

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
The Early Seleucids.....	2
Seleucus I Nicator:	2
Antiochus I Soter:.....	3
Stratonice of Macedon	5
Apama of Cyrene	6
Antiochus II Theos.....	7
Laodice I of Pontus.....	9
Stratonice of Cappadocia	9
Seleucus II Callinicus:	10
Seleucus III Ceraunus	11
Antiochus III Megas.....	11
The Later Seleucids	13
Seleucus IV Philopator	13
Antiochus IV Epiphanes	15
Demetrius I Soter	16
Demetrius II Nicator.....	17
Alexander I Balas.....	18
Antiochus VII ‘Sidetes’	19
Antiochus IX Cyzicenus	20
Related Dynasties	21
The House of Achaeus	21
Achaeus ‘The Elder’	21
Antiochis of Pergamon.....	24
Alexander, son of Achaeus the Elder	25
Andromachus.....	26
Mithridatids of Pontus	27
Ariarathids of Cappadocia.....	27
Bibliography	27

Introduction

In the haphazard patchwork that is our understanding of Hellenistic genealogy, the Seleucid dynasty stands out as particularly threadbare.

Despite the wealth of recent scholarship on countless facets of the Seleucid World, the genealogy and descent of the Seleucids themselves has received only sporadic and fragmentary attention.

This project has been created in the hope of producing and presenting as near a comprehensive stemma of the Dynasty as possible. Ancient literary evidence, numismatics, epigraphic remains, and contemporary scholarship have been combined with my own judgement and reasoning in (numerous) cases of controversy.

In the interest of objectivity I have erred on the side of conservatism; all hypotheses and conjectures are indicated as such. For the sake of convenience and accessibility, I have presented all Greek names in their latinized forms.

My thanks first and foremost go to my two supervisors at the University of Edinburgh, Prof. Andrew Erskine and Dr. Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones. Without their patient support, guidance, and encouragement none of this would have been possible. I would have considered myself quite fortunate to work with either of them individually; to have the opportunity to collaborate with both is a rare privilege.

The staff of the Postgraduate School of History, Classics, and Archaeology at the University of Edinburgh have, as always, been as helpful as they have been welcoming, and in particular I would like to thank Ms. Karen Howie for her technical support, and Mrs. Lindsay Scott for her calm mastery of all things administrative.

Any newcomer to the subject of Seleucid genealogy is standing on the shoulders of giants, most notably Edwyn Bevan, Auguste Bouché-Leclercq, Grace Macurdy, John Gaigner, and, most recently, Daniel Ogden. Without their contributions, the field would be far more barren turf.

I also owe my sincerest thanks to all those whose feedback and insight has been invaluable in the continued development and refinement of this project, including - but of course not limited to - Dr. Altay Coskun (Waterloo), Prof. Daniel Ogden (Exeter), Dr. Kyle Erickson (Lampeter), Prof. Hans Beck (McGill), and the contributors to the Seleucid Study Days held at the University of Exeter (August, 2011) the University of Waterloo (November, 2011), l'Université de Bordeaux III (September 2012), and McGill University (February, 2013). Without the collegiality and friendly cooperation of the contributors to the Seleucid Study Group, none of this would have been possible, nor would it continue to be.

The Early Seleucids

Seleucus I Nicator:

Ruled 311-281 b.c.

Son of Antiochus and Laodice

Married first to Apama, 324 b.c.

-Antiochus I Soter = Stratonice

-Laodice = Achaeus the Elder

-Apama

Married second to Stratonice, 299 b.c.

-Phila = Antigonus Gonatas

Son of the Macedonian Antiochus, a general of Philip, and his wife Laodice, Despite allegations the was a bastard, I see no reason to doubt his parentage and rather the idea emerges from the myth of his descent from Apollo recorded in Justin 15.4.2-10. The myth itself privileges Laodice and can perhaps be seen as having been promoted by either Seleucus or his successors to impart some measure of divinity on the dynasty.

Married to Apama, daughter of the Bactrian Spitamenes, as part of the mass wedding at Susa under Alexander the Great in 324, organised with the aim of fusing the Macedonian and Persian nobility with the marriage of his hetairoi to Persian women (Arr.Anab.7.4.6). Unlike the other successors, Seleucus did not repudiate his bride. Her later diplomatic and political utility would not be realized until over a decade after their marriage, suggesting that something more than political convenience bound the two. As Grainger (1990, 12) writes, 'she must have been a remarkable lady.'

The marriage produced three recorded children, Aniochus I Soter (Plut.Dem.29, App.Syr.65), and two daughters mentioned by John Malalas, Laodice and Apama (Malalas p.198, Eustathius 915, Ogden 1999, 119). No marriage for either two daughters is attested.

Although passages in Strabo (15.2.9) and Appian (Syr.55) have been taken as indication that Seleucus married a daughter of the Mauryan king Chandragupta (Sandracottus), the ambiguity with which both authors speak of only a intermarriage or a marriage relationship along with the absence of any other mention of such a wife leads me to discount the possibility. Chandragupta might just as well have married a daughter of Seleucus, or a marriage amongst their lieutenants could plausibly be thought of as a 'marriage alliance.' The mentions are too vague for any certain conclusions.

Seleucus I then married Stratonice, daughter of Demetrius Poliorcetes and Phila, as part of an alliance between the Seleucids and the Antigonids against the Ptolemies in 300. (Plut.Dem.31, 38, Diod.21.20). We cannot be sure whether or not Apama was alive at the time of his second marriage, but her epigraphical presence in 298 along with the foundation of several cities named 'Apameia' after 300 by Seleucus I - most notably Seleucia-Zeugma and Apameia - suggest to me that she was still alive. I see no reason why she would have been repudiated or divorced. (Sherwin-White and Kuhrt 1993, 26).

Seleucus' daughter by Stratonice, Phila, was married to Antigonus Gonatas during the reign of her brother Antiochus I in 278 B.C (Grainger 1997, 52). The marriage confirmed Antigonus' reacquisition of control over Macedonia after the rampage of the Celts over the preceding years, and serve to reinforce the pre-existing Seleucid/Antigonid alliance (Grainger 2010, 75-80, 145).

Antiochus I Soter:

Married to Stratonice, 294/3 b.c.

-Antiochus II Theos = Laodice I

-Apama = Magas of Cyrene

-Seleucus (d. 268)

-Stratonice = Demetrius II of Macedo

Son of Seleucus I Nicator and Apama, the half-Macedonian half-Persian was clearly intended to take the reigns of the Seleucid empire after his father's death. Named as viceroy of the East and listed as co-regent in the Babylonian Astronomical Diaries beginning in December, 292 (Parker and Dubberstein 1946, 19-20).

As further indication of his intended succession, in one of the most famous marriages in Antiquity Seleucus I transferred his young bride Stratonice to his son Antiochus at roughly the same time as he was named co-regent (Plut.Dem.38, App.Syr.59-61, Julian.Mispog.348). Whether or not we are to believe the elaborate story of the young Antiochus' insatiable desire for his stepmother cannot be known, but the strategic concerns underscoring the manoeuvre are apparent. As his alliance with Demetrius became tense, Seleucus I sought a way by which he could do away with his second bride without offending her father. Giving her to Antiochus allowed him to solve his diplomatic problem while playing the part of the magnanimous father. The political and diplomatic reasons behind the marriage are best discussed by Breebaart 1967 and Grainger 2010, 64. Whether or not it was grounded in reality, the romantic tale of Antiochus and Stratonice endured well into the Renaissance and beyond, inspiring numerous works of art discussed by Stechow 1945

The union produced two sons, Seleucus and Antiochus. Seleucus was at first the favoured heir, named co-regent in April 266/5 only to be murdered by his father on grounds of conspiracy roughly four years later (Parker and Dubberstein 1946, 20, Trog.Prol.26, John of Antioch F55, RE 2A.1234-4, Grainger 1997, 66). Antiochus was named co-regent in his late brother's place and succeeded his father.

His daughter Stratonice was married to Demetrius II of Macedon early in the reign of Antiochus II (c.255-253 B.C) in further reaffirmation of Seleucid-Antigonid ties. The degree of interrelation between the two families, barely two generations into their alliance, is best expressed by Grainger when he writes 'husband and wife were almost as closely related as in the Ptolemaic family marriages.' (2010, 132-3, Justin 28.1.2, Eus.Chron.1.249). Stratonice, when later repudiated by Demetrius II's marriage to another bride, would later incite a rebellion in Antioch after both Antiochus Hierax and Seleucus II rejected her offer of marriage (Justin 28.1.2-4, Agatharchides F20, Grainger 2010, 177-8, and Nourse 2002, 272).

Apama was married to Magas of Cyrene during the preparatory stages of the First Syrian War, in confirmation both of Magas' assumption of the diadem and a Cyrenaean-Seleucid alliance against Ptolemy II (Paus.1.7.3, Por.F32.5, Eus.Chron.1.40.5). Her daughter by Magas, Berenice, would later marry Ptolemy III

An uncertainly-dated inscription at Illion mentioning the 'adelphē kai basilissa' (queen and sister) of Antiochus has been taken by some (Ogden 1999 124-6, Bielman-Sanchez 2003, 50) as implying that Antiochus I was married to either his full- or half-sister before Stratonice. Stephanus of Byzantium mentions that Antiochus named the city Nysa after his wife, which has been taken by Ogden as indication that he a) had another wife names Nysa and b) this Nysa could have been his half-sister by Seleucus' (unattested) Indian wife. I reject both notions, as Stephanus of Byzantium is obviously ill-informed about eponymous Seleucid foundations when he states that Antioch was named after the mother of Antiochus - a patently incorrect statement given the chronological incompatibility and Strabo's alternative account. Nourse 2002, 236n49 provides the best overview and refutation of the argument for another sister/wife of Antiochus. Similarly, I stand unconvinced by the notion that the use of *hirtu* to describe Stratonice in the Borsippa Cylinder (Sherwin-White and Kuhrt 1991) implies the existence of another wife. Both *hirtu* and *sarratu* are archaisms, representing a nuance literary

usage of regal title rather than the typical titulary for Babylonian/Assyrian queens in the first millennium (Melville 2004 49-53). Finally, the title 'queen and sister' appears later during the reign of Antiochus III as a metaphorical title meant to reinforce the equality, partnership, and legitimacy of the queen, not to identify her as an actual sister. Jones 1993 provides the best epigraphical discussion of this title, and argues against dating the inscription to the reign of Antiochus I. The later use of 'queen and sister' is in turn grasped by the ancient authors and retrojected as far back as Seleucus I and Apama - e.g. Livy 38.13.

