

The reigns of Antiochus VIII and Antiochus IX at Antioch and Tarsus

Autor(en): **Houghton, Arthur**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau = Revue suisse de numismatique = Rivista svizzera di numismatica**

Band (Jahr): **72 (1993)**

PDF erstellt am: **19.09.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-175380>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern. Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

ARTHUR HOUGHTON

THE REIGNS OF ANTIOCHUS VIII AND ANTIOCHUS IX
AT ANTIOCH AND TARSUS¹

Plates 1–3

Tetradrachms of Uncertain North Syrian Origin, c. 121–96 B.C.

There are few periods of Seleucid history more troubled and more difficult to interpret than the years between 114 B.C. and 95 B.C., when Antiochus VIII Grypus and his half-brother and rival claimant to the throne, Antiochus IX Cyzicenus, fought each other across Syria, Cilicia, and Phoenicia in a struggle for power that encompassed the entire kingdom, destroyed what little cohesion was left to the Seleucid state, and led directly to the disintegration and final extinction of the Seleucid monarchy a half-century later.

Exactly what occurred during this period is not known. The few historical sources speak in vague and imprecise terms of the wars between Grypus and Cyzicenus,² and contemporary documentation is very fragmentary and only partially helpful. The coins remain the principal means to clarify the history of the period.

In certain areas, the numismatic evidence is specific. Most mints in southern Syria, Coele-Syria and Phoenicia, produced currency that was dated in accordance with the Seleucid calendar, whose first year (Year 1) equates with 312/311 B.C. Damascus, Sidon, Ake-Ptolemais and Ascalon all issued dated coins, and enough examples have now been recovered to give a reasonably clear picture of the succession of reigns of

¹ Abbreviations used in this article are:

- Bellinger A.R. Bellinger, *The End of the Seleucids*, Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences 38 (June 1949), pp. 51–102.
CSE A. Houghton, *Coins of the Seleucid Empire*, ACNAC 4 (New York 1983).
LSM E.T. Newell, *Late Seleucid Mints in Ake-Ptolemais and Damascus*, NNM 84 (New York 1939).
SMA E.T. Newell, *The Seleucid Mint of Antioch*, AJN 51 (New York 1917–1918), pp. 1–151.

I am grateful to Georges Le Rider for reading an early version of this paper and providing helpful commentary. The author also wishes to thank the curators of the collections cited in this note, who provided full access to their material. Particular thanks are due to Arnold Spaer, for providing information essential to the conclusions given here. The photographs with this article were taken by Wayne Moore.

² Principally Flavius Josephus, *Ant.* XIII, 327, and Eusebius, *Chron.*, Vol. 1, 260.

Grypus and Cyzicenus at these four cities.³ Another unknown mint, likely in Phoenicia, produced a series of dated bronze issues for Cyzicenus from 112/111 to 101/100 B.C. (below).

In Cilicia and the Syrian north, however, the tradition of dating coinage was weak. Many issues produced by mints in these areas – silver in particular – show no dates at all, and until recently the published coins of these areas, even if dated, have been insufficient to indicate clearly who reigned at which location, over what period of time. We now know more about what occurred.

Antioch

Toward the beginning of this century, E.T. Newell proposed that between 121 and 95 B.C., Antiochus VIII and Antiochus IX ruled four times each at Antioch. In the absence of countervailing evidence, most scholars have accepted Newell's judgment.⁴ Although this author has expressed reservations about Newell's view of the number of reigns of each king at Antioch,⁵ there has been no objective support for a different theory until recently. Recent work with Catharine Lorber on a forthcoming comprehensive catalogue of Seleucid coins, however, has made it evident that the dated bronze issues of Antioch recovered since Newell's study of the Antioch mint now provide a significantly clearer picture of coinage activity at the Seleucid capital, and indicate that the two rulers occupied the city no more than three times each. The following catalogue of Antioch's dated bronze coins struck between 121/120 and 108/107 B.C. – the year of Antioch's last recorded dated coinage – illustrates the point. The catalogue begins with coins of Antiochus VIII Grypus, struck during his second reign as king at Antioch.⁶

³ A. Houghton and W. Müsseler, *The Reigns of Antiochus VIII and Antiochus IX at Damascus*, *SM* 159/40, 1990, pp. 57–62, discuss the late history of Damascus against the dated issues of this city, Ascalon, and Ake-Ptolemais.

⁴ Newell, *SMA*, pp. 92–110, supported by Bellinger, pp. 87–91, Cox, p. 54, and O. Mørkholm, *Some Western Seleucid Coins*, *INJ* 3, 1965/66, p. 12. E. Will, *Histoire Politique du Monde Hellénistique 323–30 av. J.-C.* (2nd edn., Nancy 1979), p. 447, follows Bellinger.

⁵ A. Houghton, *The Antioch Project*, *Mnemata: Papers in Memory of Nancy M. Waggoner* (New York 1991), p. 78, and n. 19.

