, 172; Ma 1999, 42. More broadly on the history of Labraunda and its relation with Mylasa, cf. Boffo 1985, 234–243; Virgilio 2001; Dignas 2002, 2–4; 59–66; 68–69.

[4] The identification has been posited by Crampa 1969, 121 and defended by Gygax 2000, 353; 358–362, who further points out that Sophron was involved prior to his conflict with Laodike in 246, and thus not at the same time as Ptolemy the Brother, as Buraselis 1982, 136–137 suggests. On Sophron, see also below, sections 3 and 5.

gonos Doson and Philip (V) are named as the kings on whose behalf these officials acted.[5] Letters 1 to 3 are normally dated to ca. 240, but, according to the revised chronology of the Third Syrian War, Seleukos regained power at least over parts of western Asia Minor in ca. 244, while he may have lost it for good in 242.[6] Letters 4 to 8 were written around 220, after Karia had come under Antigonid domination in 227.[7]

The inscriptions repeatedly refer to the "liberation" of Mylasa which Olympichos had brought about at the order of Seleukos. Crampa thought that this action took place at the very beginning of the king's rule, i.e. in summer 246. But so far no explanation has been offered as to why the city should not have been free beforehand. And if indeed Antiochos II had oppressed the city and rescinded a democratic constitution for any one reason we do not know of, why should Seleukos have bothered to grant freedom immediately after his succession?[8] At any rate, the revised chronology of the Third Syrian War and the War of Brothers now offers a much better framework for understanding these problems. Since Olympichos acted only after Sophron and Ptolemy the Brother had become involved in the matters, the correspondence with Olympichos will go back to the later years of Antiochos' rule.[9] As early as August, the Ptolemies started to extend their control into Ionia and Karia. Whether Mylasa was part of their immediate gains or changed hands only after Seleukos had been defeated at Ankyra cannot be decided. At all events, the latter battle ought no longer to be dated to 241/237, but must have taken place in October 246. With this, Seleukos effectively lost his active positions in Asia Minor and Syria, even though some allegiance to him remained, as we shall soon see.

But before his supporters dared to take an active role, they had to be encouraged by Seleukos' 'Beautiful Victory', which allowed him to return into Syria later in 245 or early in 244. Most famous is the action Smyrna took to gain Magnesia and the garrison at Old Magnesia, which had changed over to Hierax' party by September 246. Smyrna was bringing it back under the – at least nominal – rule of

---

[5] ILabraunda (as n. 2), 1–8, esp. 3 ll. 4–8 (on the governors until the 240s). – The fact that Hierax is not mentioned may be understood in a way that the conflict had resided during Seleukos' rule and / or that Olympichos was never subject to Hierax. See also n. 3 for further cross-references.

[6] See above, n. 1; cf. also the Smyrna Decree (below, n. 10). On ca. 240 BC, see below, n. 8.

[7] Cf. Virgilio 2001, 49–53; 2003, 176–181; also Kobes 1996, 139–144; Will 1979, 366–371; Bengtson 1971.

[8] Seleukos' grant of freedom is attested in ILabraunda (as n. 2) 3 l. 30; 5 l. 34; 7 ll. 9–10, though not a grant of a democratic constitution, as Crampa 1969, 80–85 claims (likewise, however, Boffo 1985, 237; Dignas 2002, 3; Virgilio 2001, 46; 48; 2003, 174 with n. 449 [and p. 175 on the date]). Inscription 3 ll. 31–33 rather states that the inhabitants of the temple territories were enrolled as citizens of Mylasa. Similarly to Crampa, Ma 1999, 44 regards the grant of freedom as a reward for the loyalty to Seleukos, but it remains unclear how this loyalty was demonstrated. Differently, Heuß 1975, 408–415 argues that the repeated emphasis of the freedom is purely rhetorical, cf., e.g., p. 412: "Der politische Freiheitsbegriff im Hellenismus (und nicht nur da) entbehrt der institutionellen Präzisierung und war deshalb dem Schicksal ausgeliefert, eine mehr verbale als reale Existenz zu führen". This, however, does not do justice to the historical circumstances. That the liberation involved military action is further implied by the fact that Olympichos kept his troops in Mylasa for over 20 years, in contravention of Seleukos' orders and his own promises; cf. ILabraunda I 4 ll. 10–13, with Kobes 1996, 193–195; 257 (in contrast, Kobes 1994, 4–6 seems to imply a peaceful return under Seleukid control sometime after mid-245). The latter, however, remains very vague as to the liberation itself, which he 109–110 n. 35 synchronizes with the "Befreiung" (!) of Smyrna (see below, n. 10). – Differently, Boffo 1985, 237; IMylasa, p. 11; Billows 1995, 94–95; Dignas 2002, 59; Virgilio 2001, 40; 2003, 172; 272–273 and Austin 2006 no. 179 p. 326 date the first attestation of Olympichos to 240, which is also accepted by Heuß 1975, 405; 406. – Olympichos may have been a highly prominent figure in the area as early as under Antiochos II, when he bought substantial estates from Queen Laodike (thus Crampa p. 52), if only the queen mentioned in ILabraunda 8 ll. 19–20 is to be identified with her and not with Laodike II, wife of Seleukos II (thus Virgilio 2001, 48; 2003, 175); differently, Kobes 1996, 137–138, who ascribes the transaction to Laodike I, but in 246/241; undecided Martinez-Sève 2002/3, 698–699.

[9] For Antiochos' rule over Mylasa after 260, cf. also Gygax 2000, 361 with n. 43; 362. The few days after the king's death and before the friction with Laodike were not enough for Sophron to deal with Mylasa.

Seleukos. He would be informed only afterwards, but was ready to grant *asylia* to the sanctuary of Aphrodite Stratonikis and autonomy and tax exemption to the city.[10] Around the same time early in 244, Seleukos himself seems to have given instructions to Olympichos to vindicate Mylasa from Ptolemaic control. This must be the "liberation" referred to in the correspondence.[11]

Up to two years thereafter, Korris complained to Seleukos that the citizens of Mylasa had disregarded his ancestral privileges. The king responded with another letter to Olympichos, asking him to defend the priest's rights – though only if his allegations were correct. The official forwarded the royal letter to the city to enforce the royal decision, but then received a delegation which produced evidence – correspondence involving Sophron and Ptolemy the Brother – that proved the priest's claims to be misleading. For the time being, Olympichos decided the conflict in favour of the citizens of Mylasa. And there is no evidence for new turmoil prior to the arrival of Antigonos Doson in Karia in 227. It should be emphasized that the official seems to have acted in line with the royal instructions, rather than making an independent decision to his own and Mylasa's advantage.[12]

The negotiations involving Olympichos and Seleukos would have extended over a couple of months, perhaps even lasted up to half a year. This time span must have evolved somewhere between 244 and 242.[13] In the course of 242, however, Seleukos ceded all of Asia Minor north-west of the Tauros mountain range to his brother Hierax as the price for the latter's desertion from Euergetes. This agreement was critical to ending the Third Syrian War in 241, because Seleukos could then concentrate his forces in southern Syria, while Hierax was trying to bring as much of Asia Minor under his sway as possible.

Uncertainties remain in regards to the period after the death of Sophron in ca. August 246 and the empowerment of Olympichos in ca. 244. The study of this period is intertwined with one of the most complex and intricate prosopographical problems of the Hellenistic period: the biography of Ptolemy the Son of Ptolemy Philadelphos and his identification with, or distinction from, other Ptolemaioi attested as active in western Asia Minor during the mid-third century. Scholarship on this topic is legion, but we can safely ignore works predating 1969, when J. Crampa published the editio princeps of the Labraunda dossier, complemented by a substantial investigation of the problem.[14] Still scholarly

---

[10] OGIS I 229 (ca. 244 BC) = IMSipylos 1 (ca. 245 BC) = ISmyrna II 1.573 = Austin 2006, 174 (ca. 241), l. 6. For the date and context, cf. Coşkun ca. 2015a. Differently, e.g., Bouché-Leclercq 1913, 102 (ca. 243 BC); Crampa 1969, 86 (ca. 246 BC); Cohen 1978, 60 (ca. 243) (Cohen assumes that Smyrna's initiative was about keeping Magnesia and Palai Magnesia loyal to Seleukos "in the face of the omnipresent Ptolemaic Aegean fleet", whereas I think it was about gaining them back from Hierax). Cf. also Ma 1999, 44–45 (vaguely in the Third Syrian War); 49–50 (extension of Smyrna disguised as act of loyalty for Seleukos); 118 (Ma assumes that the soldiers of Palai Magnesia stood under the command of Seleukos, which was clearly not the case); 235: "The Smyrnians conducted their annexation of a Seleukid colony at Magnesia under Sipylos in the language of loyalty towards Seleukos II and concern for his interests". – And OGIS 228 = Rigsby 1996, 102–103: grant of freedom, tax exemption and *asylia*. Rigsby 1996, 95–105 (with further documentation) is undecided between 245 and 244 or 243 for the *asylia* grant. Surprisingly, Ma 1999, 161 supposes the *asylia* grant to predate the *sympoliteia* decree.

[11] See above, n. 8. Differently Gygax 2000, 359f. who denies Ptolemaic control of Mylasa at all, because he considers Ptolemy the Brother an official of Hierax, as Crampa does (but see above, n. 3), and because the Ptolemaic official approached by the Kildareis was called Tlepolemos (see below, n. 58).

[12] Similarly, Virgilio 2001, 44–45; 2003, 172–175, with many further details, though different chronology. Cf. also Dignas 2002, 62, who argues that Olympichos negotiated the final decision with Seleukos. At least, one may say that he defended it successfully: ILabraunda (as n. 2) I 3 ll. 22–24; I 4 ll. 6–7. Differently, e.g., Kobes 1996, 110.

[13] ILabraunda (as n. 2) 1–3.

[14] Crampa 1969, 97–120 equates 'Ptolemy of Ephesos' (see below, section 4) with Ptolemy the Son, the Brother and *Ptolemaios epiklesin Andromachos*; the latter he takes as a nickname coined on his defeat at Andros (105–113), which he dates to 262 though (instead of 246, see below, section 3). Moreover, Crampa equates a royal brother killed in Thrace – Hierax according to Just. 27.3.11 – with Ptolemy of Ephesos slain by Thracians, thus conflating the brothers of Euergetes and Seleukos without need (105f.). Crampa (113–120) further thinks that Ptolemy the Son

views continue to be manifold, contradictory and inconsistent, but it is hoped that the new chronology of the Third Syrian War and the War of Brothers will permit us to solve most of the difficulties.

2) Ptolemy the Son of Philadelphos and Perhaps the Brother of Euergetes

"Ptolemy the Son of Philadelphos" was co-ruler with his father since 267, but betrayed him in 259/58. The rich documentation from Egypt, supplemented by inscriptions from Asia Minor and further potentially relevant literary and papyrological evidence has been made accessible most conveniently by W. Huß in 1998. Based upon this most thorough source collection, the German scholar presents an important discussion that seeks to settle the vexed question about Ptolemy the Son's identity. Superseding Crampa's synthesis, Huß has certainly presented the strongest among the 'unitarian' approaches. These argue against proliferating the number of Ptolemaioi attested in top positions in the mid-course of the 3rd century.[15] But, as his predecessors, Huß has overstretched the principle of prosopographical economy: most obvious are the difficulties entailed by the identification of Ptolemy the Son with the oldest son of Lysimachos and Arsinoe (*ca. 298): it is hard to accept that he was adopted by Philadelphos when Arsinoe married her brother, became his co-ruler only after Arsinoe's death, but defected in 259/58, though survived the reconquest of the city by Antiochos II; and as if this were not yet enough, he is even thought to have found the mercy of his ex-adoptive father, who granted him a fiefdom in Lykian Telmessos in 257/56, was reappointed commander-in-chief of the Aegean fleet by Euergetes in 246 and lived on to be honoured in Telmessos in ca. 239 before dying in a revolt in Ephesos.[16] While still the best starting point for further research on the topic, Huß' contribution has not been able to end the century-old controversy, but rather has spurred new debates.