Polyaenus' mention of Antiochus II marrying his paternal half-sister 'Laodice' has also been used to argue for another daughter of Antiochus I by another wife, but I ask the reader to refer to my comments on the marriage of Antiochus II in which I argue for rejecting this identification of Antiochus II's wife.

[Stratonice of Macedon](#) = GP Stratonike [1] and DNP Stratonike [4]

c.275(?) b.c - 235 B.C

Daughter of Antiochus I and Stratonice

Married to Demetrius II of Macedon, c.260-255(?)

Separated from Demetrius II, 239

Instigated revolt at Antioch, killed at Seleucia-in-Pieria, 235

A daughter of Antiochus I and Stratonice, born presumably around the time of her father's accession to the throne though we lack any certain date for her birth. She was married to Demetrius II of Macedon, son of Antigonus Gonatas and Phila, early during the reign of her brother Antiochus II, thus placing the marriage roughly in the mid-250s (Eus.Chron.1.249, Justin 28.1.1-4, Bevan 1902a I.173, Grainger 1997, 66). The marriage was a further affirmation of the ties between the Antigoniid and Seleucid houses, and was by now the third marriage linking the two dynasties over a period of roughly four decades.

The degree of interrelation between the two houses makes this marriage blend the line between endogamy and exogamy, and Bevan best captures how twisted Seleucid-Antigoniid relations had become when he describes Stratonice as 'a princess who - so involved were now the relations - was at once the half-sister and niece of his mother and the niece of his father' (Bevan 1902a I.173-4).

In 239, however, as Seleucid power in Asia Minor was waning during the reign of Seleucus II, Demetrius sought to bolster his other alliances with a second marriage. Justin records that he married the Epirote princess Phthia, daughter of Olympias and Alexander of Epirus, in order to secure Macedonian support for Olympias' claim to Acarnania (Justin 28.1.1-4). Stratonice, unwilling to brook taking second place at the Macedonian court, divorced Demetrius and fled to her nephew Seleucus II, hoping to gain his support against Demetrius and avenge the slight to her status (Nourse 2002, 272, Justin 28.1-4, Jos.Con.Ap. 1.22 = Agatharchides F 19 = FGrH 3.196). Justin mistakenly writes that she fled 'ad fratrem Antiochum,' and I agree with Bevan's explanation that Justin found her described as the sister of King Antiochus who was reigning at the time of her marriage and made neither his first nor his last chronological slip (Justin 28.1.4, Bevan 1902a.I.174n1)

A fragment of Agatharchides relates a perhaps embellished tale in which Stratonice flees to Syria and seeks to marry her nephew Seleucus, who was not well-disposed to the idea of marrying his aunt

(Agatharchides F 19). Stratonice, with her endogamous marriage proposal declined, then turned to consolidating her own power against her nephew. In 235, Seleucus departed on campaign in the East, and in his absence Stratonice seized the moment of opportunity and incited the populace of Antioch to revolt against her nephew. The revolt in c.235 was then put down by Seleucus II on his return to Syria, and the defeated Stratonice fled to Seleucia-in-Pieria.

Though she had an opportunity to flee Syria, the literary tradition relates that Stratonice had a dream which she believed forbade her from departing. Shortly thereafter, she was captured by men loyal to her nephew and executed (Nourse 2002, 272, Grainger 2010, 177, Bevan 1902a I.236-7).

Apama of Cyrene

c.290 - 249 b.c.

Daughter of Antiochus I and Stratonice

Married to Magas of Cyrene, c.275

Mother of Berenice II

Amongst the least-recognised but perhaps most influential Seleucid women of the third century, this daughter of Antiochus I and Stratonice was likely their first child if we place the date of her marriage in c.275. I, along with Grainger 2010 and Bennet place her birth c. 292 and thus she would have been of marriageable age in the years preceding the outbreak of the First Syrian War.

Apama first appears on the Seleucid stage with her marriage to the disenchanted Ptolemaic governor of Cyrene, Magas, who was also the stepson of Ptolemy I. Paus. 1.7.1-3 relates both the marriage and the subsequent revolt of Magas against his stepbrother Philadelphus, but our ancient source implies that Magas, already married to Apama, then enticed his father-in-law into breaking his treaty with the Ptolemies by invading southern Syria and Egypt.

I, along with Grainger (2010, 87), Marquaille (2008, 44), and Bevan (1902a, 1.147), would argue instead that our source has reversed both the sequence of events and the impetus behind Magas' rebellion. I think it far more likely that Antiochus I took note of Magas' disaffection with Ptolemaic rule and made overtures of an alliance that was then sealed by the Cyrenaean's marriage to the Seleucid princess. With Seleucid endorsement and Apama by his side, Magas took the diadem and became basileus of Cyrene, which in the process was transformed into a Hellenistic kingdom in its own right.

After the failed revolt of Magas, Apama disappears from the ancient sources though based on accounts of her later life we can surmise that her and Magas produced a daughter, Berenice (II), at some c.270. As part of Magas' reconciliation with Philadelphus and thus Cyrene's re-integration into the Ptolemaic fold, Berenice was betrothed to the future Ptolemy III as recounted by Justin 26.3.1-2.

In his account of the courtly scandals that occurred in the wake of Magas' death, Justin refers to the mother of Berenice and wife of Magas as 'Arsionoe.' Though scholars continue to be divided on the identification, I argue that Justin has made an onomastic error and that we can safely identify Apama with Justin's Arsinoe. The fact that Justin, in some MSS, identifies Magas as 'agan' does little to boost his credibility, and the lack of any mention of either Apama's death or repudiation, or another marriage of Magas, further refutes his claim. The ages of those involved also support the identification: if we place the marriage of Apama and Magas in c.275, then Berenice would have had

to have been born around c.270 if she was to be of betrothable age by c.258 when Magas and Philadelphus were reconciled, and of marriageable age by c.250 when the account of Justin begins. This leaves Apama as the only realistic candidate for the mother of Berenice.

In addition – and I owe my thanks to Chris Bennett for this note – I must defer to the excellent overview of contemporary scholarship and the ultimate conclusion that Apama is Arsinoe to his s.v. Apama n. 6 of his Ptolemaic Genealogy. In particular, his mention of a fragment of Callimachus on P.Oxy.20.2258 explicitly mentioning Magas and Apama as the parents of Berenice II leaves little room for doubt.

Finally, the actions of Justin's 'Arsinoe' have such a distinctly Seleucid flavour that leaves little doubt in my mind as to either her identity or her intentions. In a fascinating instance of a Seleucid woman interfering in the affairs of her nuptial court in service of her natal house, Justin 26.3.1-7 recounts that Apama, displeased with the prospect of Cyrene being returned to the Ptolemaic fold and thus the alliance that her own marriage had sealed being broken, prevented Magas' planned marriage of Berenice from taking place.

Instead, Apama petitioned Antigonus Gonatas for a substitute groom for her daughter, who happily sent along his half-brother Demetrius Kalos ('The Fair') to marry Berenice and thus become king of Cyrene. Given the broader context of renewed Seleucid-Antigonid ties that had occurred in the 250s and 260s BC, the manoeuvre was as sensitive to contemporary developments as it was beneficial to Apama's brother, Antiochus II.

Demetrius, however, rapidly inspired the ire of the Cyrenaeans. While we can likely dismiss Justin's scandalous account of the affair between Apama and her stepson as superfluous embroidery, Apama's centrality in steering the course of Cyrenaean succession cannot be denied. I agree with Chris Bennett when he writes that after the assassination of Demetrius, "It seems likely that the rest of [Apama's] life was short and unpleasant."

I defer to Laronde 1987 and Grainger 2010 for the most detailed narratives of the First and Second Syrian Wars, and the upheavals in Cyrenaean politics.

Antiochus II Theos

Ruled 261-246 b.c.

Son of Antiochus I and Stratonice

Married first to Laodice, before 261 b.c.

- Seleucus II Callinicus = Laodice
- Laodice = Mithridates II of Pontus
- Apama?
- Antiochus 'Hierax' = daughter of Zelas of Bithynia
- Stratonice = Ariarathes III of Cappadocia

Married second to Berenice Phernophorus, 252 b.c.

- Antiochus
- Unnamed Daughter

Son of Antiochus I and Stratonice, born c.286, associated with his father on the throne shortly after the murder of his older brother Seleucus presumably around 264/5, and took the throne on the death of Antiochus II in 261 (Grainger 1997, 13-15, Parker and Dubberstein 1946, 19-20).

There is disagreement amongst ancient and modern commentators alike over the identity of the Laodice to whom Antiochus was married at some point before he took the throne. Polyaeus 8.50 states that she was the half-sister of Antiochus II, while a fragment of Porphyry - F32.6 - claims that she was the daughter of Achaeus. Our lack of an attested half-sister of Antiochus II immediately leads me to disagree with Ogden and others who prefer Polyaeus, and I agree with Bouché-Leclercq (1913, 2.543), Nourse (2002, 235) in identifying her as the daughter of Achaeus. The house of Achaeus bears all the signs of some degree of intermarriage or relation to the Seleucids by the reign of Antiochus II through its use of dynastic names, wealth, regional prominence, and service as Seleucid officials, and I have little difficulty in believing that a Laodice of this lineage would have been a likely candidate for marriage to Antiochus.

At any rate, Laodice gave birth to the ill-fated pair of Antiochus Hierax and Seleucus II but her husband neither immediately nor explicitly favoured one as his successor (Diod.31.19.6, Justin 28.5.3, Grainger 1997, 35-6, and Macurdy 1932, 82-3). Both brothers, along with an otherwise unattested sister named Apama are mentioned in Babylonian documents from c.245 (Grainger 1997, 35-6, Ogden 1999, 128).

In 252 B.C. Antiochus II married Berenice 'Phernophorus' - the dowry-bearer - daughter of Ptolemy II and sister of Ptolemy III to mark the confirmation of the peace that ended the Second Syrian War (Por. F43, Macurdy 1932, 83). While many have viewed this as the imposition of Ptolemaic dynastic will on the Seleucids through marriage, I concur with Grainger in seeing this as a more mixed end to the conflict (Grainger 2010, 135-9).

Whether or not the second marriage to the Ptolemaic princesses necessitated the repudiation of Laodice is unclear. A inscription giving her land in Caria - OGIS 225 - has been taken by some to be a sort of ancient divorce settlement compensating Laodice for her repudiation with sizable estates. Lockhart 1961 provides what I consider to be the best discussion of the inscription, and the uncertain dating of the inscription along with the convincing arguments of Nourse and Grainger against her repudiation make me inclined to believe that she remained a wife - if not the principle wife - of Antiochus II (Nourse 2002, 262-70, and Grainger 2010, 156-7). The continued identification of Laodica as 'the wife' in Babylonian documents, along with Antiochus II's later departure from the then-pregnant Berenice to Laodice in Ephesus further support arguments for her primacy (Grainger 2010, 156-7).

