

Antiochos Soter and the Third Syrian War

Kyle Erickson

One of the more vexing problems of Seleukid iconography has been determining the issuer of the Antiochos Soter coinage. These coins, which have been long known to numismatists, have defied attempts to definitively fix their origin either to a particular group, a particular time or even a particular mint. While uncertainty of origin in itself is not unusual, the iconography utilised on the coins as well as their legend make them a particularly interesting challenge.

The most intriguing feature of the coinage is the legend, ANTIOXOY ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ. Unusually for the early Seleukid empire, the king is given his cultic epithet on the Antiochos Soter type. For this reason, the coin types with this legend are interesting for how they shape our understanding of early Seleukid ideology. The simplest explanation for the appearance of a portrait of Antiochos I along with his name would be that that coinage was issued during his lifetime. However as discussed below, it is unlikely that this coinage was in fact manufactured during the reign of Antiochos I; rather the evidence argues that the coinage was likely produced posthumously. If this is the case, then based on the dating of hoards of coins containing the type, the most probable time period for the issuing of these coins was at the latest the tumultuous period following the death of Antiochos II. To date, the interpretations of the evidence have suggested that owing to the fluctuations of power at the time, Antioch was the probable minting location and they were issued during the Third Syrian War. So while the location of the mint and the timing of the issuance have been regarded as settled, the identity of the minting authority has remained a matter of mystery and controversy.

In this volume, Coşkun has proposed a new chronology which combines the Third Syrian War and the War of the Brothers. This chronology opens up new possibilities for the interpretation of these coins which may solve many of the numismatic quandaries. This chapter analyses the weaknesses of the prior attempts at attribution and shows how Coşkun's new chronology provides another contender for the production of the Antiochos Soter coinage.¹ However even that attribution faces challenges and in conclusion I will suggest that the best match for the production of the coinage is in fact Antiochos II, who up until now has been overlooked as the issuer.

A brief discussion of the types of coins of the so-called 'Antiochos Soter' type is necessary before discussing their origins. As we have seen above the coinage is unique for the Seleukids before the reign of Antiochos IV owing to the inclusion of the epithet.² There also are other features that make the origin of this coinage difficult to determine. The type appears in three denominations that are normally grouped together, gold octadrachms, silver tetradrachms, and a bronze. The gold and silver types are the same, with the obverse depicting the diademed head of Antiochos I facing to the right with a dotted border. Portraits of Antiochos I had been used on the issues of both Antiochos I and Antiochos II. The reverse

for both types shows Apollo seated facing left on the omphalos, holding an arrow and resting his left hand on a grounded bow. (FIGURE 1) There are no control or mint marks on either the gold or silver coinage of this type which could help with the determination of the mint or minting authority.³ However, the bronze denomination may be related to the type as it shares the same legend, although not the same reverse. The obverse of the bronze type features the diademed head of Antiochos I facing right, while the reverse shows an anchor flanked by the caps of the Dioskouroi. (FIGURE 2) The bronze coinage has a control mark: DEL which also appeared on coins minted for Seleukos II and Antiochos III on gold, silver and bronze coinage.⁴

In addition to the unique legend, the production of this coinage is significant in several ways. First, the gold octadrachm found in the excavations at Gordion⁵ is the first Seleucid gold octadrachm produced. The coin was not struck from a unique die, but utilised one of the tetradrachm dies. As Houghton and Lorber observe, the very large denomination coin could be linked either with the famed wealth of the Ptolemies or with a Seleukid attempt to counter Ptolemaic influence.⁶ Another significant feature of this coinage is the large number of dies used, 4 obverse and 22 reverse dies.⁷ A similar production at Antioch was only achieved by the third tetradrachm issue of Seleukos I with 6 obverse dies and 12 reverse dies.⁸ Mints only used large numbers of dies for simultaneous production or because extended use caused significant die wear, in both cases it is clear that many coins of the type were minted. This large output of coinage strongly suggests a large need for fresh coinage and points to an area and time of conflict when ready money was required to obtain supplies, pay troops and meet other demands of active warfare. While periods of conflict are hardly rare within the empire, the distinct legend which is difficult to place with any particular king suggests a greater period of turmoil, when there would have been multiple claimants to the diadem.

History of scholarship on the coinage

A brief history of scholarship on the attribution of the coinage to a mint and to a faction is necessary before considering the implications of Coşkun's new dating. We noted that a first reaction might be to attribute the Antiochos Soter type to Antiochos I. However, that position has been rejected on the basis that the lack of the title *Basileus* suggests that the coinage was issued posthumously, a contention that seems to hold consistently true for the epigraphic record of the Seleukid kings. Furthermore, the assignment of a cultic epithet to the living king on his coinage has generally been discounted in the empire until after the reign of Antiochos III.⁹

The first substantial treatment of the coinage was by Newell¹⁰ who argued for a date in the interregnum period after Antiochos II's death and the death of Berenike and her child, Antiochos.¹¹ He attributed the coinage on the basis of style and similarity of fabric to a mint at Apameia.¹² The number of find spots in northern Syria and Mesopotamia also point to a mint in this region.¹³ As the legend, the choice of obverse, and his location of production were all abnormal, he attributed the production to the garrison at Apameia which he speculated had not taken sides in the conflict and awaited the outcome. In this argument, the

image and legend of the deceased grandfather of both potential kings would have served as a non-controversial image which could have been used by either side in the conflict. However, the subsequent identification of a large number of coins using a wide range of reverse dies suggests a large volume of coinage which is incompatible with a single garrison mint attempting to hedge its bets.¹⁴

After the discovery of the gold octradrachm in the excavations at Gordion,¹⁵ alongside another gold octradrachm (in this case of Seleukos III) produced in Antioch, D. H. Cox produced a new hypothesis that attempted to solve some of the difficulties created by Newell's garrison mint theory. Cox assigned both coinages to Seleukos III, from Apameia and Antioch mints respectively, and cited his campaign against Attalos I as the origin of the hoard. In this argument, the Antiochos Soter coinage would have been designed to recall his successes in Asia Minor against the Galatians and rally support for his war against Attalos.¹⁶

After the publication of Cox's work based on the Gordion excavations, several more hoards appeared which prompted a significant re-evaluation of the coinage by G. Le Rider in his analysis of the mints at Antioch.¹⁷ One problem that must be considered is that the Meydancikkale hoard does not contain any tetradrachms with the Antiochos Soter legend, despite its burial between 240-235.¹⁸ However, it does contain four tetradrachms from the DEL mint. As Le Rider notes, it is dangerous to draw any conclusions from the lack of Soter coinage in the hoard,¹⁹ and we should be wary of producing an argument from the silence. One important point that Le Rider makes is that we do not necessarily have to associate the gold and silver production (both of which lack control marks) with the bronze coinage as the production of a single mint in a single period. Finally, after raising some of the issues concerning the assignment of this coinage to Seleukos II based on style and iconography, an issue to which we will return, he rejects Cox's attribution of the coinage to the mint at Apameia and proposes that the source was a new mint operating near Antioch which he names DEL and associated with partisans of Seleukos II.