⁶ Grypus' first reign dates to his brief appearance as king at Antioch in 128 B.C., possibly in connection with a failed attempt by Cleopatra Thea to establish her authority at the Seleucid capital, before she was driven out by Alexander II Zabinas: A. Houghton and G. Le Rider, *Un premier règne d'Antiochos Epiphane à Antioche en 128*, *BCH* 112, 1988, pp. 401–411. As Georges Le Rider has pointed out, Grypus' second reign would technically have been his co-regency with Cleopatra Thea, which would then have been immediately followed by his third reign – in fact his second period as «sole» Seleucid ruler. In an attempt to simplify the nomenclature, this article refers to Grypus' sole reigns as being distinct from his co-regency. The situation is, happily, less confused with respect to Cyzicenus.

DATED BRONZE ISSUES OF ANTIOCH⁷

Antiochus VIII Grypus – Second Sole Reign (121–114/113 B.C.)

Units

Obv. Radiate, diademed head of Antiochus VIII to r.; dotted border.

Rev. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ ΕΠΙΦΑΝΟΥΣ Eagle standing l. on thunderbolt, sceptre over shoulder.

Half Units

Obv. Bust of Artemis r., quiver over shoulder.

Rev. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ ΕΠΙΦΑΝΟΥΣ Apollo standing l., holding arrow with r. hand and resting l. on bow.

S.E. 192 = 121/120 B.C.⁸

Units

New York (15 examples); Jerusalem, A. Spaer collection (9 examples).

Half Units

New York (2 examples); Paris (Babelon 1376).

S.E. 193 = 120/119 B.C.

Units

New York; London (3 examples); Seyrig, RN 1955, 113; Glasgow (Hunter 31); Jerusalem, A. Spaer collection (2 examples).

S.E. 194 = 119/118 B.C.

Unit

London

⁷ Except as noted, coins are catalogued in accordance with the principal public collections in the cities indicated, with the number of examples given where more than one is known at the location cited. The catalogue notes coins that have been published or otherwise recorded, or that the author has personally reviewed. Certain important collections may, therefore, be underrepresented.

⁸ London records a unit of S.E. 191, but the date is not clear.

S.E. 196 = 117/116 B.C.

Units

London (3 examples); Copenhagen (SNGCop. 386); Jerusalem, A. Spaer collection (4 examples).

Half-Units

Paris (Babelon 1386); Jerusalem, A. Spaer collection.

S.E. 197 = 116/115 B.C.

Units

New York (2 Examples); London (4 examples); Paris (Babelon 1393); Jerusalem, A. Spaer collection (2 examples).

S.E. 198 = 115/114 B.C.

Units

New York; London (2 examples); Copenhagen (SNGCop. 387); Jerusalem, A. Spaer collection (3 examples).

Half Units

Jerusalem, A. Spaer collection (the date is not fully clear).

S.E. 199 = 114/113 B.C.

Units

London; Glasgow (2 examples: Hunter 33 and 34)

Antiochus IX Cyzicenus – First Reign (114/113–113/112 B.C.)

Units

Obv. Diademed, lightly bearded head of Antiochus IX to r.; dotted border.

Rev. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ ΦΙΛΟΠΑΤΟΡΟΣ Winged thunderbolt.

Half Units

Obv. Bearded head of Heracles r.

Rev. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ ΦΙΛΟΠΑΤΟΡΟΣ Club.

S.E. 199 = 114/113 B.C.

Units

New York (7 examples); London (6 examples); CSE 332; Jerusalem, A. Spaer collection (6 examples).

S.E. 200 = 113/112 B.C.

Units

London (9 examples); Jerusalem, A. Spaer collection (9 examples).

Half-Unit

London (BMC 17). The date is not fully clear.

Antiochus VIII Grypus – Third Sole Reign (113/112–111/110 B.C.)

Units

Obv. Radiate, diademed head of Antiochus VIII to r.; dotted border.

Rev. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ ΕΠΙΦΑΝΟΥΣ Eagle standing l.
on thunderbolt, sceptre over shoulder.

S.E. 200 = 113/112 B.C.

Units

London (2 examples); Paris (Babelon 1401); Jerusalem, A. Spaer collection (2 examples).

S.E. 202 = 111/110 B.C.

Units

New York; London (3 examples); Paris (Babelon 1404); Jerusalem, A. Spaer collection (9 examples).

S.E. 203 = 110/109 B.C.

Unit

London (only the initial Γ can be read of the date).

Antiochus IX Cyzicenus – Second Reign (110/109–108/107?)

Units

Obv. Bearded head of Heracles r.; dotted border.

Rev. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ ΦΙΛΟΠΑΤΟΡΟΣ Athena standing l., holding Nike and resting l. hand on shield; spear behind.

S.E. 203 = 110/109 B.C.^{8a}

Units

New York (4 examples); London (5 examples); Copenhagen (SNGCop. 409); Jerusalem, A. Spaer collection (8 examples).

S.E. 205 = 108/107 B.C.

Unit

London (BMC 24).

From the catalogue, the events of 121/120–108 B.C. can be reconstructed as follows:

1. Antiochus VIII Grypus ruled at Antioch from the death of his mother, Cleopatra Thea, in 121/120 B.C., until the arrival of Cyzicenus in 114/113 B.C. Historians have generally placed Cyzicenus' arrival in Syria at 113 B.C., but there is nothing to suggest that this did not happen in the previous year.
2. Cyzicenus held Antioch for at least a year. Judging from the volume of coinage produced during Cyzicenus' first reign, he likely held Antioch for a longer period, perhaps from c. 114 B.C. to 112 B.C.
3. Grypus then reoccupied the city. Despite the gap in Antioch's dated coinage in S.E. 201, there is no reason to believe that Grypus did not hold the city for the next two or three years, until 110/109 B.C.
4. Cyzicenus returned to Antioch in 110/109 B.C., and held the city for perhaps two years. His last dated coinage was issued in 108/107 B.C.