Berenice, presumably around 246, gave birth to a son and perhaps a daughter as well (Por. F43, App.Syr.65). Antiochus II died in 246, and despite the allegations of Polyaeus 8.50 and Porphyry F43 that Laodice poisoned him, I see no conceivable reason why she would have plotted against the husband who had recently returned her to a position of prominence and essentially repudiated his younger bride. The ensuing conflict between Laodice and Berenice are reported in Justin 27.1.1-2, Porphyry F43, App.Syr.65, and the Gurob Papyrus. The son of Berenice and Antiochus was killed either by the designs of Laodice or her children shortly after the death of Antiochus II.

Laodice, daughter of Antiochus II, was married to Mithridates II of Pontus early in the reign of her brother Seleucus II, c.245 B.C (Eus.Chron1.40.6, Justin 28.5.3, Grainger 1997, 48). Whether the pair were married before or after the battle of Ancyra is unclear, but the conflicting viewpoints are succinctly explained by Erciyas 2006, 13-5 (also Bevan 1902a, 1.22-8).

Stratonice, daughter of Antiochus II and Laodice, was married to Ariarathes III of Cappadocia, late in her father's reign in approximately 250. (Diod.31.19.6, Por.F32.6, Macurdy 1932, 86). The marriage confirmed Ariarathes' father, Ariamnes, as client king of Cappadocia after he had led the kingdom to recovery from Galatian invasions.(Bevan 1902a, 2.57-9, Grainger 2010, 131).

Antiochus Hierax, for his part, was married at some point during the War of the Brothers to the daughter of Prusias of Bithynia - also the sister of Ziaelas of Bithynia - c.233 B.C. in order to strengthen his position (Eus.Chron.1.40.10, Bevan 1902a, 2.132). It is unsure whether or not her name was Laodice, as we cannot be certain whether the Laodice referred to by Polybius 5.74.5 is meant to be the daughter or the wife of Hierax (Macurdy 1932, 91). Hierax died in 227 B.C. at roughly the same time his brother was killed in a riding accident (Justin 27.3.12, Por.F32.9, Grainger 2010, 181).

[Laodice I of Pontus](#) = GP Laodike [4] and DNP Laodike II [4]
c.265(?) - ???

Daughter of Antiochus II and Laodice I

Married to Mithridates II of Pontus, c.245

- Laodice = Antiochus III Megas
- Laodice = Achaeus the Younger
- Mithridates III of Pontus

A daughter of Antiochus II and Laodice, born presumably in the early years of her father's marriage to Laodice. She was not married until after her father's death, during the troubled early years of the reign of her brother, Seleucus II (Justin 38.5.3, Eus.Chron.1.40.6 [1.118], Bevan 1902a I.194-5 and Appendix M). Precisely when and under what circumstances the marriage occurred is uncertain, and the majority of the scholarly debate revolves around whether to place the marriage before or after the Battle of Ancyra.

I agree with Bevan's refutation of Reinach and Niese (Bevan 1902a I.App M), and his arguments in favour of placing the marriage during the early reign of Seleucus II and before Ancyra - and thus before the outbreak of the War of the Brothers. For further discussion of the chronology, see also Erciyas 2006, 13-15 and McGing 1986, 253-4. The marriage is notable as the first dynastic link between the Pontic and Seleucid houses, as well as being the marriage that produced the future wife of Antiochus III.

The pair have three attested children: two daughters named Laodice, married to Antiochus III and his rival Achaeus, and the future Mithridates III of Pontus. With the introduction of a Seleucid princess into the Pontic court, a broader swathe of Hellenization began within the kingdom as it was brought more closely into the Seleucid orbit. In addition, Laodice I left a lasting impact on the onomastic traditions of Pontus, as thereafter every royal female in the dynasty would bear the name Laodice.

[Stratonice of Cappadocia](#) = Stratonice [5] DNP and Stratonice (2) in Grainger 1997

A daughter of Antiochus II and Laodice, Stratonice's marriage to the budding dynasts of Cappadocia confirmed both their submission to the Seleucid throne and their recognition as the client kings of

the region. The precise date of her marriage cannot be known, but given that she was married by 250 we can place her birth in roughly 270-265.

Diodorus 31.19.6 mentions the marriage itself, which is also discussed by Macurdy 1932, 83 and Bevan 1902a, 2.57-9. Diodorus' explicit mention that the marriage was the result of alliance between Ariamnes and Antiochus II means that the marriage must have occurred before the king's death, and I would argue that around 250 is the safest estimate.

By 250 the Cappadocian kingdom, largely due to the efforts of Ariamnes and his predecessors, had recovered from the deprivations of Gallic invasions and persistent infighting amongst the rival dynasts of the region. The family itself was of Iranian descent and had in the fourth century been loyal Achaemenid satraps who revolted after the invasion of Alexander the Great. (Diod.31.19.1-6) Ariamnes thus sought Seleucid support to bolster his claim to preeminence in Cappadocia, and struck an alliance with Antiochus II, who was quite content to entrust control and administration of the region to a subordinate.

In a marital manoeuvre that is strikingly similar to the marriage and co-regency of Antiochus I, Ariamnes married his favoured son Ariarathes to the Seleucid princess Stratonice at the same time as he was named co-ruler of Cappadocia and given a diadem. Such imitation of Seleucid dynastic practice was only the beginning of a broader swathe of Hellenization that occurred throughout the court and the kingdom. For further discussion of the dynamics of power and influence, please refer to McAuley 2012.

Seleucus II Callinicus:

Ruled 246-226 b.c.

Son of Antiochus II and Laodice

Married to Laodice, daughter of Andromachus, date unknown

- Alexander / Seleucus III Keraunos
- Antiochus III Megas
- Antiochis = Xerxes of Armeni

Son of Antiochus II and Laodice I, Seleucus II became king at around age 20 after the death of his father in 246 despite the conflicting claims of Berenice Phernophorus and the supporters of her son (Por F43).

After the flurry of dynastic activity of the previous generations, the reign of Seleucus II is refreshingly straightforward. Seleucus II followed in his father's footsteps by marrying a Laodice from the Anatolian client dynasty of Achaeus. The precise genealogy of this Laodice is again uncertain given the vagueness of the sources, but we can safely presume that she was the niece of his mother and thus from the next generation of Achaeids (Pol.4.51.4, 8.33.1, Polyaeus.4.17). Whether she was the daughter of Andromachus or Achaeus is uncertain, especially given the relatively certain presence of both names in two different generations of the family. I am inclined to read Polybius as indicating her parentage by Andromachus, and given the narrow constraints of Hellenistic nomenclature it is hardly difficult to believe that there would have been an Achaeus and Andromachus in her generation as well; the presence of a Laodice in both generations is a fitting example. The divergent scholarly viewpoints are: Bevan 1902a, 1.203-4, Bouché-Leclercq 1913, 2.562, and Macurdy 1932, 90.

Polyaenus 8.60 mentions another wife of Seleucus named Mysta who is ambiguously described as wearing royal garb (Ogden 1999, 132). I agree with Ogden when he cites Athenaeus' reference (578a) to her and another Nysa as mistresses of Seleucus II as evidence that she was not his wife but rather his *hetaira* (Ogden 1999, 132).

Laodice and Seleucus gave birth to three children: Alexander, who would later (briefly) become Seleucus III, the future Antiochus III Megas, and a daughter Antiochis (Ogden 1999, 132, Grainger 1997, 48, *RE* 2A.1235-1241).

During the reign of Antiochus III in 212 B.C., his sister Antiochis was married to the vanquished king Xerxes of Armenia in a simultaneous confirmation of subordination and display of clemency to the defeated (Pol. 8.23.5, John of Antioch FGrH 4.557, Bevan 1902a, 2.15-6). Her later murder of her husband, allegedly at the instigation of Antiochus III, would sever nearly all Seleucid links to Armenia (Grainger 2010, 283, Poly. 8.25).

Seleucus III Ceraunus

Ruled 226/5-223/2 b.c.

Son of Seleucus II and Laodice II

Originally named Alexander, changed his name after his ascent to the throne in 222 b.c.
(Por. F.32.9, Eus.Chron.1.40.11)

No attested wives or children.

Sickly and young, he was poisoned by his courtiers in 224/3 b.c.
(App.Syr.66)

Son of Seleucus II and Laodice II, Seleucus III reigned briefly after his father's death in a riding accident in 227/6 B.C. Changing his name from Alexander to Seleucus upon taking the throne, he reigned for three to four years until he was assassinated by Nicanor and Apatourius (Por. F32.9, Euseb.Chron.1.40.11, App.Syr.68, Pol.32.71.4, Grainger 1997, 63). Their motives for doing so remain unknown.

We have no attested wives or children for Seleucus III, though he likely made his brother Antiochus III co-regent or viceroy in the East (Pol.2.71.4, Porphyry F45, Eus.Chron.1.40.12, Grainger 1997, 20).

Antiochus III Megas

Ruled 222-187 b.c.

Son of Seleucus II and Laodice II

Married first to Laodice, daughter of Mithridates II, 221 b.c

- Antiochus Neos = Laodice (sister)
- Seleucus IV Philopator = Laodice IV
- Antiochus IV Epiphanes = Laodice IV
- Cleopatra I Syra = Ptolemy V

- Laodice = Antiochus Neos
- Antiochis = Ariarathes IV of Cappadocia
- Nysa(?) = Pharnaces of Pontus

Married second to Euboea of Chalcis, 190 b.c.

- Unnamed daughter?

Son of Seleucus II and Laodice II, Antiochus was made either viceroy or satrap in the East during the short reign of his elder brother Seleucus III and was likely around twenty when he was assassinated (Pol.2.71.4, Porphyry F45, Eus.Chron.1.40.12, Grainger 1997, 20). After he took the throne in 222 he was quickly faced with the rebellions of his relative, Achaeus, and Molon. (Pol.5.40.6-42.3).

Amidst great pomp and circumstance, the young king took Laodice, daughter of Mithridates II of Pontus, as his wife in a ceremony performed at the symbolic location of Seleucia-Zeugma in 222 (Pol.5.43.1-4). The marriage itself is difficult to classify as exo- or endo-gamic given that Laodice and Antiochus were cousins through his aunt Laodice, though this is hardly a rare occurrence amongst Seleucid marriages. Laodice III was a highly visible figure during the reign of Antiochus III, appearing in several inscriptions compiled in a dossier by Ma 2000. Her name generally appears alongside that of her husband and the pair are occasionally referred to - or refer to each other - as 'brother and sister' (Jones 1993, Ma 2000, 255). Given our certainty of Laodice's descent, the title ought not to be taken literally but rather as a metaphorical expression of the intimacy and collaboration of the royal pair in the affairs of administration (Nourse 2002, 237). The identification of the queen as 'sister' - in the same way it was used by Ptolemy III and Berenice II even though they were not actually siblings - strengthened Laodice's position within the family, thereby conveying a sense of family intimacy, stability, and harmony to the reigning trio. In reward for her exceptional piety, loyalty, and affection to her husband, Antiochus III decreed that Laodice be honoured with a state cult and an eponymous priesthood, the intricacies of which are best discussed by Debord 2003 and van Nuffelen 2004.