Houghton and Lorber in their catalogue of Seleukid coins follow Le Rider in assigning the coinage to the DEL mint and link it with the bronze coinage.²⁰ They refrain from associating the coinage with any particular group, although they suggest that the high value gold coinage and the large output may tempt one into connecting the coinage to the wealthy Ptolemaic coffers.

Having outlined the prior scholarly attributions of these coins, it is now useful to highlight the unsolved problems with each of the views. If we are willing to accept, as most modern scholars do, that the coinage was produced during the period of turmoil that followed the death of Antiochos II then we must look at the groups that controlled Antioch during this period to determine the issuer. Under the traditional view of the chronology of the Third Syrian War and the Laodikean War, there are three possible parties that could have produced the Antiochos Soter coinage in Syria: Berenike and her son Antiochos; the Apameian or Antiochean garrisons as proposed by Newell; and Seleukos II. Let us examine the problems with each of these proposals in turn, starting with Berenike and Antiochos. Beginning with Seleukos I, all Seleukid kings place their own name with the title 'Basileus' on their coinage.

It would be surprising if Berenike and her young child deviated from this established pattern particularly while involved in a conflict where their right to the diadem was under attack. Nonetheless it could be possible that they followed the general Ptolemaic practice of placing an ancestor on their coinage. However, despite the suggestion of Houghton and Lorber that they looked back to Antiochos I as a king who had killed his older son to avoid dynastic strife,²¹ Antiochos I is an odd king for a Ptolemy to choose for coinage given the lack of connections and the conflict between the two houses in that generation. If, as is done in the traditional scholarship on the period, we consider the inscription from Kildara as evidence of support for Berenike's position,²² then it is interesting for our study of the coinage that there is no mention made of Antiochos I, the immediately relevant parties: Ptolemy and his wife and the boy, here named King Antiochos, and his parents.²³ It seems likely therefore, that if Berenike was attempting to use this coinage to establish legitimacy for her son, then more appropriate choices would have been his father, or perhaps even his great grandfather, Seleukos I, who had not only founded the dynasty but had done so with Ptolemaic help. On the other hand, one could argue that the name Antiochos may have been the overriding factor as well as a desire to issue a coinage distinct from but also reminiscent of that issued by his father. Furthermore, Antiochos I was a popular figure on the coinage of Antiochos II.²⁴ In this case, the refashioning of Antiochos I's coinage and the inclusion of his cultic epithet may have represented a functional merger of the Ptolemaic practice of continuing to use the established iconography of Ptolemy I on its coinage, and the greater variety of images used by the Seleukids to highlight continuity. Pursuing this line of argument, the epithet 'Soter' may have been used to highlight Berenike's control of the Seleukid familial cult at Seleukeia in Pieria.²⁵

However, it seems unlikely under both the traditional chronology, and Coskun's new proposal, that Berenike and her partisans controlled any territory beyond Antioch.²⁶ Despite speculations that might link the coinage to Berenike, the decisive argument against her and her partisans' ability to produce this coinage is the volume of production discussed above. The few months during which Berenike remained alive after the death of Antiochos II (at most until about September of 246) is extremely unlikely to have provided enough time to mint the amount of coinage that was produced.

Therefore if we are to exclude the possibility of Berenike, on the basis of the traditional chronology and further supported by Coşkun's new chronology, the next option to turn to would be Newell's garrison at Apameia as the source of the coinage. Le Rider has forcefully rejected this theory and has been followed by others who have reassigned the mint to Antioch.²⁷ While it is possible that Newell's garrison could have been posted at Antioch rather than at Apameia and in theory could have controlled a part of the city, there is no evidence for this, nor evidence for such a large concentration of the army in Antioch that was opposed to either side as Newell had proposed for Apameia. Furthermore the large output of the mint suggests that it was beyond the capabilities of a single garrison. Nor do we have any other evidence for the production of royal coinage outside royal mints, or by the army without the support of a member of the ruling house.

Thus according to the traditional chronology and our current understanding of the minting authority, if we rule out Berenike and Newell's garrison, there remains only one other candidate who has previously been suggested as the authority for the production of this coinage. Le Rider,²⁸ followed tentatively by Houghton and Lober,²⁹ attributes it to Seleukos II. But even in his attribution of the coinage to Seleukos II, Le Rider expressed some doubts surrounding the use of the portrait of Antiochos I and the legend by the king. As with coinage that might have been issued by Berenike and her son Antiochos, one would expect to see the portrait of Seleukos II on coinage issued by him, or to see strong evidence of a connection to his ancestor on his other coinage.³⁰ However, rather than a continuation of the seated Apollo reverse favoured by Antiochos I Soter and by his father Antiochos II, Seleukos II's coinage is far more innovative. This break from the seated Apollo image is, in fact, what we see with the majority of Seleukos II's coinage from Antioch where the type present on the Soter coinage does not appear. A further problem arises when discussing Seleukos II's iconographic programme. While the Soter coinage reproduces an earlier type first produced by Antiochos I, the reverse image of Apollo seated on the omphalos was also used by Antiochos II and seems to have become the standard image of Seleucid silver coinage during his reign. Seleukos II is the first Seleucid king to have deviated from this representation of Apollo and does so in a fairly radical way. Rather than Apollo seated on the omphalos, Seleukos II's Apollo often stands resting his arm on a tripod. (**FIGURE 2**) But there is no standardised system and a greater degree of variation, not only does he rest on a tripod but Apollo also stands resting his weight on his bow, and Athena gains importance as she appears more often on drachms but occasionally elsewhere.³¹ Furthermore, there are exceptions to the change in reverse type, where Ecbatana stands out as retaining the traditional reverse,³² the distinctive Soter coinage would mark a significant deviation from the rest of Seleukos II's coinage. Finally, in his coinage Seleukos II does not highlight a strong connection to his grandfather or father, and at most made occasional reference to the founder of the dynasty and his namesake, Seleukos I. Hence the Soter coinage would stand as a significant anomaly in Seleukos II's coinage production.