The actual end of Cyzicenus' second reign at Antioch might not be known but for an inscription from Paphos cited by Newell,⁹ which seems clear that Grypus held Antioch's seaport, Seleucia Pieria, and therefore probably Antioch itself, in 108 B.C. The

^{8a} A unit of the thunderbolt reverse type with ⚡ in the Spaer collection has an unclear but possible date S.E. 203. While worth recording in this note, the carry-over into Cyzicenus' second reign of a first reign type and control is sufficiently anomalous as to beg confirmation by another example.

⁹ SMA, p. 104.

voluminous undated silver coinage that marks Grypus' final reign at Antioch likely, if not certainly, was begun that year.

Grypus was murdered by his war minister, Heracleon, after which Cyzicenus returned to assume control of the Seleucid capital. Newell placed this event about 96 B.C., but the volume of coinage struck at Seleucia on the Calycadnus by Grypus' son, Seleucus VI, during the latter's military preparations against Cyzicenus suggests that Grypus' murder may have occurred a year or two earlier.¹⁰ Cyzicenus reigned some two years at Antioch before Seleucus evicted him from the city about 95 B.C.

Tarsus

The absence of any dated Tarsian Seleucid coinage of the period complicates the problem of determining Grypus' and Cyzicenus' regnal periods at this city. Cox's attempt to establish chronologies and regnal sequences on the basis of the controls that appear on Tarsus' royal Seleucid issues led her to the conclusion that each king had three periods of rule at that city, and that coinage was produced in all; Bellinger generally accepted Cox's view.¹¹ This author has suggested the need for a revision of the number of reigns and chronologies of the two kings at Tarsus.¹²

A full study of the Tarsus mint is forthcoming, but enough information on the dies and monograms of Tarsus' silver coinage issued by Grypus and Cyzicenus now exists to permit, in conjunction with the new Antiochene material, reasonable conclusions to be drawn about the city's history during the period in question.

Table 1 summarizes the information currently available from analysis of nearly two hundred Tarsian tetradrachms struck between c. 121 B.C. and c. 95 B.C., from the final year of the joint reign of Cleopatra Thea and Antiochus Grypus, through the reign of Seleucus VI. The Table is organized according to ruler, in a manner that shows the relationships between coin sequences issued during different reigns, and indicates two periods of discontinuity between coin series that likely reflect breaks in production and that, with the likely dates of the coin series, are discussed below. The data is preliminary, pending a more complete publication of the coins of Tarsus in the Seleucid period.

After the death of Cleopatra Thea, in 121 B.C., the Tarsus mint continued to strike money for Antiochus VIII using, first, a single obverse die to produce what must have been a very limited number of coins. The mint may not have operated continuously thereafter. The break in the monogram sequence that is visible in the Tables, along with a clear discontinuity in style and convention between Grypus' Early/A issue and his coins of the Early/B series, suggests that the mint may have shut down for a time, even for some years. With the Early/B series, Tarsus significantly expanded its rate of production: the volume of recovered coins of this series, and the extensive recutting of

¹⁰ A. Houghton, *The Royal Seleucid Mint of Seleucia on the Calycadnus*, Kraay-Mørkholm Essays, Numismatic Studies in Memory of C.M. Kraay and O. Mørkholm (Louvain-la-Neuve 1989), p. 98.

¹¹ D. Cox, *The Coins, Excavations at Gözlü Küle, Tarsus, Vol. 1, The Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Princeton 1950), pp. 52–54; Bellinger, p. 88.

¹² CSE, p. 37.

TABLE 1

Ruler	Regnal Period/Date	Controls	Dies	Number of Coins Recorded
Cleopatra/ Antiochus VIII	c. 121	⌘ , ⌘	A1-2	8
Antiochus VIII	Early/A c. 121	⌘ , ⌘	A1	1
	Discontinuous Production?			
	Early/B c. 116-14/	⌘ , ⌘	A2, 3, 3a, 3b	11
		⌘ , ⌘	A3a	10
		⌘ , ⌘	A3a	25
		⌘ , ⌘	A3a-3b	25
		⌘ , ⌘	A4	4
		⌘ , ⌘	A5	8
Antiochus IX	Early c. 114-12	⌘ , ⌘	A1	2
		⌘ , ⌘	A1-2	10
		⌘ , ⌘	A1	5
		⌘ , ⌘	A1	1
		⌘ , ⌘	A3-3a	4
		⌘ , ⌘	A4	10
		⌘ , ⌘	A4	8
		⌘ , ⌘	A4	1
		⌘ , ⌘	A1, 3, 4, 5, 6	17
		⌘ , ⌘	A6	1
Antiochus VIII	Middle c. 112-11?	⌘ , ⌘	A1	6
		⌘ , ⌘	A2	12
		⌘ , ⌘	A3	3
		⌘ , ⌘	A3	13
		uncertain	A3	1
	Discontinuous Production			
	Late c. 98-7	⌘ , ⌘	A1	1
		⌘ , ⌘	A2	1
Antiochus IX	Late c. 97-6	⌘ , ⌘	A1	1
		⌘ , ⌘	A2	1
Seleucus VI	c. 95	⌘ , ⌘	A1	2

Obverse dies are numbered sequentially within each indicated period. Small letters after die numbers indicate recutting of the die: 3a = first recut, 3b = second recut, etc.

die 3 indicate some haste and disorganization, perhaps reflecting a sudden need for locally-produced money in anticipation of the coming conflict with Cyzicenus. Whatever the circumstance, Tarsus remained in the hands of Antiochus VIII until Cyzicenus' arrival in Cilicia about 114 B.C.