The most authoritative current prosopography of the Ptolemaic Dynasty by Ch. Bennett divides the sources among two different Ptolemaioi, but still identifies Ptolemy the Son with Ptolemy the Brother, whom he considers to have survived the Second (and perhaps even Third) Syrian War.[17] Bennett even maintains the unlikely equation of Ptolemy of Telmessos with the Son, although J. A. Tunny and M. D. Gygax have demonstrated independently from each other many of the weaknesses that this identification suffers from.[18] The latter two scholars brought further relief by distinguishing between

---

revolted in 259 because of his failures (first at Andros, then in Miletos – which ignores that he had been allied with Timarchos: Trog. Prol. 26), and was accepted as a high official by Antiochos II, possibly through the mediation of Andromachos, brother of Queen Laodike, and later serving first Seleukos (thus allegedly mentioned in FGrH 260 F 32.8), then Hierax. When the latter's rule disintegrated in the later 230s, his mercenaries killed him and allied with Euergetes. Positive evidence for Ephesos under Ptolemaic control dates to 221 (Polyb. 5.35.11).

[15] Huß 1998, 229–236; 250 (in short: idem 2001, 311–312; 348–350); cf. Gygax 2000, 354 n. 6. For less sophisticated 'unitarian' approaches, see above, n. 14 (Crampa), and below, nn. 49 (Seibert 1976) and 60 (Oikonomides 1984a); also Heuß 1975, 405. Outdated is H. Volkmann, Ptolemaios der Sohn [Nr. 20], RE 23.2, 1959, 1666–1667. The evidence presented by Huß makes it clear that Ptolemy the Son was an effective co-ruler and as such included in the regnal dating formula of Egypt, albeit without the title *basileus*.

[16] Huß 1998, 235–236 (quoting Segre 1938, 183 = Robert 1966 no. 55 ll. 2–11, dating between 265/64 and 257/56, and TAM II 1 ll. 2–9 = OGIS I 55 = Austin 2006 no. 270 ll. 2–9 of 240 or 239); 243 (Philadelphos also condoned his half-brothers Magas and Keraunos); 245–248. This view is accepted also by Bennet, 2001–2013 s.v. Ptolemy the Son (with the most detailed discussion), even though he distinguishes *Ptolemy epiklesin Andromachou* (on whom see below) from Ptolemy the Son, and dates OGIS I 55, as Austin 2006 no. 270 to February 240 (Wörrle 1978, 218: February 240). – See also below, n. 18 and section 7 c).

[17] Bennett 2001–2013 s.v. "Ptolemy the Son". Similar, e.g., Kobes 1994, 2; Virgilio 2001, 45; 2003, 173; also Seibert 1976, 47; 55f. and Ravazzolo 1996, 125; 130; 133–134, though with the erroneous conclusion that Ptolemy the Son never controlled Ephesos in the Second Syrian War (but see below, section 4). – Prosopographia Ptolemaica distinguishes between no. 14542 Ptolemaios ho Hyios (sources include: Trog. Prol. 26; Athen. 13.593a-b) and no. 14544 Ptolemaios Andromachos (source: Trog. Prol. 27).

[18] Tunny 2000, 86–89 rightly claims that appointing anyone else than a legitimate son in 267 (while having such) would have been incompatible with the policies of Philadelphos; see also below, section 7 a). Surprisingly, Gygax 2002

Ptolemy the Son, whose traces get lost with his defection in 259, and the Ptolemy who commanded the Aegean fleet early during the rule of Euergetes, even though their arguments are only partly compatible.[19] While such a threefold differentiation deserves acceptance, the biographical reconstructions are still in need of modification. Once again, the revised chronological framework of the Third Syrian War will be helpful to shed new light on this old problem.

Gygax agrees with Huß and Bennett on equating the aforesaid Son with "Ptolemy the Brother of King Ptolemy" (sc. Euergetes) as mentioned by Olympichos in the letter to the citizens of Mylasa.[20] According to Gygax, however, this does not require the Brother's letters to Mylasa to postdate the accession of Euergetes in 246, but is more compatible with a date before or early in the Second Syrian War, when Ptolemy the Son of Philadelphos is supposed to have governed in Karia (perhaps as early as 267) or Ephesos (possibly from 262 on) until his defection in 259 or even thereafter. The next episode of the conflict would then have involved Sophron, probably when he was still serving Antiochos II as *strategos* i.e. before July 246, while the third stage that involved Olympichos himself took place under Seleukos II.[21] As a result, neither the correspondence of Olympichos as the representative of Seleukos II nor his activities under Philip V require that Ptolemy the Brother acted as an official of either Euergetes (during the Third Syrian War, 246–241) or of Hierax (after ca. 242).[22]

At the current stage of the discussion, the identification of the Son with the Brother would thus appear to be compatible with the evidence. But some caution in accepting this view is advised, since Olympichos mentions Sophron first and Ptolemy second, followed by Olympichos himself. A chronological order would be more intuitive, and will in fact gain further credibility in the course of this study.

3) Ptolemaios epiklesin Andromachos

Departing from Huß, Gygax distinguishes the aforementioned Son of Philadelphos from *Ptolemaios epiklesin Andromachou* (sic) who seems to be attested in a highly fragmentary Copenhagen Papyrus.[23] He thereby rejects the interpretation of *Andromachos* as (derogatory) epithet 'Fighter at the Battle at Andros', which allowed other scholars such as Huß to continue identifying him with Ptolemy, the Son of Philadelphos.[24] Despite the grammatical difficulties,[25] Gygax follows K. Buraselis in equating the

---

first concedes the possible identification with Ptolemy the Son on the basis of the Greek inscriptions and literary sources, but then rejects it only on the grounds that the Mende Stele of 264/63 requires Ptolemy the Son to have been engendered by Philadelphos. Tunny and Gygax (cf. also idem 2001, 149–167) accept the identity of Ptolemy of Telmessos with the offspring of King Lysimachos and Arsinoe (II); for an alternative suggestion, see below, section 7 c). For the disambiguation of the Son and Ptolemy of Telmessos, cf. also Wörrle 1978, 218–219 n. 85; Ravazzolo 1996, 124.

[19] Gygax 2000 mainly argues for the identity of Son and Brother, who disappears from the sources after 259, and the commander of Euergetes (on whom see below).

[20] Huß 1998, 244–245; likewise, Wörrle 1978, 218 n. 85. For Labraunda, see also next n.

[21] ILabraunda (as n. 2) 3, normally dated to ca. 240 (though I suggest ca. 244/242 BC) and 4–7 of ca. 220 BC; see above, n. 8. Cf. already Ma 1999, 41 n. 55: the equation of the Son and the Brother does not require his survival until Olympichos composed the letter.

[22] The involvement of Hierax has been claimed, e.g., by Crampa 1969, 83; 119, followed, e.g., by Robert – Robert 1970, 449; Gygax 2000, 359–400. Note that while I date the start of Hierax' revolt and independent rule in parts of western Asia Minor as early as September 246, I see no evidence for his intrusion into Karia; cf. Seibert 1976, 46. Against Crampa, cf. also Bagnall 1976, 170; Kobes 1994, 4. See also above, n. 3 with further cross-references.

[23] P.Haun. I 6, ll. 1–13 = Segre 1942/43, 269–271 = Bülow-Jacobsen 1979, 92–93 = Ravazzolo 1996, 131 = Huß 1998, F (p. 235, cf. 242–243; and Crampa 1969, 105–113). And Gygax 2000, 356; 365; cf. Buraselis 1982, 133–134; Grainger 1997, 167; Bennet 2001–2013 s.v. Ptolemy Andromachou (with detailed bibliography). See also above, n. 17.

[24] Rejecting Crampa 1969, 105–113, Buraselis 1982, 129 pointed out that a compound on *-maches* cannot be a "Spottname".

[25] See below on *epiklesin* and the use of the nominative or genitive, with nn. 33–37.

Ptolemy of the Copenhagen Papyrus with *Ptolemaios Andromachou*, i.e. Ptolemy, the son of Andromachos, who was eponymous priest of Alexander and the Theoi Adelphoi in Alexandria in 251/50. Both scholars further believe that Andromachos was only the adoptive father of this Ptolemy, while he was a natural son of Philadelphos probably from his mistress Bilistiche. This one happened to be priestess (*kanephoros*) of the Theoi Adelphoi in the same year 251/50 and is mostly viewed as the wife of Andromachos,[26] whose personality would otherwise remain opaque though.[27] Neither suggestion will ultimately hold ground.

But let us first explore the remaining information contained in the same Copenhagen Papyrus: *Ptolemaios epiklesin Andromachou* (or rather *Ptolemaios epiklesin Andromachos*, as we shall soon see) seems to have captured Ainos in Thrace and fought in the naval battle at Andros, before being assassinated in Ephesos.[28] Ptolemaic conquests in Thrace early in the rule of Euergetes are also attested in the Adoulis Inscription and confirmed by Ptolemaic sovereignty over Ainos attested in 242.[29] *Ptolemaios epiklesin Andromachos* would thus be the same *Ptolomeaus* who captured the Thracian *Adaeus* according to the *Prologi* of Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae*, for the victory of Gonatas at Andros, which is most commonly dated to 246 or 245 (I suggest early August 246), is mentioned in the same sentence.[30] The defeated admiral is called *Opron* in the manuscript tradition, though this needs to be corrected into <*S*>*o-p*<*h*>*ron*, the name of the above-mentioned *strategos* of Ephesos, as shall be further demonstrated below.

But before we look more closely at the controversy surrounding this identification,[31] it needs to be pointed out that the involvement of *Ptolemaios epiklesin Andromachos* in the combat near Andros has found general acceptance: that the highly abridged *Prologi* fail to mention him more explicitly as a participant in the Battle of Andros must indeed not be pressed to prove his absence.[32] The Copenhagen Papyrus may even offer a clue to understanding why *Ptolemaios epiklesin Andromachos* is not named along with the defeated admiral Sophron: it seems that this Ptolemy "[left] behind [his allies near] Andros" to save his fleet and thus to be in a position to take over Ephesos after the death of Sophron.

---

[26] Gygax 2000, 362–363, with Buraselis 1982, 123–133; cf. Hölbl 1994, 49 with n. 83; Lehmann 1998, 93–94. However, Tunny 2000, 87–88 suggests to distinguish two Bilistichai. Ravazzolo 1996, 131–133 bases the identification with a son of Philadelphos on the fact that the entry on *Ptolemaios epiklesin Andromachou* (ll. 1–13) precedes that of Euergetes (ll. 14–23); he is followed by one Arsinoe (ll. 24–27) and Euergetes' son Magas (28–34, on which cf. Habicht 1980, 3–4); and cf. idem 137–143 for a discussion of all the sources on Bilistiche. Cf. also Prosopographia Ptolemaica no. 05237 (with addition) for the priest and no. 14717 = 05066; E0217 for the priestess.

[27] But cf. Buraselis 1982, 131–132; Ravazzolo 1996, 132–133. for the possible identity with the homonymous owner of *dorea* attested in 253/249. No viable option is his identification with Andromachos, the father of the Seleukid usurper Achaios the Younger (on whom cf. Grainger 1997, 5; 8; 47; 693; Coşkun ca. 2015a), thus possibly serving Hierax, as Crampa 1969, 113–120 suggests; see above, n. 14.