To briefly summarise, there are good grounds to reject the attribution of the coinage to any of the three parties which have previously been proposed, Berenike and Seleukos II on iconographic grounds, and Newell's Apameian garrison on political and production grounds. With no good candidates for the production of this coinage, we have been left with a perplexing coinage which has resulted in it standing outside the normal frame of Seleucid coinage.³³

Criteria for producers:

To unravel the mystery it may be useful to back up and summarise what elements would make it possible to attribute this coinage to any particular party. It is now well accepted that the coinage was produced at the mint at Antioch, although we have not yet necessarily placed it within a sequence of coinage. So whoever produced it must have been in control of Antioch. Secondly, the scale of the production of the coinage was significant and therefore the producers of the coinage must have had access to the necessary finances and either the time or the scale to produce the coinage. As a corollary to this argument, the coinage is

unlikely to have come at a point when there was also large scale production of a different type of silver coinage at the same mint since that would have overburdened the production capacity of even a very active mint.

In addition to the practical considerations around production of the coins, there are the iconographic factors, such as how the images relate to other coinage attributed to the same authority. The image of Antiochos I on the obverse combined with the seated Apollo on the reverse alongside the introduction of the epithet Soter has a defining significance to the production of the Antiochos Soter coinage. As such it would be surprising if the coinage came from a king whose iconography deviated significantly from this pattern. I would propose as a first step in our search for attribution that we should look towards kings who produced coinage with the image of Antiochos I, and at the very least used the seated Apollo iconography. As a second step, I suggest that we consider that the large scale production and what has hitherto been defined as a limited time frame mean that the coinage was either produced to commemorate a specific event or to fulfil an interim need such as financing a military campaign, or we must reconsider the time scale. Next any attempt to solve the riddle must also provide a suitable environment for the coinage production.

One final point of discussion must be addressed. The coinage has a fairly wide distribution, appearing at least in the excavations at Gordion, Homs, and two Mesopotamian hoards but it does not appear in the relatively large hoard in Kilikia that is normally dated to this period. Thus any solution must not rely on a significant control over that region.

Possible new interpretations:

In this volume Coşkun has proposed a new chronology of both the 'War of the Brothers' and the Third Syrian War. This new chronology, whether it is fully accepted or not, provides a new range of potential producers of the Soter coinage, and it is worth exploring whether or not any of the groups to whom Coşkun assigns control of Antioch could have produced the coinage. If Coşkun is correct, then the parties that are involved at the start of the Third Syrian War are less limited. Let us summarise briefly the events that impact on Antioch according to Coşkun's reconstruction.³⁴ In April - May 246, Seleukos II, Antiochos Hierax and their sister Apame were in Babylon likely attending or participating in the Akitu festival on behalf of their father.³⁵ Seleukos II was also recognised as joint-regent in the normal fashion sometime in the spring. In early September, Babylon heard that Antiochos II had died and Seleukos II was recognised as sole-king. The presence of the two male children of Laodike and the connection to the Akitu festival and Seleukos' immediate accession suggest that they were not excluded from the royal court but remained as the rightful successors. The movement of Hierax in this period is difficult to reconstruct but Coşkun associates him with Alexander in Sardes in September.³⁶ Seleukos' movement is easier to follow, after being confirmed king, he moves westwards with an army, so that he was on his way to Ionia when hearing of his father's death. Thus at no point in 246 do either Seleukos or Antiochos Hierax control Antioch, but both are active in Asia Minor and Babylonia.

Under this reconstruction, Seleukos' has already been named king and recognised as such in Babylon before his father's death. As such, we should reject the repudiation of Laodike suggested by Porphyry³⁷ and not assume that Berenike's child was the designated successor. Coşkun suggests that this arrangement was accepted at Antioch, at least until news of Seleukos II's supposed death at Ankyra and the subsequent Ptolemaic invasion in September/October 246.³⁸ Under this version of events, Antioch remained loyal to Seleukos and his partisans either kept Berenike under house arrest from July until October or had her killed in the same period. Thus, unlike the traditional chronology, Berenike had a limited impact on the events after the death of Antiochos II. Nonetheless, it remains possible that she requested her brother's aid even if it did not arrive until after he had news of Seleukos' death. As with in the traditional chronology, Berenike had already been killed by the time he arrived in Antioch.³⁹ While elements of this reconstruction seem probable, it is difficult to fully accept the inactivity of Berenike in this period, it was certainly possible for Ptolemaic allies to recognise her child as king, even if the only evidence for such an act comes from the (potentially misinformed) commander at Kildara.⁴⁰ However, it remains difficult to see how Berenike could have access to sufficient resources to allow her produce the Soter coinage while simultaneously defending her position in Antioch.

Ptolemy Euergetes, according to both the traditional and Coşkun's chronology, arrived in Antioch in early October and was welcomed into the city.⁴¹ He reached Babylon by late December 246 and returned to Egypt by August 245.⁴² Therefore, if we wish to place the Soter coinage within the hands of Ptolemy himself, we are left with the relatively defined period between October 246 and August 245. While it is certainly possible that the production of the Soter coinage could have taken place during this year, it would have been an exceptionally high period of production. While the Ptolemaic coffers might have been able to support this range of minting activity, there still remains the difficult question of iconography. It might be possible to connect bronze coinage that might be linked to the Soter coinage to Ptolemy; the reverse of this type shows an anchor flanked by the caps of the Dioskouroi. The caps of the Dioskouroi (as well as the stars which may also represent the gods) appear framing the cornucopia on the coinage which features Ptolemy's wife Berenike on the obverse.⁴³ While it is possible that the coinage was produced for Ptolemy, it seems unlikely, in light of his own production of coinage in Egypt, that he would produce coinage naming Antiochos I to whom he had no connection rather than his normal coinage. It may have been possible that the coinage was produced while he claimed guardianship over Berenike's child, but there is no evidence that he ever recognised the deceased child.

Let us return to the new options presented to us by Coşkun's new chronology. Following his return to Egypt, Ptolemy left behind a varied group of men in control of the various regions under his control. If we follow the account in Porphyry then Ptolemy gave over Kilikia⁴⁴ in mid-245 to be governed by his friend Antiochos.⁴⁵ As Coşkun has suggested, it is likely that this friend of Ptolemy was Hierax who had already opposed his brother in Asia Minor in the previous year.

Returning to the new chronological narrative, thus in mid-245 Ptolemy returns to Egypt leaving Xanthippos in charge of the campaign against Seleukos on the eastern side of the

Euphrates and Antiochos (Hierax) to continue the conquest of Kilikia. Seleukos campaigned successfully against Xanthippos and defeated him in late 245 or early 244.⁴⁶ After this, Seleukos should have been able to move quickly to recapture the Seleukis.⁴⁷ However, it seems that he was unable to do so and his progress was hindered by Ptolemaic forces. Coşkun suggests that Ptolemy allowed Hierax to move into the region as he withdrew his forces and that Hierax was able to hinder Seleukos for about a further two years.