Cyzicenus' coinage at Tarsus may have followed Grypus' Early/B issues almost immediately. The number of dies employed for Cyzicenus' early tetradrachm series is not large but, considered together with the number of recovered coins (fifty-nine recorded examples as of 9/1/93), reflect the production of a moderately active mint, operating over a period of perhaps a year – about the length of time it took Cyzicenus to lay siege to and occupy Antioch. This synchronism is unlikely to be coincidental, and probably reflects the reality, that Cyzicenus held both Cilicia and Syria Seleucis at the same time. If this assumption is correct, Cyzicenus ruled at Tarsus c. 114–112 B.C.

Grypus' middle issues, with the characteristic control ME, form a compact, closely-linked group. They appear to have directly followed Cyzicenus' early coinage, indicating that Grypus' reoccupied Tarsus soon after he had taken Antioch back. But the issuance of coinage at the Tarsus mint could not have lasted very long at this time. Only three obverse dies were used to produce the thirty-five recorded tetradrachms of this period, suggesting that the mint may have been in operation no more than a year, and possibly less.¹³

Episodic production of this nature is not unusual for less important Seleucid mints, particularly when currency from other sources – such as the enormously productive mint at Antioch – was sufficient to meet demand. But in the case of Tarsus, it leaves a question as to what happened after 110 B.C. Did Cyzicenus return, as he did at Antioch? Or did Grypus retain his hold on Cilicia Pedias? The material evidence from Tarsus itself is silent. No coinage for Cyzicenus is known to have been produced at this city prior to his last two issues, and since both of these show characteristic late, beardless images of the king and have a control (IP) that links them to the Tarsian tetradrachms of Seleucus VI, they are likely to have been struck at the very end of Cyzicenus' career.

To hazard a guess, Cyzicenus did not return to Tarsus after being driven out in 112 B.C. A single tetradrachm issue was struck for Cyzicenus at Mopsus in S.E. 205, indicating that at least this Cilician city was prepared to show allegiance to this king in 108/107 B.C.¹⁴ But Mopsus is more than sixty kilometers east of Tarsus, and there is no evidence to suggest that Cyzicenus' control extended into central Cilicia Pedias after his brief occupation of the province some five years earlier. The silver coinage of uncertain origin that may have been issued in Cilicia can be given to Cyzicenus' early period there (114–112 B.C.), as can his only known, very unusual, tetradrachm of Seleucia on the Calycadnus.¹⁵

A mint-by-mint comparison of the information now available on the coins of both Antiochus VIII and IX is revealing. Table 2, which summarizes the conclusions given above on Antioch and Tarsus, and which records the years in which dated coins of each

¹³ The very high ratio of the number of known obverse dies to the number of known examples of Grypus' middle issues, 11.7, indicates that no new dies are likely to be found for this series.

¹⁴ G.K. Jenkins, NC 1951, pp. 19–21, now in London. The second example, struck from the same obverse die, is NFA 2, 1976, 289, on which the date cannot be distinguished.

¹⁵ In Brussels: Houghton (above n. 10), p. 90.

TABLE 2

*Dated Coinages of Antiochus VIII and Antiochus IX***

Year		Mint						
S.E.	B.C.	Tarsus	Antioch	Damascus	Sidon	Uncertain (Eros/Nike Bronzes)	Ake- Ptolemais	Ascalon
192	121/20	↑	G	CT/G			CT/G; G	CT/G
193	120/19	↓	G	G	G		G	G
194	119/18	Undated		G				G
195	118/17	Issues of		G			G	G
196	117/16	Ant. VIII	G	G	G		G	G
197	116/15	↓	G	G	G		G	G
198	115/14	↓	G	G	G		G	
199	114/13	Undated, Ant. IX	{ G C	G	C		G	{ G C
200	113/12	↓	{ C G	C	C		C*	C
201	112/11	Undated,		C		C	C	G
202	111/10	Ant. VIII?	G	C	C	C	C	G
203	110/9	↓	{ G C				C*	G
204	109/8	↓		G			C	G
205	108/7	↓	C	G		C		G
206	107/6	↓	↑				C	G
207	106/5	(no						G
208	105/4	coinage?)	Undated					G
209	104/3	↓	Issues	G				G
210	103/2	↓	of			C		
211	102/1	↓	Antiochus	G		C		Autono-
212	101/0	↓	VIII	G		C		mous
213	100/99	Undated,	↓	G				Issues
214	99/8	Ant. VIII?	↓	G				↓
215	98/7	Undated	Undated				Hasmoneans	
216	97/6	Issues of	Issues of				under	
217	96/5	Ant. IX	Ant. IX				Alexander	
							Jannaeus	

** The letters CT, G and C represent Cleopatra Thea, Antiochus VIII Grypus and Antiochus IX Cyzicenus, respectively, and indicate those years for which coins are known. All coins thus represented are dated, except for issues of Tarsus and certain issues of Antiochus IX of Ake-Ptolemais, which are shown as C*.

king were struck at Damascus, Sidon, Ake-Ptolemais and Ascalon, illustrates the political confusion surrounding the Seleucid succession after Cyzicenus' invasion of Syria.