The marriage produced, in order, three sons: Antiochus 'Neos,' Seleucus IV Philopator, and Antiochus IV Epiphanes, originally named Mithridates. In an unprecedented dynastic manoeuvre for the Seleucids, and perhaps in imitation of the Ptolemies or Achaemenids, in the winter of 196-5 Antiochus III married his younger son Antiochus to his sister Laodice (App.Syr.4). The union is the only attested instance of full-sibling marriage in the dynasty, and represents an attempt by Antiochus to make consanguinity a prerequisite for succession (Ogden 1999, 135, Bielman-Sanchez 2003, 46).

The metaphorical intimacy of Antiochus III and Laodice III was meant to be concretely realized in the union of their children, but the design was shattered with the death of Antiochus Neos in 192 (Livy 35.15.2, Aymard 1940). I see no reason to suspect Antiochus III's involvement in the murder of his son, especially given his elaborate dynastic machinations. After the death of her brother/husband, Laodice disappears from our sources save for two inscriptions: one naming her chief priestess of her mother's cult in Media, and another honouring her at Delos (Austin 158 and OGIS 251, Grainger 1997, 48). Unlike the vast majority of Seleucid scholars, I fail to see a convincing reason why she ought to be also identified as the wife of both Seleucus IV and Antiochus IV for reasons I shall discuss in the context of Antiochus III's successor. There is, I would argue, neither concrete nor convincing grounds for such an unprecedented instance of triple-sibling marriage in a dynasty that previously had never privileged consanguineous unions.

Livy's mention of two other sons, Ardys and Mithridates, at 33.19 I take as erroneous and agree with Holleaux's very convincing argument that they were in fact subordinates of Antiochus III, not his sons (Holleaux 1912).

In a monumental marriage that irrevocably intertwined the two dynasties, Antiochus III married his daughter Cleopatra I Syra to Ptolemy V in 193/2 B.C. at the close of the Seleucid triumph that was the Fifth Syrian War (App.Syr.5, Jos.AJ.12.154, Porphyry F47, 49a, Pomeroy 1990, 23, and Whitehorne 2001, 81-4). Celebrated at the symbolic location of Raphia, the marriage has been seen by some as essentially reducing the Ptolemies to the status of Seleucid client-kings (Grainger 2010, 274). While this is perhaps a bit excessive, the marriage nevertheless brought the Seleucids and Ptolemies into such close interrelation that mutual interference became inevitable.

To consolidate his alliances before his invasion of Thrace, Antiochus III married his daughter Antiochis to Ariarathes IV of Cappadocia who would become an ally in the Roman War (Diod.31.10.2, 31.19.7, Pol.31.17.2, App.Syr.5, Bevan 1902a, 2.57-9). The perhaps embroidered tale of her intervention in the succession of her sons is recounted at Diod.31.19.7.

An unknown daughter of Antiochus III was offered to Demetrius of Bactria as part of a diplomatic agreement mentioned at Pol.11.39.9, but there is no indication either of her identity or if the marriage ever actually took place.

A third daughter - whom I take to be the same as Nysa - was offered to Eumenes of Pergamon along with several cities as a dowry, but the Attalid declined the marriage alliance and in so doing aligned himself against the Seleucids (App.Syr.5, Pol.32.30.8, Bevan 1902a 2.59-62). (Perhaps?) the same Nysa is later mentioned in a decree at Athens in honour of Pharnaces of Pontus and his wife that is discussed by Reniach 1906, 46-8.

Finally, in 190 B.C. Antiochus III married Euboea, the daughter of Cleombrotus of Chalcis, to solidify his ties with Greece (Pol.20.8.1-5, App.Syr.16.2, Livy 36.11.1-2, Athenaeus 439e-f). It is unclear whether Laodice was still alive by the time Antiochus took his second wife, but I suspect she was. As in the case of Antiochus II and Laodice, I see no reason why a repudiation would be absolutely necessary, and Euboea's lack the title *basilissa* or such cultic honours as Laodice had received lead me to believe that she was clearly second in the eyes of Antiochus III. A lacuna from the Seleucid court from between 177 and 176 could possibly be taken as indication that she was still alive after the death of Antiochus III, discussed by Bielman-Sanchez 2003.

Antiochus and Euboea gave birth to one unnamed daughter, mentioned at Livy 37.44.6 and in the Babylonian Astronomical Diaries in 187 (Grainger 1997, 71).

The Later Seleucids

Seleucus IV Philopator

Ruled 187-175 b.c.

Son of Antiochus III and Laodice III

Married to Laodice IV, parentage unknown

-Demetrius I Soter = Laodice (unknown)

-Antiochus (d.168)

-Laodice = Perseus of Macedon

Son of Antiochus III and Laodice III, Seleucus IV became co-regent with his father in 193 and then king in 187 after his father's death in the East (Pol.18.51.8, App.Syr.26, Holleaux 1916). His reign, as Grainger notes, was an unusually quiet one by Seleucid standards and was focussed more on recovery and consolidation after the disastrous terms of the Roman peace than on expansion or campaigning (Grainger 1997, 63-5, and Hoover 2002, 83-5).

Nearly every scholar of the Seleucids to date has assumed that Seleucus IV, and later his brother Antiochus IV, were married in sequence to their sister Laodice after the death of her husband/brother Antiochus Neos. Such a far-reaching assumption, though almost universally accepted, rests on connections made using very tenuous evidence. The only literary mention that we have of this Laodice (RE 18) is in the context of her marriage to Antiochus Neos in Appian, and then she disappears entirely from the literary record only to appear in an inscription naming her a high priestess of her mother's cult. Laodice (RE 19), wife of Seleucus IV and Antiochus IV is never actually mentioned in the literary sources and appears only epigraphically and numismatically. Scholars have simply presumed that the two are the same based on convenience and the presumption that Antiochus III would have simply –and immediately – substituted Seleucus IV for Antiochus Neos. The argument is entirely inferential, and even Dittenberger doubted that the connection could be made with any degree of certainty.

I agree with Dittenberger in seriously doubting the possibility that Laodice (RE 18) is the same as Laodice (RE 19). The chronology of the equation also does not necessarily follow: if such a replacement was automatic, then why did Antiochus III wait four years to name his new heir? Moreover, if we presume that Seleucus IV was born around 220-15 BC, as seems likely, then by the death of his brother he would have been between 28 and 23 years old; the chances of him having already married are likely, especially as he was a governor in Thrace. Antiochus III showed himself to be perfectly willing to marry his other children off to various client dynasts and even to the Ptolemies, and likely would not have hesitated to find another match for this now-widowed Laodice. I see no reason to assume that he automatically transferred Laodice 18 to her younger brother. By the reign of Antiochus III, Seleucid marriage connections had spread the name of Laodice everywhere from Cappadocia, Anatolia, and Pontus to Parthia and it is as if there is a contemporary shortage of Laodices. Given the emphasis and frequency with which later Seleucid women who took multiple husbands in succession are mentioned in the ancient literary sources, I suspect – though this is by no means definitive – that Justin or Polybius would have made some note of such a monumental dynastic event as one sister being married to three brothers in succession. If Antiochus truly was inspired by the Ptolemaic model to such serial close endogamy, then he would have realized the importance of such a dynastic trait to the public image and *pompe* of the dynasty. As such we would expect these marriages to be advertised broadly, be it in inscriptions, numismatic iconography, or even the surname *philadelphus* but, alas, no such publicity appears. I find it difficult to believe that an event described by contemporary scholars as a monumental shift in dynastic policy would have completely slipped below the radar of the ancients.

That being said, I strongly agree with the identification of Laodice 19 as the wife of both Seleucus IV and Antiochus IV in succession. For this we need only to look at numismatic iconography for substantiation: in an article from 2002, Hoover compares portraits of a veiled queen that appear on coins struck by both Seleucus IV and Antiochus IV and concludes that the two women are one and the same. Seleucus IV would have prominently displayed his wife on his coinage to promote an

image of family solidarity that is in keeping with the general theme of rebuilding and consolidation that characterizes his reign as a whole. Antiochus IV, for his part, would have included her to legitimate his rule after he technically usurped the throne from the son of Seleucus. The levirate marriage of the widowed Laodice by Antiochus IV would have given a sense of continuity between the two brothers' reigns while bolstering Epiphanes' own legitimacy. Incidentally – and again this is a tenuous point but nonetheless one that ought to be made – the Laodice depicted on the coinage of Seleucus IV appears noticeably young, subtly reinforcing the notion that she is a younger bride taken from elsewhere and not the sister of Seleucus who would, by the time of his reign, have been roughly 25-30. All in all, I argue that Laodice, wife of Antiochus Neos, was not the same Laodice who married Seleucus IV and Antiochus IV in succession. Instead, this latter Laodice was taken from one of the many related dynasties that formed the Seleucid extended family and was married to Seleucus in accordance with the well-established habit of choosing wives from client dynasties as a means of reinforcing the central authority of the house.

At any rate, this Laodice IV, of unknown parentage, is recorded in OGIS 252 and *I Delos* 1497 (Grainger 1997, Laodice (15), 50). The couple had three attested children: an elder son Demetrius, younger son Antiochus, and daughter Laodice. Demetrius was sent as a hostage to Rome in 178 in accordance with the terms of the peace, where he would remain until 162 (Pol.31.2.5, App.Syr.45, Justin 34.3.6-8, Grainger 1997, 41).

Laodice, daughter of Seleucus IV and Laodice IV, was married to Perseus of Macedon as a striking sign of solidarity between the two houses in 177 B.C (Pol.26.7, Livy 42.12, Justin 35.1.2). Although many scholars have, in a similar technique to the aforementioned cross-identification of Laodice IV, presumed that this Laodice returned to Syria after Perseus' defeat and married her brother Demetrius, I reject this in accordance with the erudite arguments of Helliesen 1980.

On the death of his father his younger son Antiochus was made king after Rome refused to release his older brother Demetrius (Pol 31.12). The young king was briefly adopted as co-regent by his uncle Antiochus IV, until he was murdered after the birth of a son to Antiochus IV and Laodice IV (John of Antioch F58, Diod.30.7.2, Austin 138, Le Rider 1986, 409-17).