[28] On Ephesos in or after the Second Syrian War, see below, section 5.

[29] Adoulis Inscription = OGIS I 54 = Austin 2006 no 268 for Thrace. And SEG XII 375 ll. 4–5 = Rigsby 1996 no. 28 for Ainos depending on Euergetes in 242; cf. Bagnall 1976, 160.

[30] We do not know precisely when Ptolemy's fleet prevailed over Adaios, the Thracian ally of Antiochos II and Gonatas, or when Sophron was defeated at Andros, though the former battle may have taken place in 246 BC, while the latter must fall between autumn 246 and spring 245. Cf. Trog. Prol. 27 (quoted in n. 32); Buraselis 1982, 123–176, esp. 136–141, followed by Reger 1985/93, 155; 158; 1994, 33 et al.; Walbank 1988, 306; 587–595; 599–600; Lehmann 1998, 93; Gygax 2000, 354; Ehling 2003, 311. And Coşkun ca. 2015a for August 246. For 246, though with very different arguments, Grainger 1997, 154; 167; 2010, 154. No longer tenable is a date around 250 BC or during the Second Syrian War, as considered by Will 1979, 235–238.

[31] See below, section 5.

[32] Trog. Prol. 27: *ut Ptolomaeus Adaeum denuo captum interfecerit et Antigonus Andro proelio navali Oprona* (to be corrected in *Sophrona*) *vicerit*. Cf. Buraselis 1982, 123–141; Walbank 1988, 587–595; 599–600; Grainger 1997, 154; Lehman 1998, 92–94 (the assassination in Ephesos is understood as a result of the defeat at Andros); Gygax 2000, 354; 365.

Judgements about this decision may have differed, but one should keep in mind that after the betrayal of Sophron parts of the Aegean fleet of the Ptolemies may well have been deployed in Karia or Kilikia, where they would have been of better use than in the unexpectedly less hostile Aegean. Of course, one cannot expect the extremely shortened version of the *Prologi* to provide us with such nuances: for its compiler, it sufficed to name only the top winners and top losers of two confrontations.[33]

This said, it is to be conceded to Huß that no valid parallel for *epiklesin* followed by a simple patronymic has been produced so far. But even if so,[34] I would not see the need for a natural son of Philadelphos to be legitimized through adoption by whichever courtier. Accordingly, we should not speak of *Ptolemaios epiklesin Andromachou*, but rather of *Ptolemaios epiklesin Andromachos*, whom we have to distinguish from *Ptolemaios Andromachou*. This view is further supported by a revision of the Copenhagen Papyrus itself, for it cannot be decided, if the original text read *Ptolemaios* or *Ptolemaiou epiklesin Andromachou*.[35] More importantly, patronymics in the two other identifiable entries for Magas and Arsinoe are avoided.[36] Given the lack of either a definite attestation or a grammatical parallel, it is therefore methodologically unacceptable to postulate *Ptolemaios epiklesin Andromachou* as the official name form, let alone to draw conclusions on an adoption. I rather suggest accepting *Andromachos* as a cognomen, so that I shall henceforth speak of Ptolemy Andromachos. As a further conclusion, *Ptolemaios Andromachou*, the priest of 251 was likely the son of this Ptolemy Andromachos. One chronological implication of this view is that the *cognomen* Andromachos cannot be a reference to the battle in which Sophron died. It may possibly relate to an earlier (in this case victorious, but unattested) battle at Andros; or it reflects a successful man-to-man fight (which the Romans would have rewarded with a *spolia opima*), unless it is simply a nickname expressing his martial qualities, accepted early in his life to gradually become official.[37]

The dynastic name and the top positions attested for both father and son seem to hint even at a blood relation with the royal family. This would explain the inclusion of Ptolemy Andromachos into the Copenhagen Papyrus, if indeed it was a compilation of biographic information on the Ptolemaic family –[38] or rather of their *res gestae*, since the remaining fragments do not convey the impression that the parents or other family members were introduced systematically. Against this background, one may even hypothesize that Ptolemy Andromachos was yet another natural son of Philadelphos. Since the latter was born in 309/8, Ptolemy Andromachos may have seen the light of this world between 290 and 280, to become the father of Ptolemy Andromachou (the priest of 251/50) between 275 and 265. Given the proliferation of Ptolemaioi in Alexandria, the use of a *cognomen* instead of a patronymic would make a lot of sense: Ptolemaios, son of (Ptolemaios with the *cognomen*) Andromachos would not

---

[33] I suggest to read P.Haun. I 6, right column, ll. 8–10 as follows: αἱρεῖ κ(αὶ) Αἶνον κ(αὶ) πολλα[/ επει κ(αὶ) ναυμαχήσας ἀπέλ[*ιπεν συμμάχους* (vel similiter) *κατὰ*] / Ἄνδρον (my changes in Italics).

[34] The parallels produced by Buraselis 1982, 130 come close, but are not entirely equivalent in syntactical terms.

[35] Whether *Andromachou* is to be taken as a patronymic or simply an apposition in the same case as Ptolemy's name cannot be decided on the basis of paleography, as Buraselis 1982, 125 (with discussion on pp. 126–132; cf. Ravazzolo 1996, 132–136) admits, but in fact the latter option is definitely more likely. For the second mention remains uncertain due to the abbreviation; the first mention is now mostly conceded to have been in the nominative case; but this is of little value given that it is heavily corrupt (cf. Bülow-Jacobsen 1979, 92 and 94 with pl. III: [Πτολεμα]ῖος); more importantly, it is a later addition (in a different handwriting) at the top of the papyrus, which dates to the 2nd century AD (Segre 1942/43, 278). How should the scribe have known that Andromachos had not been the natural father of this Ptolemy, when the original lemma did not reveal the case endings of the name formula and the entry itself does not seem to have detailed genealogical issues?

[36] P.Haun. 6 l. 28 on Magas and Frg. 3 (cf. Bülow-Jacobsen 1979, 93 and 98 with pl. III).

[37] See above, n. 30 on the Battle of Andros and n. 26 on the priest of 251/50.

[38] Thus suggested by Segre 1942/43, 276–280; cf., e.g., Buraselis 1982, 125; Ravvazolo 1996, 131; Gygax 2000, 363–364; Bennett 2001–2013 s.v. Ptolemy Andromachou n. 3.

only be clear to contemporaries, but also avoid the confusion with (King) Ptolemaios (Philadelphos), son of Ptolemaios (Soter) or (Prince) Ptolemaios (Euergetes), son of Ptolemaios (Philadelphos).[39]

By 246, though possibly much earlier, Ptolemy Andromachos had been appointed supreme commander of the Ptolemaic forces in the Aegean or at least in Karia. We may leave it open whether he took over Mylasa together with Ephesos after Sophron's death or whether he conquered it soon thereafter; the correspondence between Mylasa and "Ptolemy the Brother of Ptolemy" as mentioned by Olympichos was composed between 246 and 244 at any rate. This reconstruction has the further advantage that Olympichos would list the documentary evidence in chronological order (Sophron – Ptolemy the Brother – himself).[40] So far, this appears to me the most plausible solution of the vexed problem.

4) *Ptolemaioi* Attested as Commanders in or near Ephesos

The documentation presented for Ptolemies prominent in Asia Minor has so far been incomplete. Still missing is the following anecdote told by Athenaios, who probably drew on Phylarchos: "And Ptolemy the son of Ptolemy Philadelphos the king, who was governor of the garrison in Ephesos (ὁ τὴν ἐν Ἔφησῳ διέπων φρούριαν), had a mistress named Eirene. And she, when plots were laid against Ptolemy by the Thracians at Ephesos, and when he fled to the temple of Artemis, fled with him: and when the conspirators had murdered him, Eirene seizing hold of the bars of the doors of the temple, sprinkled the altar with his blood till they slew her also."[41]

Apparently, this Ptolemy was a son of Philadelphos and he died in Ephesos, hence he was dubbed 'Ptolemy of Ephesos' by Gygax or 'Ephesian Ptolemy' by Huß. 'Unitarian' scholars are compelled to date this deadly revolt after Ptolemy of Telmessos had been attested for the last time around 239 BC – which we are in no way obliged to accept.[42] Since the Labraunda dossier was published in 1969, most frequently a *terminus a quo* of 246 has been posited. This would be convincing, if the 'Ephesian Ptolemy' should be identified with the Brother and with Ptolemy Andromachos.[43] Although Gygax rejects this equation, he agrees with Huß and others insofar as the parallels between the anecdote told by Athenaios and the Copenhagen Papyrus cannot be coincidental. Hence he still thinks that *Ptolemaios epiklesin Andromachou* (sic) and the 'Ephesian Ptolemy' were the same, while distinguishing him from Ptolemy the Son and co-ruler of Philadelphos, who is his choice for Ptolemy the Brother of King Ptolemy (Euergetes). In fact, Athenaios' anecdote is the sole basis for Gygax – and Buraselis, followed herein also by Tunny – for claiming that *Ptolemaios epiklesin Andromachou* was a natural son of Philadelphos.[44]

---

[39] Perhaps the nomenclature was also chosen to avoid the impression of arrogating royal status.

[40] See above, n. 5 for Olympichos' letter.

[41] Phylarch. FGrH 81 F 24 = Athen. 13.64 (593a-b) = Huß 1998, E (p. 234). Translation adapted from Attalus.org (20 Nov. 2013).

[42] See above, with nn. 14–15 for Crampa and Huß, also with n. 17 for Bennett. And cf. Seibert 1976, 52–54, who rejects a similar *terminus*, albeit based on a section in Teles, *Peri phyges* (ed. Hentze 1909, p. 23), which only seemingly attests the survival of Chremonides after 240; see also below on Polyaen. 5.18.

[43] Cf., e.g., Ravazzolo 1996, 125; 130; 133f. Contra Ma 1999, 41 n. 55 (leaving open the identity of the Ephesian Ptolemy).

[44] Buraselis 1982, 133; Gygax 2000, 355–358; 363–365; cf. Hölbl 1994, 49. Others had previously dissociated the death of the 'Ephesian Ptolemy' from the events of the Second Syrian War by relating it to Ptolemy Andromachos, who "was slain in Ephesos", cf. the restoration of P.Haun. I 6, ll. 11–13 in accordance with Athen. 13.593a-b by Segre 1942/43, 275: καταστασιασθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν [Θρᾳκῶν μισθοφόρων] ἐν Ἐφέσῳ κατεσφάγη, followed by Crampa 1969, 114–118. Gygax admittedly avoids depending on the survival of Ptolemy the Son after 258, let alone on his reconciliation with either Philadelphos or Euergetes. But such improbable assumptions are avoided once the identity with Ptolemy of Telmessos is rejected and the equation of the Son and the Brother is made, whereby the activity of the Son and Brother is limited by 259/58. Differently, Tunny 2000, 87–88 equates Ptolemy Andromachos with both the Brother and the 'Ephesian Ptolemy'.