From the evidence, Cyzicenus' initial hold on Cilicia was brief, lasting little more than two years. His single reign at Damascus, from 113/112 to c. 110 B.C. was also short. Although Cyzicenus returned to Antioch, Grypus seems to have held the balance of power elsewhere in the north, as well as at the southernmost major coastal city of Ascalon. The coins indicate that Cyzicenus retained continuous authority at Ake-Ptolemais and, as far as can be determined, along the Syrian and Phoenician coast.

Table 2 summarizes the current state of knowledge of the reigns of Grypus and Cyzicenus, according to the evidence of the coins produced by mints that struck dated issues and the conclusions that can be inferred for the regnal periods of each king at Tarsus. It includes a series of bronze units with the obverse type of an Eros bust and the reverse of a standing Nike to which no clear attribution can yet be given. Newell first thought that these coins were struck at Sidon, but later changed his mind to Damascus; Bellinger believed them to have certainly been struck at Damascus.¹⁶ As the dated coins of Damascus show, however, this cannot have been the case.¹⁷ Newell's first idea – Phoenicia, if not Sidon itself – now appears closest to the mark.

Some North Syrian Tetradrachms of Antiochus VIII and Antiochus IX

Various public and private collections, and occasional numismatic sales, include coins of both Grypus and Cyzicenus to which no particular attribution has been given. Enough material is now available to permit consideration of these as a whole, to illustrate a number of linking relationships between issues and, against the background of the known dated coinage of both rulers, to make a few general comments regarding their locations of issue and likely dates of production.

¹⁶ SMA, p. 103, n. 43; LSM, p. 77.

¹⁷ Bellinger, p. 88.

CATALOGUE*

Tetradrachms of Antiochus VIII

Obv.: Diademed head of Antiochus r.; fillet border.

Rev.: *Type A* (Athena Nikephoros, Series I–III)

ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ ΕΠΙΦΑΝΟΥΣ

Athena, holding Nike in outstretched r. hand, resting l. hand on shield; spear within l. arm; controls as indicated; wreath border.

Type B (Zeus Uranius, Series IV–X)

ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ ΕΠΙΦΑΝΟΥΣ

Zeus, nude to waist, crescent above head, standing l. holding star in outstretched r. hand and resting l. on shield; spear within l. arm; controls as indicated; wreath border

SERIES I

Group 1: IE above Ę

A1 P1 16.16 Paris. Babelon 1428. SMA 363 (Ě). *Pl. 1, 1.*

Group 2: EP above Ę

A1 P2 16.14 London. BMC 19. *Pl. 1, 2.*

SERIES II

Group 1: In l. field, AΘ above Ϡ

A1 P1 15.28 London. BMC 20. *Pl. 1, 3.*

Group 2: In l. field, IE above Θ (P2) or Θ (P3–4). SMA 362.

A1 P2 15.74 London. BMC 17. *Pl. 1, 4.*

A1 P3 16.37 New York (inv. 2428).

A2 P4 16.63 Jameson 1746. *Pl. 1, 5. Note:* the style is anomalous.

Newell, SMA 362, records the existence of another example in Petrograd, no. 687.

* Unless otherwise indicated, the locations of coins in the catalogue refer to the principal public collections in the cities named. «Cambridge» signifies the Fitzwilliam Museum only, the coins of the Lewis collection, formerly in Corpus Christi College, having been moved to that location. Dies are numbered sequentially within each Series.

SERIES III

Group 1: In l. field, NOY above \mathfrak{N} .

- A1 P1 16.15 Berlin. *Pl. 1, 6.*
" " 16.37 London. BMC 18.

Group 2: In l. field, IE above \mathfrak{N} (P1) or \mathfrak{N} (P2). SMA 364.

- A1 P2 16.19 Hess-Leu, 2 Apr. 1958, 251; Hess 90, 1935, 422; Hess, 28 Oct. 1930, 2628; A. Cahn 61, 1928, 169; Naville 10, 1925, 1437; Sotheby's, 7 Nov. 1896 (Bunbury), 572. *Pl. 1, 7.*
" " 16.00 Paris. Babelon 1429.
" " 15.59 Cambridge. SNGLewis 1099.
" P3 16.20 MuM FPL 388, Apr. 1977, 15; «ANA», 24 Aug. 1976, 1594.

SERIES IV

Group 1: In l. field, \mathfrak{M} above \mathfrak{R}

- A1 P1 16.20 Washington, D.C. (AHNS 166). *Pl. 1, 8.*
" " 15.86 G. Hirsch 167, 1990, 534.
" P2 16.17 Swiss Bank Corp. 5, 1979, 274; Kastner 6, 1974, 192.