Antiochus IV Epiphanes

Ruled 175-164 b.c.

Son of Antiochus III and Laodice III

Married to Laodice IV, parentage unknown

- Antiochus V Eupator
- Other children?

Concubine (unknown)

- Alexander Balas
- Laodice

Son of Antiochus III and Laodice III, Antiochus IV - perhaps originally named Mithridates - had been a hostage in Rome and was in Athens at the time of his brother's death in 175 at the hands of his minister Heliodorus (App.Syr.45, Livy 33.19.9-10). He had been resident in Rome from 188-178 until he was replaced by his nephew Demetrius, in fulfillment of the terms of the Peace of Apamea (App.Syr.39, I Macc. 1.10-16, Grainger 1997, 25).

With the support of the Attalids, Antiochus invaded Syria, seized Antioch, and killed Heliodorus (Diod.30.7.2, John of Antioch F58, Grainger 1997, 25). He assumed the throne and essentially stepped into the place vacated by Seleucus IV by adopting his young son (and technically reigning king) Antiochus as his heir and co-regent, and married Laodice IV in a quintessential instance of levirate marriage (Le Rider 1986, 412-413, and Hoover 2002, 83-5). As soon as Laodice had given birth to a son, probably c.173, Antiochus did away with his nephew/co-regent and replaced him with his own son, also named Antiochus (Parker and Dubberstein 1946, 20-1, Le Rider 1986, 412. For a dissenting view on the identity of the co-regent, Aymard 1954). Laodice IV appears on the coinage of Antiochus IV as well, discussed by Hoover 2002.

As mentioned, the couple had one son, Antiochus V, and perhaps another son who appears on coinage discussed by Houghton and Le Rider, and identified as Anonymous 4 by Grainger 1997, 71. While some would hold that the Nysa who married Pharnaces of Pontus was a daughter of Antiochus IV, I agree with Ma's argument that she must be daughter of Antiochus III and that the inscription ought to be dated to around 195 (Ma 2000, 92).

Despite the protestations of ancient authors, I have little difficulty in attributing at the very least the paternity of Alexander Balas and Laodice to Antiochus IV, and please refer to the discussion of Balas for my supporting arguments.

The death of Antiochus IV in the East is discussed in great detail by Holleaux 1916, 77-95.

Demetrius I Soter

Ruled 161-152/1 b.c.

Son of Seleucus IV and Laodice IV

Married to Laodice V, parentage unknown

-Demetrius II Nicator = Cleopatra thea, Rhodogune of Parthia

-Antigonus (d. 152)

-Antiochus VII Sidetes = Cleopatra Thea

After the sudden death of his father in the East, Antiochus V Eupator came briefly to the throne for one year under the regency of Lysias. The young king's death was ordered by Demetrius - who allegedly could not be bothered to see the family of Antiochus IV - shortly after he arrived in Syria in 162 (Jos.AJ.12.390, App.Syr.66, Trog.Prol.34).

Eldest son of Seleucus IV and Laodice IV, by all accounts Demetrius I should have succeeded his father but first Rome's intervention in favour of his younger brother Antiochus, and then his uncle's usurpation, delayed his accession (Pol 31.12). After the death of Antiochus IV, Demetrius I's invasion

of Syria put an end to the brief reign of Antiochus V. After he seized Antioch, he killed Lysias and the family of Antiochus IV, purportedly without even seeing them (Jos.AJ.12.389-90, I Macc. 7.1-4, 2 Macc. 14.1-2, App.Syr.47, Eus.Chron.1.40.15, Livy.Epit.46)

While most scholars have presumed that he married his sister Laodice, widow of Perseus, after her return to Syria, I stand convinced by Helliesen's erudite argument that would scarcely have been possible. Instead, I suspect that he married one of any number of Laodices from the several related dynasties in or around the Seleucid empire, in a typical instance of Seleucid diplomatic marriage (Helliesen 1980). Though we cannot be certain of her parentage or descent, I believe we can safely presume that she was not his sister. That he married a Laodice is mentioned at Livy.Epit.50, and I agree with Ogden's suspicion that the names of her children perhaps divulge an Antigoniid background for Demetrius' wife (Ogden 1999, 147).

By this Laodice, he sired three sons: Demetrius II, Antigonus, and Antiochus VII Sidetes. Antigonus was later killed along with his mother in 152 by Ammonius, the minister of Alexander Balas (Liv.Epit.50).

In an attempt to renew the old Seleucid-Cappadocian alliance early in his reign, Demetrius offered Ariarathes V the hand of his sister (presumably) in marriage, though whether this passage refers to Laodice, former wife of Perseus, or another unattested sister is unclear. At any rate, the offer was declined, and out of anger Demetrius supported the bid of Orophernes for the Cappadocian throne. His plan, however, would not succeed (Hansen 1947, 118-21).

Demetrius II Nicator

Ruled 145-138 b.c., 129-125 b.c.

Son of Demetrius I and Laodice V

Married first to Cleopatra Thea, daughter of Ptolemy VI

- Seleucus V
- Antiochus VIII 'Grypus'
- Laodice = Phraates II of Parthia

Married second to Rhodogune of Parthia, daughter of Mithridates

- anonymous
- anonymous (App Syr 68)

As popular discontent both amongst the citizens of Syria and his former allies towards Alexander Balas translated into support for another potential claimant to the throne, Demetrius II became the new favourite in the dynastic arena. So unpopular was his predecessor that Demetrius II was given Balas' wife, Cleopatra Thea, along with the Seleucid throne and Ptolemaic endorsement in 148/7 (Just.AJ.13.108, Diod.32.37, Whitehorne 2001, 151). At this point, Demetrius would have been around 14, and Cleopatra Thea perhaps 19 (Ogden 1999, 148).

Cleopatra's second marriage proved somewhat more fertile and she gave birth to three children by Demetrius: the future (and ill-fated) Seleucus V, Antiochus VIII 'Grypus' - so named because of his

distinctive hooked nose - and a daughter, Laodice (Jos.AJ.13.10.1, App.Syr.68, Macurdy 1932, 96-9, Whitehorne 2001, 151-5, and Ogden 1999,

Although a fragment of John of Antioch (FGrH 4.561) mentions that an otherwise-unattested wife of Demetrius named Apama killed her son Seleucus in Damascus in 126, I believe that he - never amongst the most reliable of authors in such details - is incorrectly identifying Cleopatra Thea as Apama. Given that she is otherwise attested as having killed her son Seleucus V for taking the diadem without her endorsement, the error becomes quite apparent (App.Syr.68-9, Justin 39.1.9, Bellinger 1949, 59, and Ogden 1999, 148-50).

While on campaign in the East against the Parthians, Demetrius was captured by Phraates II in 139 and became a hostage at the Parthian court (Justin 36.1.2-6, 38.9.2-3, Jos.AJ.13.184-186). Despite two failed attempts at escape and rescue he remained in captivity, and was given a sister of Phraates, Rhodogune, to take as his Parthian wife in a scheme that seems to be an attempt by the Parthian King to gain a dynastic foothold amongst the Seleucids (Justin 36.9.3-10, App.Syr.67, Grainger 1997, 43, and Bellinger 1949, 58-9). Appian mentions at least two children from the pair, neither the gender nor the name of either is known (App.Syr.68).

Cleopatra, during the captivity of Demetrius, married his brother Antiochus VII. Though Appian would have us believe that she played the part of the jilted lover after Demetrius' marriage to Rhodogune, that she bore his brother several children and later condemned Demetrius to death by shutting him out of Ptolemais-Ake after he returned from Parthia, speak against such a notion (App.Syr.68, Livy.Epit.60). Cleopatra herself would later be forced to drink the very poison with which she had hoped to murder another pretentious son, Antiochus VIII, when her plan was discovered (Justin 39.2).

Laodice, the daughter of Cleopatra Thea and Demetrius II, was brought by her uncle Antiochus VII on his expedition to the East and was captured by the Parthians c.129 B.C. (Justin 38.10.10, Eus.Chron.1.40.19). According to Justin, after she was brought into the *harem* of the Parthian King, he quickly fell in love with and married her (Macurdy 1932, 98).

[Alexander I Balas](#)

Ruled 152-145 b.c.

Son of Antiochus IV, mother unknown

**Married to Cleopatra Thea, daughter of Ptolemy VI
-Antiochus VI Dionysus**

Son of Antiochus IV and an unknown mother, perhaps the concubine Antiochis mentioned in II.Macc.4.30. Ogden 1999, 143-5, and Dodd 2009, 99-103 provide the best review of ancient and modern discussions of his potential paternity. Josephus (AJ 13.103) and I.Macc. 10.1 support his claim to descent from Antiochus IV, while Polybius seems rather more skeptical (33.18) and Appian outright states that he was lying (Syr.67). To consider him a son, by either a concubine or another wife, of Antiochus IV is not in my mind a far-fetched conclusion. He enjoyed the support of the Attalids and the acknowledgment of the Roman Senate at Livy.Epit.52, though of course both parties

could have supported him out of sheer self-interest. A point raised by Dodd seems to me particularly simple yet convincing: his marriage to Cleopatra Thea must be at least an implicit recognition from the Ptolemies of his legitimacy, as the Ptolemies would never have contemplated marrying one of their princesses off to a mere commoner, no matter what his political utility (Dodd 2009, 100-101). This, along with Ogden's comments, make it difficult to deny him at least some shred of legitimacy through Antiochus IV (Ogden 1999, 143-6).

The preceding identification aside, in terms of genealogy his reign is rather straightforward: as a sign of Ptolemaic endorsement of his claim to the throne and in addition to the financial and military support he had already received, Balas was married to Cleopatra Thea, daughter of Ptolemy VI, at Ptolemais in 150 B.C. (Jos.AJ.13.109-110, Diod.32.9c, App.Syr.67, Justin 35.2.3-4, Grainger 1997, 6-7). From there he invaded Syria, took over Antioch, and seized the throne. Cleopatra Thea would have been barely fourteen or fifteen years old at the time, and her introduction into the house of Seleucus would have far-reaching dynastic implications (Whitehorne 2001, 150, and Bevan 1902a, 2.212).

The couple only had one child, a son named Antiochus VI Dionysus, who was residing with a foster arab chieftain at the time of his father's death (Diod.32.9d, Jos.AJ.13.131, Eus.Chron.1.40.17). The young boy reigned only briefly (145-142) under the regency of the to-be usurper Diodotus/Tryphon, and later died mysteriously during a surgical procedure. Ancient and modern commentators alike have little difficulty in identifying Diodotus as the likely perpetrator (Jos.AJ.13.145-7).

Antiochus VII 'Sidetes'

Ruled 138-129 b.c.