One may wonder, however, if Athenaios' source, the Histories of Phylarchos, would have identified the lover of Eirene as "Ptolemy the son of Ptolemy Philadelphos the king" in a narrative pertaining to the rule of Euergetes. For the 'Ephesian Ptolemy', a date during Philadelphos' lifetime would be more intuitive, and this would speak in favour of an identification with Ptolemy the Son and co-ruler of Philadelphos. This equation has yet another advantage: it would (re-) establish the chronological order of the anecdotes on three brave royal mistresses which Athenaios drew from Phylarchos: Eirene, who died with Ptolemy the Son in 258; Danae, the consort of Sophron, whom Laodike executed in July or early August 246; Mysta, the concubine of Seleukos II, who survived the disaster of Ankyra in October 246.[45]

Let us have a closer look at the downfall of Ptolemy the Son, for whose murder I would like to defend the traditional date shortly after his revolt in 259, thus around 258. By mentioning a revolt of Thracian mercenaries, Athenaios seems to hint not at the Third, but the Second Syrian War, when the Son and the Aitolian tyrant Timarchos were depending on mercenaries. A likely context within the more detailed account of Phylarchos may well have been the despair that must have seized Ephesos after its most important ally Miletos had been conquered by Antiochos II. The days of the now isolated city were numbered, and mutiny was an obvious choice for the foreign soldiers or the citizens.[46]

However, since the publication of the Labraunda dossier, a variety of arguments have been put forward against such an early date, with the obvious purpose of allowing the Son to survive until the rule of Euergetes. By removing the murder of the 'Ephesian Ptolemy' from the evidence for the Second Syrian War, J. Seibert even went so far as to deny that Ephesos had ever been alienated from Antiochos I or II. Accordingly, the Antiochos whom Frontinus attests to have captured the city must not be identified with either of them. Frontinus further specifies that this Antiochos first distracted the Ephesians' attention by a naval manoeuvre of his Rhodian allies before launching a surprise attack on the city wall from in-land.[47] Upon closer inspection, Frontinus' Antiochos must be Theos. Soter, Hierax and Megas have been considered as well, but each of them has been rejected on solid grounds: there is no indication of either a conquest of Ephesos or a Seleukid alliance with Rhodes under Antiochos I or Hierax, while Rhodes was hostile to Antiochos III (though he took Ephesos in 197). H.-U. Wiemer has shown that the Lindos Chronicle further implies the death of Philadelphos, if not the end of the Second Syrian War, as a *terminus ante quem* for the conquest of Ephesos with Rhodian support.[48]

Seibert, in turn, identifies the conqueror Antiochos with the namesake to whom Euergetes entrusted Kilikia in 245. He thus dates the conquest of Ephesos after the death of Antiochos II and before the revolt of Sophron in the summer 246, despite the involvement of the Rhodians.[49] However, our only source does not label the 'Kilikian' Antiochos as a *strategos*, but as a *philos* of Euergetes, and the revision of the War of Brothers has demonstrated that this was in fact Antiochos Hierax, won over to col-

[45] Phylarch. FGrH 81 F 24; 30 = Athen. 13.64 (593a-b; b-d; d-e). On the fates of these mistresses and their contexts within the narrative of Phylarchos, cf. Coşkun ca. 2015a (Mysta) and ca. 2015b (Danae).

[46] Trog. Prol. 26; Huß 1998, 240–241 (with further references, though denying the death of Ptolemy the Son without an explanation how he might have escaped). According to App. Syr. 65.344, Timarchos was the leader of Aitolian mercenaries.

[47] Frontin. 3.9.10 on 258 BC: *Antiochus adversus Ephesios Rhodiis, quos in auxilio habebat, praecepit, ut nocte portum cum magno strepitu invaderent: ad quam partem omni multitudine cum tumultu decurrente, nudatis defensore reliquis munitionibus, ipse ad{i}verso aggressus civitatem cepit*. Cf. Seibert 1976, followed by Ravazzolo 1976, 130.

[48] Cf., e.g., Wiemer 2002, 98–102, who convincingly defends the identification with Antiochos II. He further points out the friendly relations that the Rhodians established with the Ptolemies under Philadelphos after ending a war with the same: Lindos Chronicle 37 = Lindos II 2, col. C 1, ll. 97–102 = Higbie 2003, 40–41 (cf. p. 132); and this friendly neutrality continued under Ptolemy III Euergetes and IV Philopator; cf. also Berthold 1984, 89–92; Reger 1994, 41–43. For the arguments against the other kings, cf. also Seibert 1976, 46–47.

[49] Seibert 1976, 47; 60–61. On Rhodes, see the previous n.

laborate with Euergetes probably late in August or early in September 246.[50] And, despite Seibert, the identification with Antiochos II during the Second Syrian War is supported by yet another anecdote, this time included in Polyainos' *Strategemata*: he attests a war between the Rhodians (led by a certain Agathostratos) against "King Ptolemaios". That his *nauarches* was Chremonides implies the terminus post quem of either 263/62 or 261 when he fled from Athens after the so-called Chremonidean War. The details of Polyainos' story make it clear that Ephesos was at that time under Ptolemaic control. The city had still been a member of the *koinon* of Ionia when a cult was decreed to Antiochos I, his wife and his son between 266 and 262; but once the king was defeated by Eumenes of Pergamon in 262/61, Chremonides would have encouraged and supported the transition of Ephesos.[51]

What remains uncertain is whether Ptolemy the Son replaced him immediately thereafter as the commander-in-chief of the growing Aegean Empire of Philadelphos, or whether he arrived only after defecting from his father later in 259. As much as the reasons and circumstances of this uprising, the retirement of Chremonides from Ephesos remains opaque for us.[52] The reconquest of Ephesos by Antiochos would have happened not much later than the "liberation" of Miletos from the tyrant Timarchos, the ally of Ptolemy the Son. It is to be conceded to Seibert that Frontinus and Polyainos do not relate to the very same combats: protagonists and plots obviously differ; but there is no reasonable way around accepting that both authors report events pertaining to the same war in which the Rhodians allied with Antiochos II against the Ptolemies who had seized Ephesos at the beginning of the Second Syrian War.[53] It should thus be obvious that Athenaios' anecdote on the death of Ptolemy the Son of Philadelphos, perpetrated by Thracian mercenaries in Ephesos, likewise belongs into the same context.

However, Gygax rejects the identity of this 'Ephesian Ptolemy' with the Son of Philadelphos and co-ruler, rather equating him with *Ptolemaios epiklesin Andromachou* (sic), who is also reported to have been killed in a riot in Ephesos in the Copenhagen Papyrus. He considers the title ὁ τὴν ἐν Ἐφησῳ διέπων φρούριαν ('who managed the garrison in Ephesos') incompatible with the rank of Ptolemy the Son.[54] While I concede that this 'job description' seems to be a mismatch for the role of a governor of Ionia or a commander-in-chief of the Aegean fleet, the argument does not carry far: we have before us a literary characterization of a former co-ruler after his defection at the time of his very downfall. The power basis of this man was apparently completely shaken, and whether or not he had ever been the official Ptolemaic commander of the region (for which there is no positive evidence), on the day of his murder it had shrunk to the garrison; finally, not even this could provide him with shelter, and thus he fled to the temple of Artemis. Be this as it may, the explicit qualification of the 'Ephesian Ptolemy' as "son of Ptolemy Philadelphos the King" alone seems to imply a leading role – whichever its nature would have been. Along with this goes his persecution by revolting mercenaries, who apparently had

[50] Porphyr. FGrH 260 F 43, with Coşkun ca. 2015a.

[51] Polyaen. 5.18 on 262/61 BC. On the flight of Chremonides, cf. Heinen 1972, 182–189; on the cult inauguration, OGIS 222, with Coşkun, in preparation. Erroneously, Tunny 2000, 87 dates the beginning of Ptolemaic rule in Ephesos to 267.

[52] The speculations surrounding the revolt need not be rehearsed. For interesting observations, cf. Huß 1998, 238–241.

[53] Seibert 1976, 46–50, including a subtle analysis of the topography; but his suggestion to date the conflict with Chremonides after 253 and before 246 does not carry: "daß Chremonides mit der ptolemaischen Flotte in den Hafen von Ephesos einfährt, das damals unter Oberhoheit des Seleukiden Antiochos II. war, zu dem sehr enge Beziehungen bestanden." This ignores not only the relations of the Rhodians (see above, n. 48), but also that the tensions between Antiochos and Philadelphos gradually increased after 252 (Grainger 2010, 139–155; Coşkun ca. 2015b; also Buraselis 1982, 168–172; Walbank 1988, 298–303).

[54] Gygax 2000, 363–365 (see also above, n. 44) downplays his role in order to disqualify this Ptolemy as an addressee of the citizens of Mylasa, and thus to support indirectly the earlier date of the correspondence with Ptolemy the Brother. The problem is an artificial one. Cf. also Huß 1998, 241–242.

no higher authority to report to. It is to be inferred that he had never been subordinate to any other official in Ephesos.

These glimpses of Ephesos confirm that the return of the city under Seleukid control in 258 was very violent: it will have caused much despair among citizens and mercenaries alike. Lynching Ptolemy the Son as the culprit of the disaster or seeking mercy from the conqueror through extraditing the commander's corpse (or head) might have been the motivation behind his assassination. In any eventuality, Ptolemy the Son did not survive this conquest, and our sources are henceforth silent about him.[55]

5) Ptolemy Andromachos, Andros and Ephesos in the Third Syrian War

We are now well prepared to resume the thread of events ensuing after the death of Antiochos in July 246. Perhaps only days afterwards, Queen Laodike suspected Sophron of conspiring with the Ptolemies. They had not only been spending enormous sums to win new allies in Greece since 252, but also regained strength in the Aegean since around 250. Danae's betrayal allowed her lover Sophron to escape from Sardes and secure Ephesos for himself in July or early in August 246. With the Ptolemaic fleet waiting in the wings and possibly with substantial gifts from the Egyptian treasury, it would not have been too difficult for him to win over the soldiers under his command as well as the citizens, if grudge alone should not have sufficed after the violent conquest in 258.[56] What remains uncertain is whether Sophron hastened to call in Ptolemaic forces and with them Ptolemy Andromachos as the new supreme commander or whether he rather continued holding sway over city and fleet, feeling safe behind the walls, while his allies were patrolling the coasts of Asia Minor. The latter was likely the more attractive option for Sophron, as long as the Seleukids could not muster sufficient sources to threaten well-fortified Ephesos.

However, since I suggest that Sophron is to be identified with Opron, whom Antigonos Gonatas defeated in the Battle of Andros according to Trogus, the need for a successor in Ephesos came up nearly instantly. The naval combat which ended his life was fought possibly still in August 246. Admittedly, the equation of the two names has been contested repeatedly and even more so since A. N. Oikonomides adduced two parallels from Egypt for the name Opron. As a result, he rejects any correction of the transmitted text, a view that was accepted among others by J. D. Grainger.[57] Gygax has gone even farther, claiming that once the identification is denied, there is not even the slightest evidence for Sophron changing over to the Ptolemaic side. If the traditional chronology of the War of Brothers were still followed, the presence of a certain Ptolemy in Ephesos during the War of Brothers might even date to the 230s.[58] But the rarity of the name *Opron*, its similarity to *Sophron*, in combina-

---

[55] On different, but equally valid grounds, Tunny 2000, 86 denies that the Son could have survived the defection from his father, let alone to be reconciled to him.

[56] The revolt of Sophron is analysed in much detail by Coşkun ca. 2015a, the activities of Philadelphos after 253 until the Battle of Andros in August 246 also by Coşkun ca. 2015b (cf. Grainger 2010, 139–155). – For the variety of interpretations of Sophron, ranging from an official of Philadelphos prior to 259 to an official of Doson, cf. the (aporetic) survey of Will 1979, 368–370.

[57] Oikonomides 1984b, 151 (with reference to P.Tebt. III 2, 890.14–15 and 174, 2nd cent. B.C.; cf. Foraboschi, Onom. alt.): "Actually, the Sophron that C. Mueller identified with Opron was a Seleucid official who hardly had anything to do with Ptolemaic administration, the fleet on the Aegean, or the Ptolemaic occupation of Ephesus." Cf. Hölbl 1994, 49 with n. 84; Grainger 1997, 118; 167 (differently, idem 2010, 154; 158). However, the Teubner edition by O. Seel accepts the conjecture of Mueller. Cf. also Trismegistos – People.