The evidence for Hierax's control of the Seleukis is slim, amounting to a passage in Strabo (*Geographica* 16.2.14) in which during the war between Hierax and Seleukos the people of Arados sided with Seleukos. Furthermore, they had agreed with Seleukos that they could freely harbour refugees, but not let them leave without his permission.⁴⁸ According to Strabo, those who fled to Arados were generally wealthy and possessed significant status. Thus the choice of Arados, away from the other major courts suggests the possibility of conciliation with Seleukos.⁴⁹ While this is possible, it is also possible, given the nature of Strabo's statement about the inability of Seleukos to gain access to those refugees that they fled from him. As Coşkun sees this treaty as beneficial to Seleukos and detrimental to Hierax, he proposes that the most area of dispute between the two brothers to be near the city. As such, he argues that Hierax was allowed by Ptolemy to control the Seleukis in his stead and that he was able to control Antioch until either 243 or 242,⁵⁰ giving him up to two and half years in control of the city.

If this identification is secure, then by mid-245 at the latest we have a new potential candidate for the production of the Soter coinage. Having accepted that Hierax could have been in control of Antioch from sometime near the end of 245 until 242 at the latest, let us now return to the problems posed by the iconography. One of major reasons for rejecting the assignment of this coinage either to Seleukos or to Berenike and her child is the lack of connection between them and Antiochos I, the same cannot be said for Hierax. In contrast to his brothers, Hierax's coinage portrayed any of the three Seleucid Antiochoi, himself and his father and grandfather on the obverse and retained the Apollo seated on the omphalos reverse for the majority of his coinage.⁵¹ The focus on his ancestors was expanded to include deified versions of them at Alexandria in Troas, Lampsacus and Ilion where the portraits sometimes featured the inclusion of a wing on the diadem. The use of the winged diadem varies across these mints, relatively rare in Lampsacus⁵² and Ilion⁵³, but common at Alexandria in Troas.⁵⁴ One of the dies used for the obverse in Ilium featured a recut portrait of Antiochos I to include the wings, suggesting his deification and a link with the mint at Alexandria in Troas.⁵⁵ **(Figure 4)** Furthermore, he consistently used the Apollo on the omphalos reverse favoured by those two kings. **(Figure 5)** Hierax's principle mint in Asia Minor appears to have been Alexandria in Troas, and excluding the production of Series II of Workshop B, almost all of the portraits that appear on the obverse from that mint feature more or less idealised versions of Antiochos I.⁵⁶ Thus, the majority of Hierax's coinage fits within the iconographic pattern of the Soter coinage. Both sets of coinage place considerable emphasis on the ancestry and divinity of Hierax's predecessors while also appearing to be somewhat reluctant to foreground his own image. This reluctance to place his own image on coinage is normally assigned to his youth,⁵⁷ but the creation of a '*persona*' which places Antiochos

firmly as part of the dynastic tradition seems a far more convincing opinion.⁵⁸ One further consideration that has not been previously raised is that he took inspiration from the coinage of his early patron Ptolemy III who likewise often looked back to the founder of the dynasty as a show of continuity.⁵⁹ If the iconography fits within the general outline of Hierax's coinage, the next problem to consider is that of the legend. Why would Hierax only refuse to name himself as the authority behind this coinage?

For a possible solution to this question, let us now return to the evidence for Coşkun's reconstruction of the chronology. From the text of Porphyry the person placed in charge of Kilikia is not referred to as king but rather as a friend of Ptolemy.⁶⁰ If Coşkun is correct and this Antiochos is in fact Hierax, then we have no evidence that at this point in his career that he had begun to call himself king. If this is the case and Hierax was in a position to produce coinage then it would have been expected that Hierax would not have used his own portraits nor would he have referred to himself as king as he had not yet taken the role of usurper, but rather was acting as a Ptolemaic ally. Thus, during the immediate aftermath of the Ptolemaic invasion, Hierax would have been put in the position of defending himself from his brother in Kilikia and establishing his own power, as we have discussed above. Furthermore, he may have been subordinate to Alexander in Sardes who would have been the senior military commander in the region.⁶¹ With his proposed movement into the Seleukis, Hierax would have had access to the mint at Antioch and could have moved to produce coinage to issue payments to his soldiers or procure military supplies. As he does not seem to have been willing to assume the diadem at this point, coinage that recalled the successes of his grandfather. He perhaps chose to gloss over his father owing to the problems his father's marriage had created while he attempted to deal with them. Furthermore, this solution may also be able to solve the 'problem' of the Dioskouroi caps with the anchor. While the Dioskouroi had been popular gods for the Seleucids, they are most notably associated with the Ptolemies, as discussed below.⁶² Perhaps the choice of the caps of the Dioskouroi was to show Hierax's acknowledgement of Ptolemaic support. On the other hand, under Antiochos II Tarsus in Kilikia had produced several bronze types which featured the Dioskouroi, all of these coins also featured an anchor.⁶³ This may point to a combination of Ptolemaic support for a Seleukid prince, support that was only acknowledged on bronze coinage.

If the attribution of the coinage to Hierax is correct, then this leaves the question of the continuation of the mint marks after Antioch was controlled by Seleukos II. I would suggest that, in the alliance which helped end the Third Syrian War with Hierax forgoing the war against his brother in exchange for Asia Minor, the mint officials did not travel with Hierax but remained at Antioch and joined Seleukos II.

If we are willing to accept this new combined chronology for the Third Syrian War and the War of the Brothers then a new solution is available to the vexed question of the Soter coinage. Rather than a product of the warring factions in Antioch or supporters of any one side, the coinage was produced by Hierax during his period of control over the city. This solves many of the iconographic problems which various scholars since Newell have faced. Nevertheless several problems still remain; as it seems that Hierax did not take large portions of this coinage with him to Asia Minor during his retreat since it does not appear in the

relevant hordes, neither have all of the ramifications of Seleukos' brief campaign in Asia Minor been fully understood.