SERIES V

Group 1: To l., Δ above \mathfrak{M} .

- A1 P1 16.45 CSE 587. *Pl. 1, 9.*

SERIES VI

Group 1: To l., \mathbf{A} above \mathfrak{M} .

- A1 P1 Paris (Seyrig coll.). *Pl. 1, 10.*
" " «16» Schlessinger 13, 1935 (Hermitage), 1473 (same as Paris?)

SERIES VII

Group 1: In l. field, ☉ above A; in exergue, N.

A1 P1 16.00 Lanz 42, 1987, 316.

A2 P2 Paris (Seyrig coll.). *Pl. 2, 11.*

SERIES VIII

Group 1: M above A

A1 P1 15.91 Classical Numismatic Group 22, 1992, 158. *Pl. 2, 12.*

A2 P2 16.60 Barcelona, 5 May 1967, 272.

SERIES IX

Group 1: To l., A above EP.

A1 P3 16.06 Glasgow. *Pl. 2, 13.*

Group 2: To l., A above EP.

A1 P1 16.57 Jerusalem, A. Spaer coll.

" P2 15.97 New York. *Pl. 2, 14.*

SERIES X

Group 1: ☉ above EP.

A1 P1 16.38 Glasgow. *Pl. 2, 15.*

Group 2: ☉ above EP.

A1 P2 16.62 New York (inv. 1095). *Pl. 2, 16.*

Tetradrachms of Antiochus IX

Obv.: Diademed, lightly bearded head of Antiochus r.; fillet border.

Rev.: ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ ΦΙΛΟΠΑΤΟΡΟΣ

Athena standing l. holding Nike in outstretched r. hand and resting l. on shield; spear within l. arm; controls as indicated; wreath border.

SERIES I

Group 1: In l. field, M above A; in inner l. field, sideways, l.

A1 P1 15.93 London. *Pl. 2, 17.*

Group 2: In l. field, M above A; in inner r. field, Γ.

A2 P2 16.77 New York (inv. 2490); Walcher de Molthein, no. 3058; *Ars Classica* 15, 1930, 1086; Rosenberg, 8 March 1914, 143.

" P3 15.78 CSE 335. *Pl. 2, 18.*

" P4 16.08 Berlin (Prokesch-Osten).

A3 P5 16.38 Paris. Babelon 1475.

" P6 Weight not recorded. Sotheby's, 17 July 1974, 39.

SERIES II

Group 1: In l. field, ΔP above ⚡.

A1 P1 16.33 New York. *Pl. 2, 19.*

Group 2: In l. field, ⚡ above ⚡.

A1 P2 16.72 *Numismatic Arts and Ancient Coins* 3, 1982, 74; SNG Berry 1417. *Pl. 2, 20.*

A1 P2 16.44 Jerusalem, A. Spaer coll. (inv. 2771).

SERIES III

Group 1: In l. field, Δ above A; to lower r., Δ.

A1 P1 16.69 Rev. r. field monogram off flan. Paris.

" P2 16.27 Washington, D.C. (AHNS 483). Kovacs 11, 1993, 100. *Pl. 3, 21.*

" P3 15.71 Jerusalem, A. Spaer coll. (inv. 2685).

" P4 16.01 Superior, 11 Jun. 1986 (Grove-Grover), 1373.

" P5 15.91 New York.

A2 P6 Weight not recorded. Emporium Hamburg, 25 Apr. 1989, 35.

" P7 16.45 New York.

SERIES IV

Group 1: To l., Δ above \mathfrak{M} .

A1 P1 15.83 Paris (1483a). *Pl. 3, 22.*

Group 2: To l., Φ above \mathfrak{M} .

A1 P2 16.25 Swiss Credit 7, 1987, 288. *Pl. 3, 23.*

Group 3: To l., \mathfrak{M} above \mathfrak{A} .

A2 P3 16.2 Schlessinger 13, 1935 (Hermitage), 1482. *Pl. 3, 24.*

" P4 15.95 New York.

" P5 15.95 Giessener Münzhandlung 36, 1987, 289; PMV Inc., FPL 32 (July 1987), 8.

" P6 16.42 Berlin (Löbbecke).

SERIES V

Group 1: To l., $\mathfrak{I}\Sigma\mathfrak{P}$ above \mathfrak{Z} .

A1 P1 16.54 Paris. Trésors 30.350. *Pl. 3, 25.*

Group 2: To l., \mathfrak{Z} above \mathfrak{N} .

A1 P2 15.96 New York. A. Cahn 84, 1933, 418.

" P3 16.63 Washington, AHNS 122. G. Hirsch 141, 1984, 376. *Pl. 3, 26.*

A2 P4 16.58 Paris. Trésors 30.351. *Pl. 3, 27.*

Group 3: To l., \mathfrak{N} above \mathfrak{N} .

A3 P5 15.70 New York (inv. 3495). *Pl. 3, 28.*

SERIES VI

Group 1: In l. field, Θ above EP

A1 P1 16.91 Copenhagen. *Pl. 3, 29.*

" P2 16.02 Paris.