[58] Gygax 2000, 359; 366. Note, however, that he is less interested in Sophron or Ephesos than in strengthening his equation of Ptolemy the Brother of Philadelphos (in Olympichos' letter) with Ptolemy the Son and co-ruler of Philadelphos 267–259. His intention is to disqualify Ptolemy Andromachos as a competent authority in the dispute between Mylasa and Labraunda. The longer Sophron is supposed to have held Ephesos, the less likely it may appear that Ptolemy the Brother was involved in the conflict regarding Labraunda *after* Sophron. This, in turn, would strengthen Gygax' suggestion that the Brother had corresponded with Mylasa while still being the Son and co-ruler of Phil-

tion with our knowledge of the conflict between the latter and Laodike, as well as the loss of Ephesos and the Seleukid fleet, make a compelling case for accepting the identity, as has been argued convincingly by Buraselis. And with the new chronology established, it becomes apparent that Sophron and his Ptolemaic allies acted immediately: they seized the opportunity as long as neither Laodike nor Seleukos was prepared for such an attack, with their allies still being unaware of the betrayal.[59]

It would have made sense if Ptolemy Andromachos and Sophron united forces to launch a surprise attack on the former supporters of Antiochos, i. e. the Antigonid fleet at Samos and some Thracian allies of Antiochos such as Adaios, while other Ptolemaic forces were invading further areas in southern Asia Minor and possibly even Syria. The speed with which violence escalated between July and October 246 lends strong support to this reconstruction – with the caution though that even the most promising war can end in a complete disaster: ultimately, it was Antigonos' fleet that prevailed, causing the loss of most of the previously Seleukid fleet. The Ephesians would thus have appreciated that Ptolemy Andromachos did not run the risk of confronting the victorious fleet, but retreated from Andros to their city and fortified it against both Gonatas and Seleukos.

6) More Evidence for the Presence of Ptolemy Andromachos in Ephesos

The previous argument for the seizure of Ephesos by Ptolemy Andromachos has so far been based mainly on a combination of a) the Copenhagen Papyrus (mentioning Ainos, Andros and his murder in Ephesos), b) the *Prologi* of Trogus (attesting the capture of Adaios through Ptolemy and the defeat of *Opron* by Gonatas) and c) Phylarchos' anecdote of Danae which allows us to identify Opron with Sophron, the illoyal *strategos* of Ephesos. Only in passing, I would like to mention Papyrus Bouriant 6, which also seems to refer to Ptolemy Andromachos and not to Ptolemy the Son. However, the text is highly fragmentary and adds nothing certain to what we already know.[60] But some further pieces of evidence might add to the picture.

First, we have to look at Porphyry's account of the War of Brothers: while Seleukos was chasing Hierax in Ionia (which I suggest to date to September or early October 246), a certain "Ptlomeos" was in possession of Ephesos. It is noteworthy that Porphyry or at least his source Phylarchos will not have identified him with Euergetes, for only a few lines below, we read of "Ptlomeos, der auch Tryphon" (in Jacoby's German translation of the Aramaic version of Eusebios' Greek excerpt). This sounds as if Euergetes was introduced for the first time,[61] so that a seemingly easy solution – namely to understand that the king's name is used here instead of his *strategos* – is not applicable.

---

adelphos, thus *before* Sophron's control of Ephesos. Gygax further argues that the Kildareis approached Tlepolemos (on whom see below, n. 72) as the representative of Euergetes in the summer of 246. But, simply put, he was the closest authority of Ptolemaic rule for Kildara, such as Olympichos was the closest representative of Seleukid rule in the same region not much later.

[59] Buraselis 1982, 121–141 (who dates the Battle of Andros 246/45, see above, n. 30), esp. 135–136; 138. Cf. also Prosopographia Ptolemaica, no. 13792 Sophron (source: Trog. Prol. 27, thus identified with Opron) and no. 15125 Sophron (source: Athen. 13.593b-d).

[60] P. Bouriant 6, with the amendments of Oikonomides 1984a, seems to mention a Ptolemy slain (l. 7) probably in Ephesos (ll. 5; 9). One might want to read a relation with Thrace into the fragmentary text: the capture of Heraion (l. 3: Θραι]κην; ὃς Ἡρα[ῖο]ν [) would speak for an identity with Ptolemy Andromachos, the conqueror of Adaios. Note that the murder of this Ptolemy by Thracian mercenaries is entirely based on Oikonomides' conjecture in the lacuna of l. 6; the insertion is based on the assumption that we have to do with Ptolemy the Son, whom he identifies with the 'Ephesian Ptolemy' and Ptolemy Andromachos (as in Trog. Prol. 27 and P.Haun. 6). At the same time, however, he identifies the attacking enemy with Antiochos II, thus dating the death of Ptolemy to ca. 258 and leaving the chronological contradictions unresolved. Moreover, the reference to Greek fighters (l. 4) appears opaque to me. Oikonomides 1984a, 149–150 identifies them with the besieging force of Antiochos II, which might make sense if opposed to (assumed) Thracian mercenaries inside the city.

[61] For a similar argument, cf. already Crampa 1969, 118, though he identifies this Ptolemy with the Son and co-

And slightly later, the same chronicler speaks of "abermals bundesgenössische Hilfe von Ptlomeos (*sic*) erlangt habend". The latter action postdates the Battle of Ankyra, but not the peace with Euergetes, as is explained in more detail elsewhere. The reader of the abridged story in the *Chronicle* may well be uncertain whether this is to denote Ptolemy "Tryphon" any time after the invasion of Syria. But Porphyry was well aware that Euergetes was campaigning from Syria into Mesopotamia before withdrawing to Egypt in 245.[62] While the reader of Eusebios' *Chronicle* must indeed have been confused, we can be certain that Porphyry made deliberate distinctions among the two Ptolemaioi. However, if he was aware of the fact that the less prominent Ptolemy was otherwise called Ptolemy Andromachos or Brother of King Ptolemy (Euergetes), we cannot tell for sure. But, in a plot that was centred on two Seleukid rivals, at least Porphyry's epitomator Eusebios felt that little differentiation among homonymous external enemies was needed or even desirable.[63]

There are significant parallels to which we should point. We have already mentioned above that the *Prologi* of Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae* name the leader who defeated the Thracian Adaios *Ptolomaeus*. Since the account of Phylarchos is lost, we depend on the Copenhagen Papyrus to identify this *strategos* as Ptolemy Andromachos.[64] And towards the end of his account of the War of Brothers, Justin details that Hierax first sought refuge with the king of Kappadokia, then fled *ad Ptolomeum hostem*. The former host plotted against him, the latter arrested him, but Hierax managed to escape, only to be eventually slain by robbers in Thrace. Likewise in the *Prologi*, we read that he "escaped Ariamenes and thereafter the guardians of Tryphon" (i.e. of Ptolemy III Euergetes). If taken literally, the wording implies in both cases that Hierax fled to Euergetes, thus to Egypt, was arrested but escaped his guardians.

Porphyry helps us to complete the story: after his final defeat by Attalos in Koloe, Hierax fled to Thrace, where he died.[65] Since no one can reasonably claim that Hierax sailed to Egypt, just escaped with his life and then was able to gather forces against Attalos yet another time, we have to accept that Hierax did not flee to Ptolemy Euergetes in person, but to Ptolemaic possessions in reach. Remains the choice between Karia (where Koloe is located), Ephesos (which Ptolemy Andromachos had occupied in 246) and Thrace (where Ptolemy Andromachos had made conquests in 246).[66] While we need not buy Justin's story of his capture with its topical explanation for his flight, we should at least consider possible that, in his despair, Hierax sought the support of Euergetes Tryphon through Ptolemy Andromachos, if indeed the latter was still alive in 228 or 227.

7) Conclusions: Three Ptolemaioi of Royal Blood Active in Asia Minor

The preceding investigation allows us to clearly distinguish three different Ptolemaioi who were prominent in Asia Minor during the second third of the 3rd century.

---

ruler (see n. 14). No such distinction is made in the commentaries by Jacoby (ad FGrH 260 F 32.8) and Toye (ad F 32.8), even though the latter is aware that Ptolemy Andromachos held Ephesos.

[62] Porphyr. FGtH 260 F 32.8; with F 43 and Just. 27.1.6–9. Differently, Toye ad F 32.8, who identifies this renewed aid with Hierax' flight to Ptolemy, which Toye dates towards the end of his life.

[63] A condition neatly illustrated by Justin's creation of the *rex Bithyniae Eumenes*, in whom Zipoites, Eumenes I and Attalos are conflated: here, too, the focus was on the war between Seleukos and Hierax (27.3.1).

[64] Trog. Prol. 27, quoted above, n. 32. Differently, however, Buraselis 1982, 122–141, esp. 138–139: Adaios was captured by Ptolemy Andromachos, but executed by Euergetes. – I am more hesitant as regards App. Syr. 65.345–346: the son of Philadelphos (i.e. Euergetes) is named as murderer of Laodike (which I date to August 246: Coşkun ca. 2015a) and invader of Syria in the context of avenging his sister and nephew. This said, Ptolemy Andromachos remains the most likely candidate for conducting the murder of Laodike.

[65] Just. 27.3.9–11; Trog. Prol. 27; Porphyr. FGrH 260 F 32.8.

[66] In theory, one could also consider Kilikia, since it had Ptolemaic strongholds and neighboured Kappadokia. However, the flight to Kappadokia followed Hierax' defeat in Mesopotamia, which should be dated around 243 or 242 (Trog. Prol. 27; cf. Just. 27.3.7f.; Polyaen. 4.17, with Coşkun ca. 2015a).

a) Ptolemy, the Son of Philadelphos, is attested from 267 to 259 as co-ruler of Philadelphos. The assumption that he was an adoptive son is as baseless as it is useless within a polygamous dynasty known also for its fertility and insistence in the succession of legitimate offspring. This said, the name of his mother continues to remain controversial. Recently, scholars who reject his identification with the son of King Lysimachos and Arsinoe (II) tend to regard him as a son by a mistress, most often opting for Bilistiche.[67] But Tunny has made a strong case for Arsinoe I, which would make him the oldest brother of Euergetes, Berenike (Phernophoros) and a certain Lysimachos. With minor modifications, I am inclined to accept the latter view.[68]

The precise date of his arrival in Ephesos (between 262 and 259) is as unclear as his motivation for the defection from his father. There is little evidence that he ever held the position of a regional governor: at least around 262/61, shortly after the transition of Ephesos, it was Chremonides who led the city's and the fleet's fate as Philadelphos' admiral. The Son's mention within the correspondence between Milesians and Philadelphos in ca. 262 rather fits the role of an ambassador among other *philoi* of the king.[69] Otherwise, the evidence for his presence in Asia Minor is confined to his defection in 259 and, due to the identification with the 'Ephesian Ptolemy', to his assassination probably in 258. As a result, his arrival in Ephesos should best be viewed within the very context of his revolt, if not flight from Egypt for whatever reason.[70] In any case, he was killed by his Thracian mercenaries shortly before Antiochos assaulted the city walls, possibly on the same day, for Frontinus' anecdote permits us to conclude that his murder did not prevent the city's return under Seleukid rule from being harshly violent.