Son of Demetrius I and Laodice V

Married to Cleopatra Thea, daughter of Ptolemy VI

-Laodice

-Laodice

-Antiochus IX Cyzicenus = Cleopatra IV

-Antiochus

Son of Demetrius I and Laodice V, Antiochus VII Sidetes - so nicknamed because of his residence in the city of Side - was sent away to Pamphylia as the tide of his father's reign began to turn for the worse (Grainger 1997, 29-30). He remained there during the reconquest and first reign of Demetrius II (Por.F32.6, App.Syr.68).

When Demetrius II was captured by the Parthians in 139 and the Seleucid kingdom was left without a monarch, its queen was similarly left without a husband. The ever-endeavouring Cleopatra Thea, either believing Demetrius II lost or simply taking matters into her own hands, invited the young Sidetes to come to Seleucia-in-Pieria, marry her, and in so doing assume the Seleucid diadem (Jos.AJ. 13.222-223, App.Syr.68, Whitehorne 2001, 154). The marriage occurred in roughly 138 B.C., when Cleopatra Thea - now on her third husband - would have been about 27, and Antiochus in his late teens (Whitehorne 2001, 154, and Ogden 1999, 149-50). This represents the third marriage of the polyandrous Seleucid/Ptolemaic woman, this time to the brother of her previous husband.

Our sources present us with five attested children from the marriage: two daughters named Laodice, a young Antiochus who would become Antiochus IX Cyzicenus, another son Antiochus, and a Seleucus (Por.F32.20, Eus.Chron.1.257, and App.Syr.68. Also Macurdy 1932, 99). I agree with Ogden's conclusion that Porphyry mistook Seleucus, the son of Demetrius II who would later be murdered by his mother, for a son of Antiochus VII and Cleopatra Thea (Ogden 1999, 150). Appian's reference to the pair only having one son, Antiochus, indirectly supports this (App.Syr.68).

The two Laodices and the younger Antiochus are recorded as having died of disease at a relatively young age (Eus.Chron.1.257 = Por.F32.20, Bellinger 1949, 60n4). Antiochus IX was raised under the tutelage of the loyal eunuch Craterus in the city of Cyzicus, hence his nickname.

Antiochus VII set out on campaign in the East at the head of a massive army, presumably with the dual goal of recapturing Seleucid territory and freeing his brother Demetrius. It would be incorrect, I believe, to argue that Antiochus VII ever harboured any ill-will towards his captive brother, especially considering he was careful to bring his brother's son Seleucus V and daughter Laodice along with him to Parthia (Justin 38.10.2-10, Whitehorne 2001, 155). Antiochus VII was killed in battle in the East around 130, along with a sizeable portion of his army (Athenaeus 10.439e, Ogden 1999, 150-1).

Antiochus IX Cyzicenus

Ruled 116-95 b.c.

Son of Antiochus VII and Cleopatra Thea

Married first to Cleopatra IV, daughter of Ptolemy VIII

-Antiochus X Eusebes

Married second to Brittane, daughter of Arsaces the Parthian?

-no attested children

Married third to Cleopatra Selene, daughter of Ptolemy VIII

-no attested children

A son of Antiochus VII and Cleopatra Thea who was sent to Cyzicus for protection after the death of his father and the return to power of his uncle Demetrius II from Parthia. His claim to the throne was given the potential to be realized when events in Egypt yet again spilled over into the Syrian milieu, with dramatic consequences for the Seleucids.

The domineering Cleopatra III forced her son Ptolemy IX to divorce his beloved sister and wife Cleopatra IV in favour of another sister, Cleopatra Selene. Essentially dismissed by her mother, Justin recounts how the jilted bride sought some measure of retribution in Syria. She married the promising Cyzicenus, and gave him an army she had brought from Cyprus as both a dowry and a means by which his claim might be realized (Justin 39.3.2-4). The marriage took place in roughly 113 B.C.

The marriage produced one attested son, the pithily-nicknamed Antiochus X Eusebes Philopator (Por.F32.25, App.Syr.69).

After his defeat by his half-brother Antiochus VIII, his wife was brutally murdered at the instigation of her sister Tryphaena in a saga recounted by Justin 39.3.7-12. I agree with Ogden's presumption that the now-eligible Antiochus would have remained without a wife until his next recorded marriage in 96, and John Malalas' mention of another wife named Brittane, daughter of Arsaces the Parthian, seems to provide a likely candidate (Ogden 1999, 156). Nonetheless this is a fairly speculative pairing and I give it little analytical weight.

After the death of Antiochus Grypus in 96/5 B.C, Cleopatra Selene gave herself in marriage to his half-brother Antiochus IX (Porphyry F32.30, 32.24, App.Syr.69, Grainger 1997, 32-3).. Antiochus, as Ogden notes, would have been eager at the added claim to Grypus' throne that came with the princess (Ogden 1999, 156-7). The union had neither time to endure nor produce children, as Antiochus IX died the same year.

Related Dynasties

The House of Achaeus

Achaeus 'The Elder' = GP Akhaïos (S5), DNP Achaeus [4]

Dates of birth and death unknown
(330 b.c. - 260 b.c.?)

Married to Laodice, daughter of Seleucus I
(c. 295 b.c?)

- Alexander, Satrap of Sardis
- Laodice = Antiochos II Theos
- Antiochis = Attalus of Pergamon

Achaeus, here named 'the Elder' is a figure who has long haunted the footnotes of Seleucid scholarship without ever having stepped into the light of scholarly attention on his own. His shadowy presence in Seleucid historiography is the reflection of the precious few pieces of scattered evidence that relate to a figure named Achaeus, but that ultimately allow only glimpses of his legacy and never of the man himself. The later prominence of his progeny, their numerous ties to the royal family itself, and their pre-eminence in the Seleucid government of Asia Minor have led a century and a half of Hellenistic historians to presume, albeit conditionally and speculatively, that this Achaeus figure must have had some deeper connection the Seleucid house than mere loyalty; indeed such a subsequent pedigree, many have surmised, must imply that our Achaeus was an unattested son of Nicator himself. So in the midst of opinions and hypotheses from Bouché-Leclercq (2.n73), Beloch (GG IV.2.204-6), Bevan (1.157, 1.202, and 1.269n3), Billows (1995, 97), and other hints from Grainger, Dodd, and others, we now put forward a new reconstruction which features a piece of evidence that has generally been overlooked since Bevan's magnificent 1902 *House of Seleucus*. While this is by no means conclusive or free of the speculation that has always blanketed Achaeus, at the very least we hope it to be a salutary contribution to the debate.

Beginning with the most basic element of what we know about him leads us nowhere. The name Achaeus (vel Achaïos, Achaeos) is one that does not appear with any popularity during the Classical or early Hellenistic period, and our Achaeus is amongst the first recorded individuals to bear the name. Out of the 42 Achaïoi attested in the LPGN, only two pre-date the period which we hypothesize for the life of our Achaeus – one in Athens, and one in Thessaly. Onomastic research gives us little if any insight into his geographical or ethnic origins, save for providing the illuminating observation that his name is one that becomes, if not popular, far more prominent during the Hellenistic period. Little surprise, given the territorial reference inherent in the name, and ‘achaios’ common use as denoting a Greek residing in a non-Greek milieu (LSJ s.v. ‘achaios’). In short, the only conclusion that we can safely derive from his name is that he was Greek.

Discussions of Achaeus begin with the one seemingly concrete piece of evidence we have regarding the man: an inscription from near Laodicea-on-the-Lycos, dated to January 267, in which a certain Achaeus is described as the ‘kyrios tou topou’ – ‘the lord of the region’ and is honoured by the inhabitants of two villages on his estates for having ransomed captives from the invading Galatians. The inscription itself is best discussed by Worrie 1975, and we defer to his masterly analysis of its contents and context. This inscription, along with mentions of his children by Strabo (13.264) and Eusebius (1.251) comprises the entirety of the ancient record for this man’s existence as discussed by most scholars. Slim evidence, to be sure, though such is the nature of any enquiry into the Seleucid realm.

There is one aspect that has generally been overlooked, save for a footnote in volume I of Bevan (1.269n3). Strabo at 11.10.1-2, while describing the Eastern province of Aria (now modern-day Afghanistan) describes three cities which, according to him, were ‘named after their founders:’ Alexandria, Artacena, and Achaea. The city of Achaea is also mentioned in App.Syr.57 in which he attributes the city’s foundation to the reign of Seleucus Nicator.

Based on such evidence, Monica d’Agostini and I posit the following reconstruction. Given his name, his martial character, his mention in Greek sources and greek inscriptions, and what we believe to be a close proximity to Seleucus himself and later the royal family, we believe Achaeus himself to be Greek, and likely Macedonian.

The dates for his career and his life hinge on our identification of him as either the founder of Achaea in Aria, as well as on the later dates of his children. The city of Achaea, in what is now in North-Western Afghanistan, is amongst the last of a string of Seleucid city foundations stretching from Babylon into Bactria which we can attribute to the reign of Seleucus I, specifically to his campaigns in the East after he took the Diadem around 305 (campaign from 308-302; for city foundations cf. Cohen 1978, 12-19). Achaeus thus would likely have been a general or trusted commander of Seleucus throughout the course of his monumental, but scarcely documented, campaign of consolidation in the Eastern Seleucid realm.

But this at first strikes one who is familiar with the Hellenistic world as either odd or implausible: why would a city be named after a general, not the king himself? Though such an event is unusual it is not without precedent: the cities of Lysias, Philomelion, and Dokimeion, and later Themisonion were likely founded not by the successor kings, but by their generals or petty splinter dynasts (Cohen 1995, 297-312). Of these four examples, three date to the first generation of the diadochoi, and two of them – Lysias and Philomelion – were founded by generals of Seleucus either with royal consent

or shortly after they withdrew themselves from the Seleucid fold. Cohen's observation that at the period in which these cities were founded – around 310-300 – merits repetition: 'it is possible that the distinction of king, prince, dynast, and agent, and the responsibilities of each, were not fully defined at the time.' (Cohen 1995, 297). Though not commonplace, it is nevertheless quite possible and perhaps plausible that Achaeus founded the city of Achaea in Aria between 307 and 302 B.C, as we believe he did.

To have founded such a city, Achaeus must have at the very least been of age; one cannot imagine a teenage establishing an eponymous foundation in the East. If we presume him to be around 25 this would place his birth c.330, thus making him not part of the original generation of Macedonians that invaded the East, but the next. The young Achaeus presumably rose through the military ranks of the Macedonian phalanx and came to the attention of Seleucus I, gaining steady prominence as he proved himself in Seleucus' early campaigns and especially later in the East.