Despite Hierax emerging as an interesting candidate as the issuer of the Antiochos Soter type, another candidate also deserves attention. The discussions of the iconography of the Soter coinage offer several points in common, regardless under which authority the coinage was produced. The coinage postdates the reign of Antiochos I, it highlights the significance of the king, it is likely produced at Antioch and the bronze uses the mint mark that continues until the reign of Antiochos III. If we were to look simply at the legend and the imagery of the coinage, the most logical point of production would have been late in the reign of Antiochos II. It does not seem unreasonable to suggest that, following his death, Antiochos I was deified by his son in the same manner as he had done for his father Seleukos I Nikator.⁶⁴ If we assume that Antiochos I was deified by his son and joined his father in the temple at Seleukeia in Pieria,⁶⁵ then it is entirely possible that the coinage was designed to highlight this event and that the Antiochos Soter coinage was designed to commemorate the creation of a new god and his cultic epithet. This would make the Soter coinage parallel to the coinage issued by Antiochos I on his arrival in Sardes where the coinage paired the horned diademed portrait of Seleukos I with the reverse of either the horned horse typical of Seleukos' coinage or Apollo seated on the omphalos.⁶⁶ In this case, we would have numismatic advertisement of the deification of the first two members of the Seleukid house. Unfortunately for this argument, it seems unlikely that this event alone required the significant production of coinage that we see for the Soter coinage, although it is possible. Also, it seems difficult to explain the caps of the Dioskouroi which appear on the bronze coinage within this model.

While Houghton and Lorber have highlighted the possible Ptolemaic link with the caps of the Dioskouroi,⁶⁷ it has not been fully explored. Since the caps only appear on the bronze and not the silver, they are an iconographic feature that is often considered secondary to the interpretation of the imagery. While this imagery is important, it does not necessarily follow that the silver coinage and the bronze were initiated at the same time. Rather it would be possible for the silver coinage to have begun to have been produced before the bronze coinage and for both coinage to have continued to be produced together. However, in terms of the iconography, I would propose that we should follow Houghton and Lorber and consider the iconography of the coinage together, with either a single iconographic message or a paired message, with the caveat that the bronze may have built on the existing ideology behind the silver coinage. In this case, the caps of the Dioskouroi became rather significant. While the Dioskouroi were important for the Seleukids, this particular iconography (rather than the gods themselves) does not appear elsewhere on Seleukid coinage. Instead, the caps of the Dioskouroi may have a clearer link with the Ptolemies, in particular with Ptolemaic queens.⁶⁸ The importance of the Dioskouri as a symbol for the Ptolemaic dynasty and the queens in particular has been recognised elsewhere,⁶⁹ which might suggest that the merger of the anchor and the symbolism for a Ptolemaic princess would make for a suitable commemoration for the merger of the two royal houses. It may be possible to push this conjecture slightly further; Hazzard has suggested that the Berenike honoured on Egyptian coinage featuring the caps of the Dioskouroi surrounding the double cornucopia is not in fact

Berenike wife of Euergetes but instead his sister, Berenike Phernophoros the wife of Antiochos Theos.⁷⁰ (Figure 6) While the coinage is normally assigned to Euergetes' honouring of his wife after her death and deification, as Fulińska points out that there are no other markers of divinity on it, and that the use of the title *Basilissa*, Queen, is rather rare.⁷¹ It may be possible to suggest that Euergetes honoured his full sister, perhaps in conjunction with his invasion to 'rescue her',⁷² as the rightful Queen, not of Egypt but of the lands controlled by the Seleukid kings. This would fit with the traditional description of Ptolemy's attempt to aid his sister, and would explain the lack of titles for Berenike wife of Euergetes on the coinage which are so familiar from her and her husband's cult. If this, admittedly speculative, argument is in fact correct, the use of the caps of the Dioskouroi could be seen as a symbol of Berenike, both on the Egyptian coinage and the Soter bronzes, and their use together with the anchor would highlight the merger of the two houses.⁷³ In this case, the bronze coinage produced by Tarsus in Kilikia during the reign of Antiochos II which featured the Dioskouroi and the anchor could also be seen to reinforce this message.⁷⁴

It is clear that Antiochos II controlled Antioch and that the iconography of the Soter coinage fits within the overall iconography of his coinage. Antiochos II utilised the portrait of his father in Asia Minor. This coinage would be the only instance of the practice from Tarsus east to Seleukeia on the Tigris, which issued exclusively portraits of Antiochos I.⁷⁵ Thus the Soter coinage might fit neatly into the patterns of Antiochos II's coinage by adding Antiochos' portrait into all the major regions of the empire.

Thus Antiochos II meets the first two criteria which I have argued are necessary to identify the producer of the coinage. One final hurdle remains, in order to move the production of the coinage from the period of turmoil following Antiochos II's death a suitably important background needs to be assigned to the coinage. I have suggested already that the deification of Antiochos I on its own would not have been a suitable event for the production of this coinage in a short time frame. However, this does not exclude the notion that this deification was not also celebrated alongside other major events in the reign of Antiochos II, nor that the coinage was produced for a longer time scale beginning with the deification of Antiochos Soter. One obvious event which may have been further marked by coinage in Antioch has already been hinted at, his marriage to Berenike after the end of the Second Syrian War. This would have provided Antiochos II the opportunity to further highlight the strength of the Seleukid dynasty by confirming the empire of his father and in the locally focused bronze coinage to highlight the link between himself and the Ptolemaic princess. The famed dowry of Berenike⁷⁶ would have contributed to Antiochos' ability to produce the gold coinage found in the series, which may have been produced at this point. One argument against placing the coinage during the reign of Antiochos II at Antioch would be that it would have overshadowed Antiochos' other production at the mint. Newell had assigned a gold coin type to the mint in celebration of the wedding to Berenike.⁷⁷ However, Le Rider in his study of the mint questioned the attribution not only of the gold coinage but five other tetradrachms that Newell had located there.⁷⁸ This reduced the production of the mint during his reign by about a third.⁷⁹ Furthermore, there is a complete break in the high value coinage, with only bronze sharing control marks and iconography between the reigns of Antiochos I and Antiochos II.⁸⁰

In light of this extra capacity, it seems entirely possible that the Soter coinage could have been struck at the mint at Antioch during this longer time frame. This would provide a form of continuity between the reigns of the two kings. Furthermore, it would not be necessary to assume that the production of the tetradrachms and the bronze coinage was co-terminus. The silver coinage could have begun at any point after the deification of Antiochos Soter, and the bronze coinage would have been used following the wedding, thus the mint officials responsible for the DEL mint mark may have only been active during a later stage of production. In any case, the Soter coinage would have formed the majority of Antiochos II's tetradrachm production at Antioch.