If this reconstruction is accepted, it can safely be excluded that the Son and co-ruler of Philadelphos ever controlled Mylasa, and he thus needs to be distinguished from "Ptolemy the Brother of King Ptolemy" mentioned by Olympichos. The very idea of a Ptolemaic regional governor with responsibility for both Ionia and Karia is a misconception, infelicitously construed after a Seleukid administrative pattern valid in the early 240s.

b) A much more convincing identification of that Brother can be made with *Ptolemaios epiklesin Andromachos*. For he was in all likelihood closely related to the royal family. Unless one suggests to interpret "Brother" (of Euergetes) as a honorific title (for which there would be some later parallels in

---

[67] On Bilistiche, see above, with n. 26. On Lysimachos, see below, section 7 c).

[68] Arsinoe I, daughter of King Lysimachos, married Ptolemy II around 284 and was repudiated by 274. In theory, her oldest son might have been up to 17 years old when Philadelphos appointed a co-ruling son in 267. Previously, however, she was excluded as the mother of Ptolemy the Son because of Schol. Theocr. id. 17.128. According to this testimony, the childless Arsinoe II adopted the three children of Arsinoe I: Ptolemy, Lysimachos and Berenike (cf. also Pausan. 1.7.3, though without names). Without going into too much detail, Tunny 2000, 89 convincingly claims a *damnatio memoriae* of Ptolemy the Son. However, Crampa 1969, 98–99; Ravazzolo 1996, 124; Bennett 2001–2013 s.v. Arsinoe I with n. 7 (all with older scholarship) reject previous suggestions that a fourth child's name might have got lost in the transmission; they also rule out that the same two parents had two sons both named Ptolemy. This should indeed all be conceded. But Theokritos himself does not refer to any natural or adopted children while the sister-wife of Philadelphos was still alive (ca. 274–270). The scholiast, in turn, may have relied on information that was accurate and complete only since the later part of Philadelphos' reign, when the memory of the defector son had been condemned and the dynastic name Ptolemy passed on to the oldest legal son still alive, i.e. Euergetes (without good reason, Tunny 2000, 89 argues for Lysimachos as the subsequent successor designate, with Euergetes only being the third choice). Such name changes at the time of acceding to the throne were common practice in most Hellenistic dynasties; we may think, e.g., of the co-regency of the brothers Ptolemy VI and VIII. – At any rate, there is no need to think (with H. Volkmann, Ptolemaios der Sohn [Nr. 20], RE 23.2, 1959, 1667, quoting older scholarship) of an otherwise unknown son of Arsinoe II and Philadelphos, which contradicts the explicit statement of Theokritos.

[69] Cf. I.Miletos III 139, ll. 8–10 (= Welles, RC 14, ll. 8–10) and ll. 42–47 = Huß 1998, C (p. 234). Cf. also Gygax 2002, 55.

[70] Differently, Habicht 1980, 3–4 with the parallel of Magas, son and co-ruler of Euergetes with command of the Anatolian dominions.

the House of the Ptolemies),[71] he should be regarded as another natural son of Ptolemy Philadelphos and thus as the Brother of Euergetes. Accordingly, Andromachos was his *cognomen*, not his patronymic. He himself appears to have been the father of Ptolemy Andromachou, priest of Alexander and the Theoi Adelphoi in Alexandria 251/50. As commander-in-chief of the Ptolemaic fleet in the Aegean he is attested explicitly only in the summer of 246, though he may have been active there years before. His conspiracy with Sophron started no later than July 246, and he seized the control of Ephesos after Sophron's death in August. Hence he brought about the collaboration with Alexander and Hierax and supported the latter in his fight against revolting Galatian mercenaries at Magnesia-on-the-Sipylos later in or shortly after September.

Since the Copenhagen Papyrus mentions no other deed for Ptolemy Andromachos between the Battle of Andros and his murder, he may well have died not much after Sophron. On the one hand, one might think of the time when Seleukos' supporters were regaining confidence and strength in western Asia Minor late in 245 or in 244; this would explain the reference to the *stasis* in Ephesos in the context of his assassination. 244 would anyway have been the *terminus ad quem* for his letter exchange with the citizens of Mylasa, probably when he was harbouring his fleet somewhere in Karia rather than in Ephesos where he need not have resided permanently. Otherwise, Tlepolemos, a dynast originating from Xanthos, would have been the local representative, with Xanthos being much more accessible than Ephesos during the war.[72] On the other hand, Ephesos continued to be Ptolemaic over the following decades. This, in turn, implies that any potential *stasis* during the Third Syrian War would not have brought about a return to Seleukid control. Hence the revolt may well have occurred only long after the war was over. And, if this should be the case, he could have been the Ptolemy that Hierax was seeking shelter from in ca. 228 or 227. Only new source material will help us make a solid decision in this instance.

c) For the identification of a third Ptolemy active in Asia Minor around that time, let us finally return to the Xanthos Valley: Ptolemy, the son of Lysimachos, who was established in Telmessos in western Lykia by Philadelphos at an uncertain date and remained loyal under Euergetes. As stressed repeatedly throughout this paper,[73] this Ptolemy of Telmessos should not be identified with Ptolemy the Son of Philadelphos. Since there is no proof for his adoption by Philadelphos (who had legitimate sons of his own), this equation has never been more than a speculative hypothesis. I hope that the current paper has further strengthened the view that the identification with Ptolemy the Son, who definitely died in Ephesos around 258, is as impossible as with Ptolemy Andromachos.

However, I would like to go even further than Gygax and Tunny who still concede that the Ptolemy attested as magnate of Telmessos around 258 and 239 was the son of the Diadoch Lysimachos.[74] First, there is no positive evidence for the king's son's survival beyond the 270s.[75] Second, it would be unlikely for the honorific inscriptions from Telmessos not to mention the royal title of his father, if only he had enjoyed this rank. One might further expect his mother Queen Arsinoe II to have been named: she had been the last official queen of the Ptolemaic Empire before the death of Philadelphos and she continued to be held in the highest esteem as the adoptive mother of Euergetes and his sibl-

[71] Cf. – in a different context – Bennett 2001–2013 s.v. Lysimachus (Son of Ptolemy II), n. 4, with further references.

[72] On Tlepolemos, cf. I.Kildara = Blümel 1992, 127–133 = SEG XLII 994 = Gauthier, BE 1994, 571–573 no. 528 = Austin 2006 no. 267. Note that Tlepolemos does not bear a title in his correspondence with Kildara, even though he may well have been *strategos*.

[73] See above, nn. 16; 18; 42. On his status as a dynast, see below, n. 79.

[74] Tunny 2000, 87; Gygax 2001, 151–154; 2002, 50–52; 56. Cf. also Wörrle 1978, 218–221; Will 1979, 260; Billows 1995, 101; Kobes 1996, 78–80; 241–244 (also drawing on Ptolemy's coinage); Grainger 2010, 129 n. 37; Carney 2013, 125.

[75] Cf. the sources and the literature survey in Huß 1998, 236–237.

ings, after their mother Arsinoe I had been condemned in the mid-270s. Explicitly mentioning either the status of the father or the mother would thus have been in no way offensive to the current king Euergetes.[76]

I would therefore prefer identifying this Lysimachos with a brother of Ptolemy (III Euergetes) and Berenike (Phernophoros). In a scholion on Theokritos, all three of them are mentioned as children of Philadelphos and Arsinoe I and adopted children of Arsinoe II respectively.[77] Our further knowledge of him is solely based on Polybios' verdict on the courtier Sosibios: the latter is reported to have perpetrated five dynastic murders. If they all occurred at the same time, they would date to the context of the succession of Ptolemy IV Philopator around 222; but nothing really excludes a much earlier date either. As a result, the succession of Euergetes in 246 yields a likewise possible context at least for the assassination of Lysimachos.[78] It cannot even be excluded that this dynastic murder had been sanctioned by Philadelphos himself, who would probably not have hesitated to persecute Ptolemy his own son and co-ruler for a reason that escapes us. However, if indeed it was Philadelphos who conceded a safe haven for his grandson, Euergetes would have approved of or at least respected this decision.[79] Be this as it may, Ptolemy of Telmessos could retain his fiefdom and even pass it on to his descendants.[80]

8) Appendix: Revised Chronology of the Second and Third Syrian Wars[81]

262/260: Ephesos went over to Ptolemaic rule, possibly with the arrival of a fleet commanded by Chremonides. Antiochos I was killed in his war against Eumenes I of Pergamon. When Antiochos II succeeded, the Second Syrian War had effectively broken out.

By 259: Ptolemy the Son fled from Egypt to Ionia, took possession of Ephesos and made an alliance with Timarchos the tyrant of Miletos.

In 258: Antiochos II conquered Miletos and soon afterwards Ephesos; Timarchos and Ptolemy the Son died in these very contexts.

By 253/252: Antiochos II prevailed over Ptolemy Philadelphos in the Second Syrian War, the marriage with Berenike (and her dowry) was a covered war indemnity; Ptolemy was not able to insist that Seleukos divorced Laodike or disinherited his sons from her.

252–246: Philadelphos persistently tried to weaken the Antigonid grip of central and southern Greece as well as to re-establish Ptolemaic thalassocracy in the Aegean and possibly in the south-western parts of the Black Sea.

247/46: Seleukos II was sent at the head of strong military forces to fight the usurper Andragoras in Parthia. The latter was also attacked by Arsakes, leader of the Parnians, who became *karanos* (*strategos*) of Parthia; Andragoras was soon defeated.

---

[76] One may compare five inscriptions that accompanied dedications of Ptolemy, the son of King Lysimachos and Arsinoe, at Delos, as collected by Kobes 1996, 253 (cf. Gygax 2001, 153), though without my conclusion.

[77] See above, n. 68. Cf. also Tunny 2000, 89 on Arsinoe I's exile.

[78] Polyb. 15.25.1–2; cf. Bennett 2001–2013 s.v. Lysimachos with n. 5, even though with a preference for 222.

[79] Less convincingly, Wörrle 1978, 220–221 and Kobes 1996, 111; 145–148 (with some inconsistencies) date his appointment only to 241/40 (similarly, Will 1979, 260), relating the reference to a war in OGIS I 55 ll. 7ff. to the Third Syrian War; but it is very unlikely that Laodike, Seleukos, Hierax or Olympichos had a chance to wage war on Telmessos; the aggressor was thus either Antiochos II or Philadelphos, which is in line with the date of the first inscription for the son of Lysimachos, see above, n. 16. – Both scholars, however, rightly point out that Telmessos was granted as a present to be ruled autonomously, not to be administrated, but the mention of *archontes* in the earlier inscription does not rule out Lysimachos' monarchic position. This said, Gygax 2001, 157–167 may well be right that the first mention of Ptolemy of Telmessos in the early 250s does not necessarily imply dynastic rule, but possibly only the possession of large estates, and the grant of Telmessos as a *dorea* might be as late as the early rule of Euergetes.

[80] Cf., e.g., Kobes 1996, 148–156; 196–203; Gygax 2001, 149–151; 200–213.

[81] For references on the Seleukid dynasty or on Seleukid-Ptolemaic relations during the years 253–241, see above n. 1.

246: Philadelphos' death in January 246 delayed a planned naval campaign, but, in the summer 246, his son and successor Ptolemy Euergetes was waiting on Cyprus for an opportunity to strike.

246: In spring, Antiochos II appointed Seleukos II as his co-ruler; he was proclaimed king in Babylon in July, around the time when Antiochos died in Ephesos. News of his death reached Babylon in September. In August, Laodike moved the court back to Sardes. She suspected the *strategos* Sophron of conspiring with Euergetes or with the latter's admiral in the Aegean, Ptolemy Andromachos (*Ptolemaios epiklesin Andromachos*). Her attempt to trap him failed due to the betrayal of Danae, who was immediately executed.