Achaeus' years of service under Seleucus I were rewarded with an eponymous city foundation in the East, and perhaps a grant of land as well. The mention of his son Alexander, the Seleucid satrap of Sardis during the reign of Antiochus II, in the decrees of the Indian King Ashoka further suggests an eastern connection for the family (Merkelbach 2000). His stay in the East was not permanent, however, as he would have accompanied Seleucus I on his march to reconsolidate his Western domains against the other *diadochoi* in the winter of 302.

Our Achaeus would have found his way into Anatolia during the campaigns against Antigonos at Ipsus in 301, and then against Lysimachus at the Battle of Corupedium, which in turn gained Anatolia for Seleucus and his dynasty. Helend Lund's analysis of Asia Minor during the reign of Lysimachus and the struggle between Antigonos and Lysimachus for prominence in Anatolia leaves us little reason to presume that Achaeus was a defector after either Ipsus or Corupedium, especially given mention of other such defectors amongst whom our Achaeus is conspicuously absent (Lund 1992, 180-200; and Billows 1995, 90-6).

Achaeus was thus, we argue, given the estate near what would become Laodicea on the Lykos as both a reward for his years of service to the Seleucid house, and as his next task of governance, by Seleucus shortly after Corupedium and before his assassination by Ptolemy Ceraunus, c. 279. It was thus as the well-established 'kyrios tou topou' that he appears in the inscription of 267, by this point an aged man, but one whose power, influence, and renown had been cemented over the previous decade.

But the estates in Lycia were not, we believe, the only gift bestowed on Achaeus by Seleucus I. It is from the later prominence of his family, specifically their recurrent marriages to royal houses within one generation, that other scholars have drawn their conclusion that Achaeus must have been a son of Seleucus I. The arguments against this hypothesis have recently been repeated by Grainger, amongst others, and need not be repeated in full here save for the patent observations that if Achaeus were a son of Seleucus we would expect some mention of him in the literary sources, and we would certainly expect him to use royal titles in the epigraphic record. We, however, advocate a different vector of relation to the main house.

Observing the names of his attested descendants, one characteristic immediately stands in stark relief: all of the female members of his extended family have quintessentially Seleucid names, in this case two Laodices and one Antiochis. The men, however, do not display any of the nomenclature

typical of the royal household – a pattern that we see recur amongst every client dynasty of the Seleucids into which a Seleucid princess married (cf other stemmata for comparison). Thus we believe that he was not a son of Seleucus I, but rather was married to a Seleucid princess as both a reward and guarantor of his continued loyalty in a mechanism discussed by McAuley 2012.

Based on the ages of his sons and daughters, Achaeus must have been married c.290 and thus before he acquired his holdings in Anatolia. The precise identity of his Seleucid bride cannot be known, save for the certain observation that she must have been of royal stock given the apparent desirability of an Achaeid (to coin the adjective) bride amongst the Attalids and, moreover, the Seleucids themselves (Two Laodices, wives of Antiochus II and Seleucus II). The hint, however, lies in the names of her daughters: we think it highly likely that Achaeus was married to a Seleucid princess named Laodice, and, in this case, the most likely candidate would be Laodice, the daughter of Seleucus I and Apama and thus sister of Antiochus I, who is mentioned by John Malalas and Eustathius (cf stemma of the early Seleucids).

He and his wife Laodice produced three attested children – Antiochis, Alexander, and Laodice – between roughly 290 and 275; the lives and careers of each are discussed independently.

Antiochis of Pergamon

Queen of Pergamon

born c. 290-285, date of death unknown

Daughter of Achaeus the Elder and Laodice

Married to Attalus of Pergamon, c.271

-Attalus I of Pergamon

-Other children unknown

Daughter of Achaeus and Laodice, Antiochis must have been born in relatively short order after the marriage of her parents, making her perhaps the oldest child of the family. The date of the accession of her son Attalus I gives us a *terminus ante quem* for her birth and her marriage: according to Strabo, Attalus I was 28 when he inherited the kingdom following the death of Eumenes in 241 (Strabo 13.4.2 = 13.624), and thus he must have been born around 269, placing the marriage of his mother in 270 at the latest.

Thus we can conclude that Antiochis was born around 290-285, with the ambiguity accounting for the uncertainty regarding her precise age at marriage. At any rate, Strabo (13.4.2) tells us that Antiochis, daughter of Achaeus, married Attalus the adoptive son of Philetaerus in a union that we can place around 271 B.C. Given Attalus' position in Pergamon, and what would have been the well-established power of Achaeus and his family in the environs of Pergamon, I see little reason why we cannot readily equate the Achaeus mentioned here by Strabo mentioned with our 'Achaeus the Elder.'

The choice of bride was sage, given the dynamics of power within Asia Minor at the time, and the fact that such a match was made while both Attalus and Achaeus remained ultimately loyal to Seleucid overlordship reveals the depth of local autonomy enjoyed by Seleucid client dynasts in Asia

Minor. That Antiochis would be chosen as a suitable bride for the emergent royal house of the Attalids is testament to her own pedigree, and further strengthens the presumption of a connection between the House of Achaeus and the Seleucid Royal line (Bevan 1902, 1.195-200; Hansen 1947, 28-9; Beloch GG IV 205). Her quintessentially Seleucid only bolsters this conclusion further.

Attalus I, who ruled Pergamon from 241-197 B.C., is the only attested child of the marriage.

Alexander, son of Achaeus the Elder = GP Alexander (O1)

Son of Achaeus and Laodike, and based on the dates of his later career he must have been born around 285 to his parents who were at this point consolidating the family's hold on southern Asia Minor, under Seleucid suzerainty.

We know nothing of his early life until he appears as the Seleucid governor of Sardis in a series of inscriptions ranging from 261 – 244 B.C., in which he acts as a Seleucid official determining land allotments to veterans near Magnesia (OGIS 229 = I. Magnesia am Sipylus no. 1). Other inscriptions from the period further identify him as a prominent Seleucid official in Asia Minor during the reign of Antiochus II and beyond, acting as Satrap of Sardis and commander of military forces in the region (Syll3 n.426 = I lasos II no. 608; I Tralles no. 25; Grainger 1997, 75) His power base seems to have extended from Sardis into Caria, based on a decree of Bargylia honouring a judge from Teos which describes him as having been 'left behind' by Antiochus I (Teos.Syll.426, lines 21-2; Hansen 1947, 34).

Alexander's renown appears to have extended far beyond Asia Minor, as R. Merkelbach hypothesises (correctly, I believe) that the 'Alexander' mentioned in the decree of King Ashoka was Alexander of Sardis, not Alexander of Epirus as scholarly consensus had previously held (Merkelbach 2000). Such a connection between Alexander and the royalty of the Far East emerged, I would presume, out of his father's service in the East under Seleucus I, which would perhaps have put the family in contact with royalty beyond the Seleucid pale.

The mention of Alexander in a fragment of Porphyry (F 32.8) as the brother of Laodice, wife of Antiochus II, allows us to identify him as another son of Achaeus the Elder and Laodice. The same fragment of Porphyry mentions Antiochus Hierax had the support and alliance of Alexander, who was in turn the brother of his mother Laodice. This, along with Polyaeus' mention (4.17) of Andromachus and Achaeus the Younger fighting on the side of Seleucus II, allows us to postulate a split within the family during the War of the Brothers. In this case, Alexander and Laodice would have taken the side of Hierax based in Sardis, while Andromachus and Achaeus would have remained loyal to Seleucus II (Walbank 1957, 1.501; Schmitt 1964, 30-31; Worrie 1975, 59-87). This notion is further reinforced by Appian's (App.Syr.57) mention that in the aftermath of the Third Syrian War Laodice

After the death of Antiochus Hierax and the conclusion of the War of the Brothers Alexander presumably returned to the side of Seleucus II, Andromachus, and Achaeus, and the rift within the family was closed. Such speculation, however, is ultimately as hypothetical as the exact nature of Alexander's role in the conduct of the War itself.

We have no mention of any spouse or issue for Alexander.

Andromachus

General of Seleucus II

c.275(?) - ???

Married to unknown wife, c.255

-Laodice

-Achaeus 'The Younger'

Of Andromachus' precise place within the *stemma* of the House of Achaeus we cannot be certain, save to say that he was indeed a member of the family either directly descended from the main line or a corollary. The dates of his life, as far as I can conjecture, would make attributing his paternity to Achaeus the Elder plausible but by no means certain. Rather we must content ourselves with identifying him as part of the dynasty, with the ambiguity of the identification representing the ambiguity of our sources.

Nevertheless by working backwards from the more prominent (and datable) actions of his controversial son, the would-be usurper Achaeus the Younger, we can sketch a chronological picture of his life. Polyaeus 4.17 mentions that Andromachus and his son Achaeus were prominent generals loyal to Seleucus II during the War of the Brothers, specifically in a campaign that we can date to roughly 227 B.C. I agree completely with Billows' reconstruction proceeding from there: given that Achaeus, his son, was a general by 228 he must have been at the very least 20 years of age, and thus would have been born by 250 at the absolute latest. His father, hence, would have been married before 250, placing his birth anywhere from 280-270, which, although this aligns neatly with the childbearing years of Achaeus and Laodice, permits us little further speculation (Billows 1995 98 n.52, Polyaeus 4.17).

We know nothing of whom Andromachus married, though of course the possibility might well exist that he married a daughter of Achaeus and thus entered the family, rather than being born into the pedigree. Nevertheless we can presume that he was married sometime around 260-250, and the union certainly produced Achaeus (whom we have coined 'the Younger'), and perhaps Laodice, who would go on to marry Seleucus II. I defer to my listing of Seleucus II for the controversy and divergent viewpoints regarding the identity of this Laodice contained elsewhere on this site.

As I noted above, Andromachus is listed as a general of Seleucus II fighting against Antiochus Hierax during the War of the Brothers; an allegiance that would have put him in opposition to the other branch of the family which supported Antiochus Hierax, represented by his mother Laodice and uncle Alexander of Sardis. Polyaeus mentions the father-son pair of Seleucid generals in the context of Hierax's flight into Mesopotamia and subsequent deception of them. For further details of this potential split within the family cleft by the War of the Brothers, please refer to our discussion of 'Alexander of Sardis'

Our identification of Andromachus as a general of Seleucus II is further bolstered by Polybius' identification of him as such at 4.51.4 and 8.22.11. That he was potentially the father-in-law of his king would have further augmented his prestige within the Seleucid court, and at any rate he hailed from what was by now a well-established family of Seleucid officials who were directly related to the main house – the only one of its sort in the entire Empire.

Andromachus' fortunes changed after his defeat in Armenia in 221, during which he was captured by the Ptolemies and held in Egypt as leverage for what appears to be an alliance between his son and the Ptolemies. For details of this Ptolemaic chapter in the life of Andromachus, please refer to our forthcoming discussion in McAuley and d'Agostini 2013.