In conclusion, we have shown the problems of identifying any of the traditional candidates for the production of the Soter coinage and proposed two new candidates in different time period. If we are to maintain the original dating by Newell of this coinage to the period of turmoil that followed the death of Antiochos Theos⁸¹ then there is considerable difficulty in assigning it to any of the various factions which participated in the wars. As I hope to have shown, the traditional parties of Berenike and Seleukos II are unlikely to have produced the coinage for different reasons. If we remain convinced that the coinage was produced within this period, then Coşkun's new chronology provides a more suitable candidate in the form of Antiochos Hierax whose control of Antioch would have provided him opportunity to have produced the coinage. Nonetheless, as the silver series is not die-linked to any other Seleukid coinage its placement remains an enigma, and we are limited by the use of the mint marks on the bronze coinage alone. To this end, I believe that we should not be limited by Newell's argument on the dates. By placing the coinage at Antioch during the reign of Antiochos II, we can tie the coinage to his deification of his father, his victory over the Ptolemies in the Second Syrian War and to his marriage to Berenike. This provides a suitable context for the coinage, increases the length of time in which it could have been produced and provides a suitable moment in which Antiochos may have chosen to highlight the achievements of his family.

Bibliography

Bevan, E. R.

1901 'The Deification of Kings in the Greek Cities', *The English Historical Review* 16.64, 625-39.

Bikermann, E.

1938 'Anonymous Gods', *Journal of the Warburg Institute* 1.3, 187-96.

Blümel, W.

1992 'Brief des ptolemäischen Ministers Tlepolemos an die Stadt Kildara in Karien' *Epigraphica Anatolica* 20, 127-33.

Boehrer, C.

1993 'Antiochos Hierax am Hellespont' in M. Price, A. Burnett, and R. Bland (eds.), *Essays in Honour of Robert Carson and Kenneth Jenkins*, London, 37-47.

de Callatay, Fr.

2012 'Control marks on Hellenistic royal coinages: use, and evolution towards simplification?', *Revue belge de Numismatique*, 158, 39-62.

Chaniotis, A.

2003 'The Divinity of Hellenistic Rulers' in A. Erskine (ed.) *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, Oxford, 431-45.

Chrubasik, B.

2011 *The Men who would be King: Kings and Usurpers in the Seleukid Empire*. DPhil Thesis, Christ Church, Oxford.

Clayman, D.L.

2014 *Berenice II and the Golden Age of Ptolemaic Egypt*. Oxford.

Coşkun, A.

2012 'Deconstructing a Myth of Seleucid History: the So-Called 'Elephant Victory' over the Galatians Revisited', *Phoenix* 66.1-2, 57-73.

2015 'The War of Brothers, the Third Syrian War, and the Battle of Ankyra (246-241 BC): a Re-appraisal' in K. Erickson (ed.) *War within the Family: The Seleukid Third Century*, Swansea.

Cox, D. H.

1966 'Gordion hoards III, IV, V and VII' *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* 12, 19-55, pl. 3-21.

Del Monte, G.E.

1995 'Antioco I Soter e i figli Seleuco e Antioco, un nuovo testo da Babilonia', *SCO* 45, 433-444.

1997 *Testi dalla Babilonia ellenistica, vol. 1: Testi cronografici*. Pisa.

Erickson, K.

2009 *The Early Seleucids, Theirs Gods, and Their Coins*, PhD Thesis, Exeter.

Fleischer, R.

1991 *Studien zur seleukidischen Kunst I: Herrscherbildnisse*. Mainz am Rhein.

Fulinska, A.

2010 'Iconography of the Ptolemaic queens on coins: Greek style, Egyptian ideas?' in Ewdoksia, Papuci-Władyka (ed.) *Studies in Ancient Art and Civilization 14*, Krakow.

Grainger, J. D.:

1997 *A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer*. Leiden.

Habicht, C.

1970 *Gottmenschen und Griechische Städte*, 2nd ed. München.

Hazard, R.A.

1995 *Ptolemaic Coins: An Introduction for Collectors*. Toronto.

- 2000 *Imagination of a Monarchy: Studies in Ptolemaic Propaganda*. Toronto.
- Holton, J.R.
- 2015 'The Ideology of Seleucid Joint Kingship: The Case of Seleucus, Son of Antiochus I' in K. Erickson (ed.) *War within the Family: The Seleukid Third Century*, Swansea.
- Houghton, A. and Lorber, C.
- 2002 *Seleucid Coins: A Comprehensive Catalogue: Part I: Seleucus I through Antiochus III*. 2 vols. New York.
- Iossif, P.P.
- 2011 'Apollo *Toxotes* and the Seleukids: *Comme un air de famille*' in P. P. Iossif, A. S. Chankowski & C. Lorber (eds), *More than Men, Less than Gods: Studies on Royal Cult and Imperial Worship: proceedings of the international colloquium organized by the Belgian School at Athens (November 1-2, 2007)*, Leuven, 229-92.
- Kosmin, P.J.
- 2014 *The Land of the Elephant Kings: Space, Territory and Ideology in the Seleucid Empire*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Ma, J.
- 2000 *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*. Oxford.
- Muccioli, F.
- 2013 *Gli epiteti ufficiali dei re ellenistici*, Stuttgart.
- Mørkholm, O.
- 1991 *Early Hellenistic Coinage: From the accession of Alexander to the peace of Apamea (336 - 188 B.C.)*. Cambridge.
- Newell, E.
- 1977 *The Coinage of the Western Seleucid Mints From Seleucus I to Antiochus III, with summary of recent scholarship by Otto Mørkholm*. Original 1941. New York.
- van Nuffelen, P.
- 1999 'Le culte des souverains hellénistiques', *Ancient Society* 29, 175-89.
- 2004 'Le culte royal de l'empire des Séleucides: une réinterprétation', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 53.3, 278-301.
- Rigsby, K.J.
- 1996 *Asyilia. Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*. Berkeley.
- Sachs, A. J. and H. Hunger
- 1989 *Astronomical Diaries and Related Texts from Babylonia*. Vol. 2. Wien.
- Sherwin-White, S. and A. Kuhrt
- 1993 *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A new approach to the Seleucid Empire*. London.
- van der Spek, R. J.
- 1993 'The Astronomical Diaries as a source for Achaemenid and Seleucid History', *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, 91-101.
- 2014 'Commentary on related texts to BCHP 11' http://www.livius.org/cg-cm/chronicles/bchp-ptolemy_iii/bchp_ptolemy_iii_related_texts.html accessed January 2014.
- Le Rider, G.
- 1999 *Antioche de Syrie sous les Séleucides. Corpus des monnaies d'or et d'argent, I: De Séleucos I à Antiochos V, c. 300-161*, Paris
- 2000 'Apamée de Syrie: un chapitre contestable de E.T. Newell dans *WSM*' in S. Hurter and C. Arnold-Biucchi, eds. *Pour Denyse: Divertissements Numismatiques*, Bern, 105-8.
- Waage, D.B.
- 1952 *Antioch-on-the-Orontes*, Vol. 4, Part 2. *Greek, Roman, Byzantine and Crusaders' Coins*, Princeton.