246: Still in August, Sophron escaped to Ephesos and went over to the Ptolemies. Together with Ptolemy Andromachos, he concerted attacks on the former Seleukid allies: the latter invaded southern Thrace (thereby killing the dynast Adaios), the former attacked the fleet of Gonatas in Samos, who however prevailed. Ptolemy Andromachos quickly retreated from Samos to take control of Ephesos.

246: In August or September, the Ptolemaic *strategos* of Karia Tlepolemos extended his control over some Seleukid places: Kildara changed over to him voluntarily, while Mylasa may well have been conquered around the same time.

246: Possibly still in August, Laodike died, either through machinations of Sophron or in the context of an open war ('Laodikean War') that she waged in order to recapture Ephesos or to curb further Ptolemaic encroachments on Seleukid territory.

246: After news of Sophron's cooperation with Ptolemy Andromachos had reached Euergetes, he ordered the invasion of Kilikia, where the satrap Artabazos was killed.

246: In the face of Sophron's defeat and Seleukos' near arrival, Ptolemy Andromachos was in urgent need of allies to maintain old and new Ptolemaic acquisitions in the west. Perhaps early in September, he won over Alexander, Laodike's brother, and through him her younger son Antiochos Hierax, aged 14. In all likelihood, he promised them the control of all remaining Seleukid possessions in Asia Minor as a reward for collaborating against Seleukos.

246: In September, Seleukos arrived in Lydia, but was excluded from Sardes by Alexander. Hierax was staying in a garrison outside the walls. He was defeated and possibly chased by Seleukos, but escaped to Magnesia-at-the-Sipylos. Hierax depended mostly on Tolistobogian and possibly also Ptolemaic contingents.

246: Learning about the invasion of Phrygia, Seleukos aborted his campaign in Ionia. Around the end of September, Mithridates II of Pontos launched a surprise attack on Seleukos near Ankyra (with Galatian Tectosages): his core troops were destroyed (20,000 victims are reported) and his court sacked (his concubine Mysta was sold into slavery). Seleukos was supposed to be killed, but escaped via Kilikia, northern Syria and Mesopotamia into Media.

246: In October, Euergetes heard about Seleukos' defeat and immediately set course to Seleukeia-in-Pieria. Berenike and her son Antiochos were likely under house arrest since the conflict with Sophron had broken out. When the crisis escalated further, they were murdered by Seleukid loyalist. But rumors of Seleukos' death undermined further resistance against Euergetes who was received as new king in Seleukeia and in Antioch. Only when it was becoming clear that Seleukos had survived, Euergetes pretended that Berenike was still alive, to facilitate his further campaigns.

246: In December, Euergetes' troops arrived first in Seleukeia-Sippar and a bit later within the walls of Babylon, where loyalist troops were resisting under the 'chief guardian'.

245: In January, the acropolis and the temple of Marduk were lost to the invaders, who had been reinforced through a contingent led by a 'prince' of Egypt, but the royal palace area was continuously held. In February, the loyalists were relieved through forces under Seleukos, the commander (*pahat*) of Seleukeia (-on-the-Tigris?). The defender suffered further setbacks, but the Ptolemaic forces never gained full control of Babylon.

245: Between February and summer 245, Euergetes decided to retreat from Babylonia. From then on, his campaign turned into a raid. One may doubt that the uprising in Upper Egypt was the only reason. More likely, Seleukos was approaching with a strong army gathered in the Upper Satrapies. Euergetes left behind Xanthippos as *strategos* (?) of the provinces beyond the Euphrates, which probably relates to the north-western parts of Mesopotamia from where the access into Syria and Armenia was to be blocked. Kilikia was entrusted to his "friend Antiochos" (Hierax). Syria he was hoping to keep for himself.

245/244: Seleukos achieved the 'Beautiful Victory' over Xanthippos which yielded him both his *cognomen* Kallinikos and access into Syria.

245/244: Once it became clear that Seleukos was returning into Syria, Euergetes called Hierax into the Seleukis, hoping that his descent and fresh troops from Asia Minor might halt the progress of Seleukos. Euergetes kept Seleukeia-in-Pieria and possibly for the time being also southern Syria, while Hierax took control of Antioch and probably most other cities in north-western Syria.

245/243: Hierax would have fortified Antioch, profiting from the alliance with Ptolemaic Seleukeia and the resources coming from nearby Kilikia. Still a teenager, he abstained from the royal title and issued coins with motives celebrating the ancestors of his dynasty.[82]

244/43: Seleukos gradually moved into Syria, trying to win over as many cities with as little violence as possible. While the northern coastal area was inaccessible at first, he probably reached the Mediterranean shore for the first time in Arados, which voluntarily opted for him.

244: Smyrna had so far resisted the Ptolemies and Hierax; upon hearing of Seleukos' return into Syria, it took his side openly. *Sympoliteia* was offered to the citizens of Magnesia-at-the-Sipylos and the garrison established at Old Magnesia as a prize for changing sides.

244: Around that time, Olympichos from Alinda in northern Karia also showed open support for Seleukos, receiving order to "free" Mylasa (and Labraunda) from Ptolemaic control.

244/242: The allegiance of most other cities of Asia Minor remains uncertain. Miletos slipped into independence; Pergamon remained in a 'splendid isolation' under Eumenes I.

246?/227?: Sardes probably continued to be controlled by Alexander and Ephesos by Ptolemy Andromachos, although there is no reliable evidence for their survival after 246. Ptolemy was assassinated in Ephesos, either not too long after the Battle of Andros (perhaps in 244?) or only in the 220s in the context of Antigonid intrusions into Asia Minor. But Ephesos remained Ptolemaic until its reconquest by Antiochos III in 197.[83]

244/243: Hierax continued to control Kilikia and most of Seleukis, enjoying the support of the Tolistobogii and possibly of the kings of Kappadokia and Armenia, too. His marriage with the daughter of Ziaelas of Bithynia will date into those years as well.

244/242: Seleukos actively wooed kings and dynasts in Asia Minor, to exert pressure on Hierax' power base. He married off his sister Laodike to Mithridates II of Pontos, granting him the possession of Phrygia as a 'dowry'.

243/242: Philetairos, *hegemon* of Cretan mercenaries, and Dionysios of Lysimacheia, possibly a leader of a Thracian contingent are attested among Hierax' forces during the invasion of Mesopotamia. This was less likely the result of his flight from Syria than a bold attempt to cut Seleukos from his power basis. However, he was beaten by Achaios and Andromachos, brothers of Queen Laodike and the traitor Alexander. Despite his flight, King Arsames of Armenia was still friendly to him, but Seleukos'

[82] Cf. Erickson ca. 2015 for a discussion of this possibility.

[83] The rule of Ptolemy IV is also attested by a pair of inscriptions probably dating to 220/217, on which cf. Meadows 2013; however, he excludes too rashly Ptolemaic control of Ephesos prior to 246 after considering only a part of the ancient evidence.

generals defeated him again. But he overcame his persecutors through a ruse. In his victory celebration, he assumed the diadem and was hailed king, aged around 18. From there he probably returned into Kilikia.

243/242: Seleukos gained control of Antioch and other parts of Seleukis except Seleukeia-in-Pieria. His fleet was wrecked through storm.

242/241: The recent setbacks taught Seleukos that a compromise with Hierax was required to overcome Euergetes. By acknowledging his brother as king of Asia Minor, he reduced the costs of securing the northern frontiers of his kingdom, while Euergetes had to invest more into maintaining his holdings in Asia Minor. There are no clear indications regarding the conditions of Smyrna and Mylasa or the allegiance of Olympichos after the agreement. It is likely that they maintained a high degree of autonomy.

By 241: Seleukos was able to fully concentrate on recovering Syria except Seleukeia-in-Pieria. Operations along the coast went more slowly than deeper inland, so that he was laying siege simultaneously to Orthosia just north of the Eleutheros River and to Damascus deep into Koile Syria. Euergetes offered peace, probably on the basis of the *status quo*, if not allowing Seleukos some further gains in northern Koile Syria in return for Seleukeia-in-Pieria and Ephesos.

Abbreviated Literatur

Austin 2006	M. M. Austin, The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest. A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation, Cambridge 2006².
Bagnall 1976	R. Bagnall, The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt, Leiden 1976.
Bengtson 1971	H. Bengtson, Die Inschriften von Labraunda und die Politik des Antigonos Doson, SBAW 1971.3, 14–20.
Bennett 2001–2013	Ch. Bennett, The Ptolemaic Dynasty. Published at the Tyndale House, 2001–2013. URL:http://www.tyndalehouse.com/egypt/ptolemies/ptolemies.htm (last visit: 3 Dec. 2013).
Berthold 1984	R. M. Berthold, Rhodes in the Hellenistic Age, Ithaca 1984.
Billows 1995	R. A. Billows, Kings and Colonists, Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism, Leiden 1995.
Blümel 1992	W. Blümel, Brief des ptolemäischen Ministers Tlepolemos and die Stadt Kildara in Karien, EA 20, 1992, 127–133; Taf. 13–14.
Boffo 1985	L. Boffo, I re ellenistici e i centri religiosi dell'Asia Minore, Florence 1985.
Bouché-Leclercq 1913	A. Bouché-Leclercq, Histoire des Séleucides (323–64 avant J.-C.), 2 Vols., Paris 1913–1914.
Buraselis 1982	K. Buraselis, Das hellenistische Makedonien und die Ägäis, Munich 1982.
Bülow-Jacobsen 1979	A. Bülow-Jacobsen, P.Haun. 6. An Inspection of the Original, ZPE 36, 1979, 91–100.
Carney 2013	E. D. Carney, Arsinoë of Egypt and Macedon. A Royal Life, Oxford 2013.
Cohen 1978	G. M. Cohen, The Seleucid Colonies, Wiesbaden 1978.
Coşkun ca. 2015a	A. Coşkun, The War of Brothers, the Third Syrian War, and the Battle of Ancyra (246–241 BC): a Re-Appraisal, (forthcoming) in: K. Erickson (ed.), War within the Family. Proceedings of Seleucid Study Day III. Panel at the VIIth Celtic Conference in Classics, Bordeaux, 5–8 September 2012, ca. 2015.
Coşkun ca. 2015b	A. Coşkun, Laodike I, Berenike Phernophoros, Dynastic Murders, and the Outbreak of the Third Syrian War (253–246 BC), forthcoming in: idem/A. McAuley (eds.), Seleukid Royal Women: Roles and Representations. Proceedings of Seleucid Study Day IV, McGill University, Montreal Feb. 2013, ca. 2015.
Coşkun, in preparation	A. Coşkun, Antiochos I Soter, the Galatians, and Seleukid Rule in Asia