Mithridatids of Pontus

Ariarathids of Cappadocia

Bibliography

Ager, S.L. (2005), 'Familiarity Breeds: Incest and the Ptolemaic Dynasty', *JHS* 125, 1-34.

Austin, M.M. (2006), *The Hellenistic World From Alexander to the Roman Conquest*, 2nd edition, Cambridge.

Aymard, A. (1940), 'La mort d'Antiochus, fils d'Antiochus III Mégas', *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 66, 89-95.

Aymard, A. (1953), 'Autour de l'avènement d'Antiochos IV', *Historia* 2, 49-73.

Badian, E. (2000), 'Darius III', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 100, 241-267.

Bellinger, A.R. (1945), 'King Antiochus in 151/0 B.C.', *Hesperia* 14, 58-59.

Bellinger, A.R. (1949), 'The End of the Seleucids', *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 38, 51-102.

Bevan, E.R. (1902a), *The House of Seleucus*, London.

Bevan, E.R. (1902b), 'Antiochos III and His Title "Great King"', *JHS* 22, 241-244.

Bielman Sánchez, A. (2003), 'Régner au féminin. Réflexions sur les reines attalides et séleucides', in F. Prost (ed.), *L'Orient méditerranéen de la mort d'Alexandre aux campagnes de Pompée*, Rennes, 41-64.

Bikerman, E. (1938), *Institutions des Séleucides*, Paris.

Boiy, T. (2000), 'Dating Methods during the Early Hellenistic Period', *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 52, 115-121.

Bosworth, A.B., and Wheatley, P.V. (1998), 'The Origins of the Pontic House', *JHS* 118, 155-164.

Bouché-Leclercq, A. (1913), *Histoire des Séleucides*, Paris.

Breebaart, A.B. (1967), 'King Seleucus I, Antiochus, and Stratonice', *Mnemosyne* 20, 154-164.

Brosius, M. (1996), *Women in Ancient Persia, 559-331 B.C.*, Oxford.

Burrows, M. (1940a), 'Levirate Marriage in Israel', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 59, 23-33.

Burrows, M. (1940b), 'The Ancient Oriental Background of Hebrew Levirate Marriage', *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 77, 2-15.

Capdetry, L. (2007), *Le pouvoir séleucide: territoire, administration, et finances d'un royaume hellénistique*, Rennes.

Carney, E.D. (1991), "'What's in a Name?': The emergence of a Title for Royal Women in the Hellenistic Period', in S.B. Pomeroy (ed.), *Women's History and Ancient History*, Chapel Hill, 153-173.

Carney, E.D. (1992), 'The Politics of Polygamy: Olympias, Alexander, and the Murder of Philip', *Historia* 41, 169-189.

Carney, E.D. (1995), 'Women and *Basileia*: Legitimacy and Female Political Action in Macedonia', *CJ* 90, 367-391.

Carney, E.D. (1996), 'Alexander and Persian Women', *AJP* 117, 563-83.

Carney, E.D. (2000), 'The Initiation of Cult for Royal Macedonian Women', *CP* 95, 21-43.

Carney, E.D. (2005), 'Women and *Dunasteia* in Caria', *AJP* 126, 65-91.

Carney, E.D. (2011), 'Being Royal and Being Female in the Early Hellenistic Period', in A. Erskine and L. Llewellyn-Jones (eds), *Creating a Hellenistic World*, Swansea, 195-220.

Charpentier, J. (1931), 'Antiochus, King of the Yavanas', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, University of London* 6, 303-321.

Cohen, G.M. (1973), 'The Marriage of Lysimachus and Nicaea', *Historia* 22, 354-6.

Cook, J.M. (1983), *The Persian Empire*, London.

Debord, P. (2003), 'le culte royal chez les séleucides', in F.Prost (ed.), *L'Orient Méditerranée de la mort d'Alexandre aux campagnes de Pompée*, Rennes, 281-308.

Dodd, R. (2009), 'Coinage and Conflict: The Manipulation of Seleucid Political Imagery', PhD dissertation, University of Glasgow.

Downey, G. (1961), *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest*, Princeton.

Erciyas, D.B. (2006), *Wealth, Aristocracy, and Royal Propaganda under the Hellenistic Kingdom of the Mithradatids in the Central Black Sea Region of Turkey*, Leiden.

Ferguson, W.S. (1906), 'The Permatute Deification of Eumenes II', *CP* 1, 231-234.

Gora, D., and Horowitz, W. (1997), 'Antiochus IV in Life and Death: Evidence from the Babylonian Astronomical Diaries', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 117, 240-252.

Grainger, J.D. (1990), *Seleukos I Nikator*, London.

Grainger, J.D. (1997), *A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer*, Leiden.

Grainger, J.D. (2010), *The Syrian Wars*, Leiden.

Greenwalt, W.S. (1988), 'The Marriageability Age at the Argead Court: 360-317 B.C.', *The Classical World* 82, 93-97.

Hansen, E.V. (1947), *The Attalids of Pergamon*, Ithaca.

Heckel, W. (1978), 'Kleopatra or Eurydike?', *Phoenix* 32, 155-8.

Helliesen, J.M. (1980), 'A Note on Laodice Number Twenty', *CJ* 75, 295-298.

Holleaux, M. (1912), 'Ardys et Mithridates', *Hermes* 47, 481-491.

Holleaux, M. (1916), 'La mort d'Antiochus IV Épiphanès', *REA* 18, 77-102.

Hoover, O.D. (2002), 'Two Seleucid Notes: II. Laodice IV on the Bronze Coinage of Seleucus IV and Antiochus IV', *AJN* 14, 81-87.

Hoover, O.D. (2005), 'Dethroning Seleucus VIII Philometor (Cybiosactes): Epigraphical Arguments against a Late Seleucid Monarch', *ZPE* 105, 95-99.

Jones, C.P. (1993), 'The Decree of Illion in Honor of a King Antiochus', *GRBS* 34, 93-92.

Le Rider, G. (1986), 'l'enfant-roi Antiochus et la reine Laodice', *BCH* 110, 409-417.

Le Rider, G., and Houghton, A. (1988), 'Un premier règne d'Antiochus VIII Épiphanès à Antioche en 128', *BCH* 112, 401-411.

Lockheart, P.N. (1961), 'The Laodice Inscription from Didyma', *AJP* 82, 188-92.

Ma, John (2000), *Antiochus III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford.

Macurdy, G.H. (1927), 'Eurydice and the Evidence for Woman Power in Early Macedonia', *AJP* 48, 201-214.

Macurdy, G.H. (1932), *Hellenistic Queens: A Study of Woman-Power in Macedonia, Seleucid Syria, and Ptolemaic Egypt*, Boston.

Macurdy, G.H. (1937), *Vassal Queens and Some Contemporary Women in the Roman Empire*, Boston.

March, J. (1998), *The Cassell Dictionary of Classical Mythology*, London.

McGing, B.C. (1986b) "The Kings of Pontus: Some Problems of Identity and Date." *RhMus* 129: 246–59.

Melville, S.C. (2004), 'Neo-Assyrian Women and Male Identity: Status as a Social Tool', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 124, 37-57.

Middleton, R. (1962), 'Brother-Sister and Father-Daughter Marriage in Ancient Egypt', *American Sociological Review* 27, 603-611.

Muccioli, F. (1994), 'Considerazioni generali sull'epiteto φιλαδέλφος nelle dinastie ellenistiche e sulla sua applicazione nella titolatura degli ultimi Seleucidi', *Historia* 43, 402-422.

Murray, M. (1915), 'Royal Marriages and Matrilineal Descent', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 45, 307-325.

Nourse, K.L. (2002), 'Women and the Early Development of Royal Power in the Hellenistic East', PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Ogden, D. (1999), *Polygamy, Prostitutes, and Death: The Hellenistic Dynasties*, Swansea.

Olmstead, A.T. (1937), 'Cuneiform Texts and Hellenistic Chronology', *CP* 32, 1-14.

Parker, R.A., and Dubberstein, W.H. (1946), *Babylonian Chronology 626 B.C.-A.D. 45*, 2nd edition, Chicago.

Perdrizet, P., and Homolle, T. (1895), 'Décrets en l'honneur d'Ariarathe V et Nysa', *BCH* 19, 540-545.

Pomeroy, S.B. (1990), *Women in Hellenistic Egypt: From Alexander to Cleopatra*, Detroit.

Reinach, S. (1887), 'Le père et la mère de Mithridate Eupator', *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 31, 170.

Reinach, T. (1906), 'Remarques sur le décret d'Athènes en l'honneur de Pharnace Ier', *BCH* 30, 46-51.

Sachs, A.J., and Wiseman, D.J. (1954), 'A Babylonian King List of the Hellenistic Period', *Iraq* 16, 202-212.

Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H. (1983), 'Exit Atossa: Images of Women in Greek Historiography on Persia', in A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt (eds), *Images of Women in Antiquity*, London, 20-33.

Schulman, A.R. (1979), 'Diplomatic Marriage in the Egyptian New Kingdom', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 38, 177-93.

Sherwin-White, S. (1983a), 'Babylonian Chronicle Fragments as a Source for Seleucid History', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 42, 265-270.

Sherwin-White, S. (1983b), 'Ritual for a Seleucid King at Babylon?', *JHS* 103, 156-159.

Sherwin-White, S., and Kuhrt, A. (1991), 'Aspects of Seleucid Royal Ideology: The Cylinder of Antiochus I from Borsippa', *JHS* 111, 71-86.

Sherwin-White, S., and Kuhrt, A. (1993), *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*, London.

Slotkin, J.S. (1947), 'On a Possible Lack of Incest Regulations in Old Iran', *American Anthropologist* 49, 612-617.

Stechow, W. (1945), 'The Love of Antiochus with Faire Stratonica', *The Art Bulletin* 27, 221-237.

Tarn, W.W. (1929), 'Queen Ptolemais and Apama', *CQ* 23, 138-141.

van den Berghe, P.L., and Mesher, G.M. (1980), 'Royal Incest and Inclusive Fitness', *American Ethnologist* 7, 300-317.

van Nuffelen, P. (2004), 'Le culte royal de l'empire des séleucides: une réinterprétation', *Historia* 43, 278-301.

Vadegeerde, P.-Y. (1984), 'Portraits des rois séleucides', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 62, 59-78.

Waters, M. (2004), 'Cyrus and the Achaemenids', *Iran* 42, 91-102.

Whitehorne, J. (2001), *Cleopatras*, London.

Will, É. (1962), 'Les premières années du règne d'Antiochos III (223-219 av. J-C)', *RÉG* 75, 72-129.