Westermark, U.

1991 'Review of Davesene, A, and Le Rider, G. *Gülner II. Le trésor de Meydancikkale*' *Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau* 70, 97-101.

¹ For the sake of simplicity in the volume, I have referred to Coşkun's chapter for the discussion of the chronology rather than to repeat the arguments found there, for a version of the traditional chronology see Grainger 2010.

² See Muccioli 2013, 120-1.

³ de Callatay 2012 for the function of control or mint marks on Hellenistic coinage.

⁴ Houghton and Lorber 2002, 227.

⁵ Cox 1966, 52, pl. 4.

⁶ Houghton and Lorber 2002, 225.

⁷ Le Rider 1999, 74-5.

⁸ Houghton and Lorber 2002, 225.

⁹ Cf. Erickson in preparation for the contention that Seleukid ruler cult is never codified in the same manner as Ptolemaic cult and the use of cultic epithets is more varied than hitherto accepted.

¹⁰ Newell 1977, 163-5.

¹¹ The name of the child is given in an inscription from Kildara in Caria. Austin² 267= *SEG* 42.994 = Blümel 1992, 127-33 = *Bull.* 1994, 528 (P. Gauthier); Contra Coskun in this volume who does not believe that the child was ever named king.

¹² Newell 1977, 164 notes the similarity of style and fabric to Newell 1977, nos. 1142-3.

¹³ Newell 1977, 164 was aware of coins from the Homs 1934 hoard, Gejou's Mesopotamian Hoard, and Dunne's Mesopotamian hoard.

¹⁴ Waage 1952, 7 already questioned this view and assigned the coinage to Antioch; Le Rider 2000.

¹⁵ Cox 1966.

¹⁶ Cox 1966. However, that Coşkun 2012, 69 has rejected any connection between the Antiochos Soter coinage and the Galatian victory of the second Seleukid king.

¹⁷ Le Rider 1999, 74-96.

¹⁸ Westmark 1991 argues for several deposits in the hoard to account for some of the issues that need not be dated before this period. However, this does not solve the pertinent problem of the lack of Soter coinage in the hoard from this period.

¹⁹ Le Rider 1999, 82.

²⁰ Houghton and Lorber 2002, 225.

²¹ Houghton and Lorber 2002, 226. For the removal of Seleukos as co-regent see Holton this volume and for a rejection of his rebellion see Del Monte 1995; Del Monte 1997, 37, 228.

²² See Coşkun this volume for the argument that this inscription does not reflect the reality of the conflict, but only the conflict as it could have seemed to someone outside the immediate events.

²³ Austin² 267= *SEG* 42.994 = Blümel 1992, 127-33 = *Bull.* 1994, 528 (P. Gauthier).

²⁴ Houghton and Lorber 2002, p. 169.

²⁵ The existence of a cult of Seleukos I at a sanctuary is confirmed by Appian *Syr* 68; the existence of a cult of the rest of the Seleukid dynasty at the temple might be assumed by the existence of the priest list for the deceased kings (*OGIS* 245). Whether or not this temple was part of an imperial cult or merely civic cult is here irrelevant for the possibility Berenike could have claimed control over Antiochos' body. One could have further speculated that the need to highlight a connection to a prominent Antiochos was even more significant if the name of this child was originally Apames and Antiochos was chosen as a throne name. See Del Monte 1997, 46f; while it is possible that the child mentioned in the Sachs and Hunger 1989, -245 A Rev. 13 was the son of Berenike, it is now more likely that the child mentioned was female, van der Spek 2014 contra Sherwin-White and Kuhrt 1993, 231; van der Spek 1993, 72 note 7; del Monte 1997, 46f; Coskun this volume. As van der Spek 2014 points out, this provides the name for one of the two daughters of Antiochos and Laodike mentioned by Eusebios in his *Chronographica: FGrH* 260 F 32, 6.

²⁶ Coşkun this volume argues that Berenike never even controlled Antioch.

²⁷ Le Rider 1999, 89-90; Houghton and Lorber 2002, p. 227 follow Le Rider in his attribution of the coinage to Antioch although do not rule out a Ptolemaic influence.

²⁸ Le Rider 1999, 89-90.

²⁹ Houghton and Lorber 2002, p. 227.

³⁰ Le Rider 1999, 83.

³¹ Houghton and Lober 2002, p. 232.

³² Houghton and Lorber 2002, nos. 806-8, 810-11.

³³ It is worth noting that the coinage has its own section in Houghton and Lorber's catalogue and is not grouped with any particular monarch.

³⁴ See Coşkun this volume for the evidence behind this reconstruction.

³⁵ Sachs and Hunger 1989, –245.

³⁶ One problem not yet accounted for in this new chronology is the coinage of Seleukos II that is normally assigned to Sardes (Houghton and Lorber 2002, no. 652-663). This coinage is rather significant in scale, even given the limited duration that Seleukos controlled the city in the traditional chronology. That he is excluded entirely by his uncle would require a new attribution for the coinage. While it should be possible that Alexander who controlled the city continued to mint coinage for Seleukos, even as he opposed him, the coinage from Sardes already shows the innovative types of Seleukos II and the abandonment of the seated Apollo type. This suggests some form of control over the minting authority in the city by Seleukos. Unfortunately, there has been no full die study which might help shed light on this issue. The rest of Seleukos' coinage in Asia minor is similarly difficult to align with this new chronology.

³⁷ Porphyr. FGrH 260 F 43 ll. 11f.

³⁸ Coşkun this volume; Coşkun here dates the battle of Ankyra to September 246 and the Ptolemaic invasion of Antioch only to shortly after this event in October.

³⁹ Justin 27.1.7; FGrH 160 = Austin² 266; Polyainos 8.50

⁴⁰ Austin² 267 = SEG 42.994 = Blümel 1992, 127-33 = *Bull.* 1994, 528 (P. Gauthier). Whether or not this was in fact the case, it was not outside the realm of possibility. Furthermore, it seems unlikely that Berenike would not have claimed the throne for her child if she had the chance. This may have been the cause of the demise of both the mother and son at the hands of partisans of Seleukos II (or Laodike). See Polyainos 8.50; Val. Max. 9.10.ext. 1; Just. 27.1. It is probably best to imagine the Berenike attempted to control Antioch and sought help through her familial allies, but was ultimately defeated by forces loyal to Seleukos before her brother arrived.

⁴¹ P.Gourab II-IV; *OGIS* 54; Polyainos 8.50. It is irrelevant to our discussion here whether or not, or even how many officials came to Ptolemy in Antioch or the extent of his claims, but only that he in fact did control the city.