	Minor before the Peace of Apamea, in preparation.
Crampa 1969	J. Crampa, Labraunda. Swedish Excavations and Researches. Vol. III, Part I: The Greek Inscriptions. Part I: 1–12 (Period of Olympichus), Lund 1969. (=ILabraunda)
Dignas 2002	B. Dignas, Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor, Oxford 2002 (repr. 2004).
Ehling 2003	K. Ehling, Unruhen, Aufstände und Abfallbewegungen der Bevölkerung in Phönikien, Syrien und Kilikien unter den Seleukiden, Historia 52, 2003, 300–36.
Erickson ca. 2015	K. Erickson, Antiochos Soter and the War of the Brothers, forthcoming in: K. Erickson (ed.): War within the Family. Proceedings of Seleucid Study Day III. Panel at the VIIth Celtic Conference in Classics, Bordeaux, 5–8 September 2012 (ca. 2015).
Grainger 1997	J. D. Grainger, A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer, Leiden 1997.
Grainger 2010	J. D. Grainger, The Syrian Wars, Leiden 2010.
Gygax 2000	M. D. Gygax, Ptolemaios, Bruder des Königs Ptolemaios III. Euergetes, und Mylasa: Bemerkungen zu I.Labraunda Nr. 3, Chiron 30, 2000, 353–366.
Gygax 2001	M. D. Gygax, Untersuchungen zu den lykischen Gemeinwesen in klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit, Bonn 2001.
Gygax 2002	M. D. Gygax, Zum Mitregenten des Ptolemaios II. Philadelphos, Historia 51, 2002, 49–56.
Habicht 1980	Ch. Habicht, Bemerkungen zum P. Haun. 6, ZPE 39, 1980, 1–5.
Hauben 1990	H. Hauben, L'expédition de Ptolémée III en Orient et la sédition domestique de 245 av. J.-C., APF 36, 1990, 29–37.
Heinen 1972	H. Heinen, Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. Zur Geschichte der Zeit des Ptolemaios Keraunos und zum Chremonideischen Krieg, Wiesbaden 1972.
Herzog 1930	R. Herzog, Griechische Königsbriefe, Hermes 65, 1930, 455–471.
Heuß 1975	A. Heuß, Die Freiheitserklärung von Mylasa in den Inschriften von Labranda, in: J. Bingen et al. (edd.), Le monde grec: pensée, littérature, histoire, documents ; hommages à Claire Précaux, Bruxelles 1975, 403–415.
Higbie 2003	C. Higbie, The Lindian Chronicle and the Greek Creation of their Past, Oxford 2003.
Hölbl 1994	G. Hölbl, Geschichte des Ptolemäerreiches. Politik. Ideologie und religiöse Kultur von Alexander dem Großen bis zur römischen Eroberung, Darmstadt 1994 (Cf.: A History of the Ptolemaic Empire, trans. by Tina Saavedra, London 2000).
Huß 1998	W. Huß, Ptolemaios der Sohn, ZPE 121, 1998, 229–250.
Huß 2001	W. Huß, Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit, München 2001.
Kobes 1994	J. Kobes, Mylasa und Kildara in ptolemäischer Hand? Überlegungen zu zwei hellenistischen Inschriften aus Karien, EA 24, 1994, 1–6.
Kobes 1996	J. Kobes, „Kleine Könige." Untersuchungen zu den Lokaldynasten im hellenistischen Kleinasien (323–188 v.Chr.), St. Katharinen 1996.
Lehmann 1998	G. A. Lehmann, Expansionspolitik im Zeitalter des Hochhellenismus: Die Anfangsphase des ‚Laodike-Krieges' 246/5 v.Chr. in: Th. Hantos – G. A. Lehmann (edd.), Althistorisches Kolloquium zum Anlaß des 70. Geburtstags von Jochen Bleicken, Stuttgart 1998, 81–102.
Ma 1999	J. Ma, Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor, Oxford 1999.
Martinez-Sève 2002/3	L. Martinez-Sève, Laodike, femme d'Antiochos II: du roman à la réconstruction historique, REG 116, 2002/3 (2004), 690–706.
Meadows 2013	A. Meadows, Two 'Double' Dedications at Ephesus and the Beginning of Ptolemaic Control of Ionia, Gephyra 10, 2013, 1–12.

Nourse 2002	K. L. Nourse, Women and the Early Development of Royal Power in the Hellenistic East, Diss. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 2002.
Oikonomides 1984a	A. N. Oikonomides, The Death of Ptolemy "The Son" at Ephesos and P. Bouriant 6, ZPE 56, 1984, 148–150.
Oikonomides 1984b	A. N. Oikonomides, Opron and the Sea-Battle of Andros. A Note in Ptolemaic History and Prosopography, ZPE 56, 1984, 151–152.
P.Haun. I	T. Larsen (ed.), Literarische Texte und ptolemäische Urkunden, Copenhagen 1942.
Piejko 1990	F. Piejko, Episodes from the Third Syrian War in a Gurob Papyrus, 246 BC, APF 36, 1990, 13–27.
PP	Prosopographia Ptolemaica, ed. by W. Peremans, E. Van't Dack et al., 10 vols., Leuven 1950–2002. Lemmata have been accessed through the database Trismegistos – People (see below). Cf. also: Clarysse, W. et al. (eds.): Prosopographia Ptolemaica, Leuven 2009. URL: http://prosptol.arts.kuleuven.ac.be/
Ramsey, forthcoming	G. Ramsey, Seleucid Land and Native Populations: Laodike II and the Competition for Power in Asia Minor and Babylonia, in: R. Oetjen – F. X. Ryan (eds.): Seleukeia: Studies in Seleucid History, Archaeology and Numismatics in Honor of Getzel M. Cohen, Berlin (forthcoming).
Ravazzolo 1996	C. Ravazzolo, Tolemeo Figlio di Tolemeo II Filadelfeo, Studi Ellenistici 8, 1996, 123–143.
Reger 1985/93	G. Reger, The Date of the Battle of Kos, AJAH 10, 1985 (1993), 155–177.
Reger 1994	G. Reger, The Political History of the Kyklades, 260–200 BC, Historia 43, 1994, 32–69.
Rigsby 1996	K. J. Rigsby, Asylia. Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World, Berkeley CA 1996.
Robert 1966	L. Robert, Documents de l'Asie Mineure méridionale. Inscriptions, monnaies et géographie. Hautes Études du monde gréco-romain 2, Geneva 1966.
Robert – Robert 1970	L. Robert – J. Robert, Labraunda, BE 83, 1970, 448–454 no. 542–553.
Segre 1938	M. Segre, Iscrizioni di Licia, Clara Rhodos 9, 1938, 181–209.
Segre 1942/43	M. Segre, Una genealogia di Tolemei e le Imagines Maiorum, Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia 19, 1942/43, 269–280.
Seibert 1976	J. Seibert, Die Schlacht bei Ephesos, Historia 25, 1976, 45–61.
Trismegistos	Trismegistos. An interdisciplinary portal of papyrological and epigraphical resources dealing with Egypt and the Nile valley between roughly 800 BC and AD 800. Under the Direction of Marc Depauw, K. U. Leuven, last update: 20 Dec. 2013. URL: http://www.trismegistos.org/index.html (last visit: 29 Dec. 2013) – For searching names or persons, click "People".
Tunny 2000	J. A. Tunny, Ptolemy "the Son" Reconsidered: Are there too Many Ptolemies?, ZPE 131, 2000, 83–92.
van der Spek/Finkel, BCHP 11	B. van der Spek – I. Finkel, Ptolemy III Chronicle (BCHP 11), at the website Livius.org. URL: http://www.livius.org/cg-cm/chronicles/bchp-ptolemy_iii/bchp_ptolemy_iii_01.html (10 June 2013)
Virgilio 2001	B. Virgilio, Re, città et tempio nelle iscrizioni di Labraunda, Studi Ellenistici 8, 2001, 39–56.
Virgilio 2003	B. Virgilio, Lancia, Diadema e porpora. Il re e la regalità ellenistica. Seconda edizione rinnovata e ampliata con una Appendice documentaria, Pisa 2003.
Walbank 1988	F. Walbank, From the Battle of Ipsus to the Death of Antigonos Doson, in: N. G. L. Hammond – F. Walbank (eds.), A History of Macedonia III, Oxford 1988, 199–364.
Wiemer 2002	H.-U. Wiemer, Krieg, Handel und Piraterie. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des hellenistischen Rhodos, Berlin 2002.

Will 1979 — É. Will, Histoire politique du monde hellénistique, 323–30 av. J.-C., Vol 1, Nancy 1979².

Wörrle 1978 — M. Wörrle, Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens II: Ptolemaios II und Telmessos, Chiron 8, 1978, 201–246.

Özet

İÖ. 3. Yüzyılda Küçük Asya'da Komutan olarak görev yapan Ptolemaios'lar ve İkinci ve Üçüncü Suriye Savaşları sırasında Ephesos ve Mylasa'ya bir Bakış

Ptolemaios II Philadelphos ve Ptolemaios III Euergetes'in hükümdarlıkları sırasında, pek çok kaynak aynı isimli kişilerin Küçük Asya'nın batısında seçkin mevkilerde iş başında olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu bağlamda, bilim insanları günümüze dek çoğunlukla Ptolemaios'lar Hanedanlı'ğının önde gelen iki ya da tek bir temsilcisini tespit edebilmişlerdir. Yaygın görüş onu, Lysimakhos ve II. Arsione'nin oğlu ve aynı zamanda II. Ptolemaios'un evlatlığı ve halefi olarak tayin edilmiş olan Ptolemaios olarak kabul etmektedir. Bu kişinin, İÖ. 259 yılında isyan etmeden önce İÖ. 260'lı yıllarda Ege donanmasında Ptolemaios'ların başkumandanı olarak görev yaptığına ve üvey babası tarafından affedildikten sonra İÖ. 246'da Euergetes tarafından geri çağrılıncaya dek Telmessos'ta bir prensliğe çekildiğine inanılmaktadır. Onun, Mylasa vatandaşları ile yerel dynast Olympikhos arasında yak. İÖ. 244 yılındaki mektuplaşmalarda bahsi geçen "Kardeş Ptolemaios" olduğu eğilimi ön plana çıkmaktadır. Athenaios'un bildirdiğine göre, "Oğul Ptolemaios", tıpkı "Andromakhos olarak da bilinen Ptolemaios" gibi (P. Haun. 6) Ephesos'ta öldürülmüştür. Eğer bu eşleştirme gerçekten de doğruysa, cinayet Telmessos'taki Ptolemaios'un yak. İÖ. 239 yılında son defa belgelenmesinin ardından gerçekleşmiştir. Yazar, bu makalesinde bu ve benzeri kurgulamaları masaya yatırmakta ve barındırdıkları sayısız anormallik ve tutarsızlıklara dikkat çekerek onları kesin olarak reddetmektedir. II. Antiokhos, Antiokhos Hieraks ve II. Seleukos döneminde Seleukoslar ve Ptolamioslar arasında karşılıklı ilişkilerden yaptığı çok daha sağlam temeller üzerine oturmuş kurgulamalara dayanarak yazar, aynı ismi taşıyan bu dört kişiyi birbirinden ayırmaktadır. Buna göre; ilk Ptolemaios Lysimakhos ve II. Arsinoe'nin oğlu olup İÖ. 270'li yıllarda kaynaklardan kaybolmuştur. İkincisi, yani "Oğul Ptolemaios" I. Arsione'nin oğlu ve Euergetes'in öz kardeşi olup II. Antiokhos 258 yılında Ephesos'u ele geçirmek üzereyken kentte çıkan bir isyan sırasında ölmüştür. Üçüncüsü, yani "Ptolemaios epiklesin Andromakhos", Philadelphos'un öz oğluydu ve bu yüzden Euergetes'in kardeşi Ptolemaios ile özdeşti ve Andromakhos oğlu, İÖ. 251 yılında İskenderiye'de Aleksandros ve Theoi Adelphoi'un rahibi Ptolemaios'un ise babasıydı. O da İ.S. 244 yılından bir süre sonra Ephesos'ta öldü. Dördüncüsü, "Telmessos'taki Ptolemaios" ise Philadelphos ve I. Arsione'nin bir diğer oğluydu ve Theokritos'a göre II. Arsinoe tarafından evlat edinilmişti. Yazar, yaptığı bu yeni özdeşleştirmelerle hem İÖ. 3. yüzyılda yaşanan güç değişimleri ve büyük olaylara hem de Seleukos ve Ptolemaios Hanedanlıklarının tarihine dair yaptığı yeni kurgulamaları büyük ölçüde pekiştirmektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Ptolemaios'lar; Seleukos'lar; Küçük Asya; Ephesos; Telmessos.