The coins of Grypus all appear to have been struck in northern Syria. None carry city symbols of the type common to Seleucid coins of Cilicia, which therefore seems to be excluded as an area of origin.¹⁸ The relatively few known Attic weight tetradrachms struck in Phoenicia at the end of the second and beginning of the first century B.C. were all dated, as were the coins of the south Syrian coast and Coele-Syria; these areas are therefore also unlikely to have produced the undated coin series recorded here. By exclusion, one is left with the area of Syria Seleucis and the inland regions of Syria to the south and east as probable locations of issue.

The mint at Antioch itself cannot have produced any of Grypus' coin series noted above. Although Newell gave Grypus' tetradrachms of Series I–III to Antioch because of the relationship of their IE control to the same mark that appears on all tetradrachms of Antioch struck from Grypus' joint reign with Cleopatra through his subsequent (second) sole rule at the Seleucid capital,¹⁹ each series includes die-linked coin groups without IE and with controls that do not appear at Antioch at all. The stylistic disparity of these coins from those produced at Antioch, moreover, supports the view that they were issued elsewhere.

Despite this, the Series I–III coins may have been struck in some association with the Antioch mint. Seleucid coinages occasionally show close control relationships between issues that were not produced at the same facility, but which were likely to have been struck under the the same mint authority.²⁰ IE, evidently an important figure at Antioch, may well have had responsibility for the production of coinage in Antioch's general area as well as at the Antioch mint itself.

Newell's view that the Athena-reverse tetradrachms were struck at the outset of Grypus' second sole reign in Syria appears to be fully supported by the evidence. The coins of Series I, Group 1, with IE above Ε, are directly linked to a tetradrachm issue of Cleopatra Thea and Antiochus with the same specific combination of controls, struck by a mint which evidently extended production into Grypus' succeeding reign (p. 105, A).²¹ As one of Grypus' earliest tetradrachm types, however, the Athena Nikephorus was short-lived, lasting perhaps only a few months in c. 121–120 B.C., and apparently only in connection with the Series I–III coins discussed here. There is no clear reason why this apparently experimental royal type was employed on issues produced at three minor north Syrian mints, but not at Antioch,²² but it may be relevant that the Athena Nikephorus reverse was broadly employed as a coin type under Antiochus VII, the

¹⁸ For a discussion of symbols and type on Cilician coins of the Seleucid period, see Houghton (above n. 10), pp. 78–82.

¹⁹ SMA, p. 92. The sequence of issues at Antioch involves, on tetradrachms of Cleopatra and Grypus, a primary control in the left field, IE, and later the combination of IE above Α. During Grypus' second sole reign, the primary controls were, invariably, IE above Α, to Ι., and were usually accompanied by secondary controls placed elsewhere in the field.

²⁰ CSE, p. 44 («Uncertain Mint»).

²¹ Washington, D.C., AHNS 99 = Sotheby's, 9 Jun. 1983 (Brand 3), 144.

²² The Athena Nikephorus that had marked the reverses of all royal coinage produced at Seleucia on the Calycadnus in Cilicia, and that was continued through the reign of Seleucus VI, should be seen as a local, rather than a royal, type (Houghton, above n. 10).

father of Cyzicenus, Grypus' imminent rival for the Seleucid succession who adopted the same figure as his personal coin type immediately on his arrival in Syria in 114 B.C.

If the Athena-reverse issues of Grypus can be dated precisely, the same cannot be said for the tetradrachms of Series IV–X. All have on their reverses the standing, draped, Zeus Uranius that was instituted by Grypus at Ake-Ptolemais, Damascus and Antioch about 118 B.C. and retained until about 111 B.C., when this figure was replaced by a seated Zeus Nikephorus (Excursus, below).²³ It is within this seven-year time frame that the coins of Series IV–X were likely struck.

Correlations between coins of Grypus and Cyzicenus discussed below that may (but do not necessarily) indicate issuances from the same mints include the control P of Grypus' Series III, which reappears on Cyzicenus' coins Series IV, Group 3; Δ (or Φ) above M of Grypus' Series V which appears in the same combination in Cyzicenus' Series III; and EP of Grypus' Series IX and X, which is also carried on the tetradrachms of Cyzicenus' Series VI. It is to be noted that the principal controls of Series IX, A above EP, have the same elements as the controls applied to Grypus coinage during his final, fourth sole reign at Antioch, E above A, control configuration, style, fabric, and reverse type support the assignment of this Series to another mint, perhaps in the Antioch area (the implications of the removal of this Series from Antioch are discussed below, Excursus).

The coins of Antiochus IX Cyzicenus are difficult to assign with precision. Like the issues of Grypus discussed above, they are without dates or city symbols, and were therefore probably produced in northern Syria than in Cilicia, Phoenicia, the south Syrian coast, or Coele-Syria. If such is the case, their likely period of issue is narrowed to the years between Cyzicenus' arrival in Syria in c. 114 B.C., and 107 B.C., when his rule at Antioch, eastern Cilicia and Damascus seems to have collapsed. It is not possible at this time to more closely approximate their chronology or locations of issue.

Newell gave the coins of Series I to a hypothetical short reign of Cyzicenus at Antioch early in 111 B.C.,²⁴ but as Antioch's dated bronzes show, Grypus occupied the Seleucid capital at this time, and there is no other satisfactory period at Antioch where these issues might fit. Even so, their style, fabric, and epigraphy are very close to those of Antioch, and they may have been produced at a site in Antioch's vicinity, perhaps under a mint official (who signed himself, simply, A) who oversaw production at both locations. The lower control of Series II, P , is similar to one that appears on coins of Tarsus issued from the reign of Antiochus VII (138–129 B.C.) through that of Alexander II Zabinas (at Tarsus, c. 126/125–123 B.C.),²⁵ and may be the mark of the same individual who officiated at Tarsus under these rulers, and in northern Syria under Cyzicenus.