⁴² For the non-literary evidence see BCHP 11; *OGIS* 54. See BCHP 11 commentary for the date of Seleukos II's restoration of power in Babylon to 22.III.67 SEB = 11 July 245 BCE.

⁴³ Svoronos 1904, 1114 pl. XXXV 2-5; Cf. Clayman 2014, 129-30 and Hazzard 1995, 5. See also discussion below.

⁴⁴ The control of Kilikia was constantly in contention between the two major powers, but it seems that parts of Kilikia had unsuccessfully resisted attempts at Ptolemaic control: FGrH 160 = Austin² 266.

⁴⁵ FGrH 260 F43: et Syriam quidem ipse obtinuit, Kilikiam autem amico suo Antiocho gubernandam tradidit, et Xanthippo alteri duci provincias trans Euphraten. The Xanthippus who was appointed to control Mesopotamia may have been the unnamed official of King Ptolemy discussed in BCHP 11 obv. 12, rev. 3, 6.

⁴⁶ See Coşkun this volume for the chronology.

⁴⁷ Cf. *OGIS* I 229 = Ihnken, I. Magnesia am Sipylus (=IK 8) = I.Smyrna II.1 (=IK 24.1) 573 = Austin² 174, 1ff. for Seleukos' crossing into the region.

⁴⁸ Strabo *Geogr.* 16.2.14; for traditional arguments on the dating of this agreement see Duyrat 2005, 227-233; for the purpose of this agreement see Kosmin 2014, 122 (as an independent buffer between the Ptolemies and the Seleukids); Rigsby 1996, 11 for the conditions and the benefits to both parties; Grainger 1997, 61 and 168 who dates the grant of freedom to Arados to c. 242.

⁴⁹ See Coşkun this volume.

⁵⁰ Coşkun does not account for the fact that even after Seleukos' alliance with Hierax and subsequent peace with Ptolemy the port city of the Seleukis, Seleukeia-in-Pieria, remained in Ptolemaic hands. Whether the Ptolemaic garrison which controlled the city remained loyal to Ptolemy after Hierax switched allegiances or whether or not Hierax never controlled the city but only Antioch is unknowable.

⁵¹ See Houghton and Lorber 2002, p. 293-4; Fleischer 1991, 28-29 and Boehringer 1993, 38 for portraits of Hierax and the difficulty in identifying them.

⁵² Houghton and Lorber 2002, no. 850 (young king, possibly Hierax).

⁵³ Houghton and Lorber 2002, no. 871-2.

⁵⁴ Houghton and Lorber 2002, no. 874-886.

⁵⁵ Houghton and Lorber 2002, no. 871.

⁵⁶ Houghton and Lorber 2002, no. 874-886, with no. 879 and 883 not clearly identifiable portraits of Antiochos I.

⁵⁷ Boehringer 1993, 38.

⁵⁸ Chrubasik 2011, 51-54, cf. Erickson 2009, 183-4.

⁵⁹ Mørholm 1991, 28;

⁶⁰ FGrH 260 F43: et Syriam quidem ipse obtinuit, Kilikiam autem amico suo Antiocho gubernandam tradidit, et Xanthippo alteri duci provincias trans Euphraten.

⁶¹ In assessing this new chronology the place of Alexander needs to be further reviewed. Given that he never controlled Antioch where we have assigned this coinage, it seems impossible for him to have produced it. However, if it becomes clear the Antiochos Hierax operated both as his subordinate as well as Ptolemy's it might be possible that Alexander lay behind the choice of imagery.

⁶² See Houghton and Lorber 2002, p. 226.

⁶³ Houghton and Lorber 2002, nos. 565-7. Under Antiochos I, bronze coinage also included symbols of the Dioskouroi at Tarsus but not their caps. Houghton and Lorber 2002, nos. 332-334.

⁶⁴ The various later lists of priests for the ancestors of the living king invariably include Antiochos; e.g. OGIS 233 from Antioch in Persis; OGIS 246 from Teos; and OGIS 245 from Seleukeia in Pieria. No scholar appears to have suggested that there was not a posthumous cult of the Seleukid kings following the deification of Seleukos I. For Seleukid ruler cult in general see: Bevan 1901; Bickerman 1938; Chaniotis 2003, 436-7; Habicht 1970; Hazzard 2000; Ma 2000; van Nuffelen 1999; van Nuffelen 2004.

⁶⁵ Admittedly we have no evidence that this temple served as a royal tomb along the Ptolemaic model, we do have evidence for priests for Antiochos Apollo Soter from the reign of Seleukos IV (OGIS 245).

⁶⁶ Houghton and Lorber 2002, nos. 322 and 323. Iossif 2011, 268-272 has rightly suggested that origin of the Apollo type is Seleukeia on the Tigris. In this case, the deified form of Seleukos that appears at the mint of Sardeis was likely produced prior to Antiochos arrival in 276. The significance of the deification can also be seen in Philetairos' production of Seleukos in a horned helmet before he transferred the body of Seleukos to Antiochos, Houghton and Lorber 2002, no. 309.

⁶⁷ Houghton and Lorber 2002, 225.

⁶⁸ Fulińska 2010, 83; Hazzard 1995, 5.

⁶⁹ Here I would suggest that rather than referencing the dynasty in its entirety the use of the caps of the Dioskouroi was limited as a marker to female members of the Ptolemaic royal house, see Clayman 2014, 129-30 and Hazzard 1995, 5.

⁷⁰ Hazzard 1995, 4-5.

⁷¹ Fulińska 2010, 83-89 makes a convincing argument that the use of the term *Basilissa* reflects an Egyptian reflection of the importance of the role of wife of the Pharaoh.

⁷² See above for a discussion of the Third Syrian war and the causes of Ptolemy's intervention.

⁷³ The Dioskouroi are of course common in Asia Minor and it is always difficult to identify any particular set of deities with a particular Queen (or King).

⁷⁴ Houghton and Lorber 2002, nos. 565-7. Under Antiochos I, bronze coinage also included symbols of the Dioskouroi at Tarsus but not their caps. Houghton and Lorber 2002, nos. 332-334.

⁷⁵ Houghton and Lorber 2002, p. 169.

⁷⁶ Porphyr. *FGrH* 260 F 43 ll. 11f.

⁷⁷ Newell 1977, no. 570.2

⁷⁸ Le Rider 1999, 40-4.

⁷⁹ Houghton and Lorber 2002, p. 200 follow Le Rider's reattribution of the coinage.

⁸⁰ Houghton and Lorber 2002, p. 200.

⁸¹ Newell 1977, 163.