²³ The draped Zeus Uranius reverse was preceded at the major mints of Ake-Ptolemais, Damascus and Antioch by a similar figure, fully nude, that seems to have been retained only until S.E. 195 (for the date, see LSM 96–97, of Damascus). The date of institution of the seated Zeus Nikephorus can be inferred from the very small number of known examples of the type known for Grypus' short, third sole reign at Antioch: see the Excursus to this article.

²⁴ SMA, pp. 98–99.

²⁵ Examples with P are in Paris: Trésors 30.330 (Antiochus VII); Trésors 30.331 (Demetrius II, Second Reign); De Clercq 221 (Alexander II Zabinas).



A



A (enlarged)



B



EXCURSUS

Zeus Uranius to Zeus Nikephorus: Grypus' Change of Tetradrachm Type, c. 111 B.C.

In his discussion of the Seleucid mint of Antioch, E.T. Newell proposed that throughout his earlier reigns at Antioch, Grypus' tetradrachm coinage universally bore a standing Zeus Uranius as its reverse type, and that at the outset of his final reign (108– c. 98 B.C.) the type was changed to a seated, Victory-bearing Zeus, of the type that had been instituted c. 169/168 by Antiochus IV, and that had appeared on the reverses of a number of subsequent Seleucid rulers, including Grypus' father, Demetrius II.²⁶ In 1977, however, the American Numismatic Society was given by bequest a tetradrachm of Grypus with a Zeus Nikephorus reverse, but with a left field control, ⌘, that previously

²⁶ Antiochus IV: O. Mørholm, *Studies in the Coinage of Antiochus IV of Syria* (Copenhagen 1963), p. 24 ff. Demetrius II: SMA, nos. 321–325 (at Antioch, but the type was universal on Attic weight coinage of Demetrius' second reign).

had been applied only on coins with Zeus Uranius reverses given by Newell to Grypus' penultimate reign at Antioch. In their initial publication of the new coin, H. Troxell and N. Waggoner suggested that it was struck at the end of Grypus' third sole reign, apparently concurrently with tetradrachms of the Zeus Uranius type. Based on the evidence of a coin of Grypus' Series IX in New York (see above), the authors also concluded that production of the Zeus Uranius coins was likely continued into Grypus' final reign, alongside the new, Zeus Nikephoros coinage.²⁷

With the removal of the Grypus' series IX coins from Antioch (above, p. 100), Troxell's and Waggoner's hypothesis of a complicated (and for Seleucid coinages, unprecedented) parallel production of different reverse types can be simplified. Where to place the tetradrachms with the Zeus Nikephoros reverse and ⌘ is the issue that needs to be resolved.²⁸ Do they belong to Grypus' third sole reign, as the controls indicate? Or do they belong to his fourth, final reign, as is implied by the type?

An almost unnoticeable feature on Grypus' tetradrachms with Zeus Nikephoros and ⌘ above is the little sphinxes that adorn the legs of Zeus' throne (p. 105, Fig. A). These small figures are virtually distinct to this particular coinage of Grypus. They appear on a small handful of his Antiochene tetradrachms with ⌘ above A (of Grypus' fourth sole reign), and elsewhere on certain unrelated north Syrian tetradrachms of Alexander II Zabinas.²⁹ Generally, however, Grypus' fourth reign tetradrachms have no decorative throne elements at all (an example is on p. 105, Fig. B,) and the throne-leg sphinxes are therefore to be most closely identified with the control ⌘.

The implication of this finding is that the ⌘ series likely belongs to a period of production separate from Grypus' Zeus Nikephoros issues with ⌘ – therefore almost certainly to Grypus' third reign, the coinage of which is marked throughout by ⌘. Given the evidence of Grypus' dated issues discussed above and the low number of recorded examples of the Zeus Nikephoros series, the change of type can now be dated to the very end of Grypus' third reign, about 111 B.C.

Arthur Houghton
3043 N Street, N.W.
Washington D.C. 20007
USA

²⁷ H. Troxell and N. Waggoner, *The Robert F. Kelley Bequest*, MN 23, 1978, pp. 40–41.

²⁸ The author knows of five examples: a) New York, ANS, with the secondary control A (between the throne legs); b) another with the same control, U.S. market 1993; c) G. Hirsch 169, 1991, 544, with Γ; d) with Γ, U.S. market 1993; and e) with Δ, U.S. market 1993.

²⁹ Examples include CSE 585, and Trésors 30.347–30.348. The sphinx, which is only on the rearmost throne leg, is clear on the coins, if not the illustrations.



1



2



3



4



5



6



7



8



9



10



Arthur Houghton, Antiochus VIII and Antiochus IX at Antioch and Tarsus



11



12



13



14



15



16



17



18



19



20



Arthur Houghton, Antiochus VIII and Antiochus IX at Antioch and Tarsus



21



22



23



24



25



26



27



28



29



