

**Zeitschrift:** Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau = Revue suisse de numismatique = Rivista svizzera di numismatica  
**Herausgeber:** Schweizerische Numismatische Gesellschaft  
**Band:** 85 (2006)

**Buchbesprechung:** Arados hellénistique : étude historique et monétaire [Frédérique Duyrat]

**Autor:** Lorber, Catharine C.

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 29.12.2025

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

---

Frédérique Duyrat

*Arados hellénistique: Étude historique et monétaire*

Bibliothèque archéologique et historique Tome 173

Institut français du Proche-Orient. Beirut, 2005.

xii + 433 pp., 50 pl., 13 maps, 17 figs. ISBN 2-912738-33-4, ISSN 0768-2506

The northernmost of the great Phoenician maritime cities, Aradus enjoyed an unusual status during much of the Hellenistic period and its history is thus of special interest. Frédérique Duyrat's doctoral dissertation, submitted in March 2000, reconstructs that history and provides an extensive record of Aradian coinage over more than three centuries, from the Macedonian conquest in 333/2 BC to occasional bronze issues of the first century AD. The corpus lists 4636 coins, arranged in three categories: royal Alexanders; civic emissions of the fourth century (a tiny class);<sup>1</sup> and autonomous emissions ranging in date from c. 246/5 BC to AD 92/3. The autonomous coinage of Aradus is classified into 8 silver series, identified by Roman numerals (Series I-VIII), and 18 bronze series, assigned Arabic numerals (Series 1-18). These series are presented chronologically, based on the date of the earliest known coin, so that silver and bronze series alternate unpredictably in the catalogue. The series vary greatly in size, with a high of 1218 examples of the Tyche/Nike tetradrachms (Series VII) and a low of 2 examples each of the Poseidon/Zeus tetradrachms (Series V) and the bronzes with beardless male head/reclining zebu (Series 18). Because some of the listings run on for pages, it would have been enormously helpful to have headers in the catalogue identifying the group or series listed on each page. A second minor complaint about presentation is that Phoenician characters are not reproduced as they appear on the coins, but are represented by italicized Roman letters or Arabic numerals. Remarkably, Duyrat was able to assign die numbers to nearly every coin in her corpus. An attempt was made to illustrate every obverse die in the plates and, despite inevitable lacunae, the coverage is very good. The illustrations are a mix of photos from casts and from actual coins. The former tend to be light, sometimes too light, while some of the latter are too dark.

Excluded from the corpus and plates are two possibly Aradian coinages whose corpora have already been published by other scholars. In 1976 Otto Mørkholm surveyed the Ptolemaic «coins of an uncertain era,» identified the era as Aradian, and interpreted the coins as pseudo-Ptolemaic issues of the Phoenician city.<sup>2</sup> And in a 1991 article, Arthur Houghton associated the so-called «anchor Alexanders» with Seleucus I and divided them into four groups, one of which (Group III) he

<sup>1</sup> This already-small class will be significantly reduced by a redating proposed by O. HOOVER, A Second Look at the Aradian Bronze Coinage Attributed to Seleucus I (SC 72-73), AJN 18, 2006, forthcoming.

<sup>2</sup> O. MØRKHOLM, The Ptolemaic «Coins of an Uncertain Era», NNA 1975/76, pp. 23-58.

gave to Aradus.<sup>3</sup> Duyrat's handling of the «anchor Alexanders» is confusing. On p. 12 she mentions Martin Price's doubts about the attribution of certain «anchor Alexanders» to Aradus,<sup>4</sup> yet does not engage his arguments. She notes that Houghton proposed the reassignment of his Group I from Aradus to Susa, reports Brian Kritt's rejection of this coinage from Susa,<sup>5</sup> but fails to state her own view, leaving the reader to wonder whether E.T. Newell's original attribution to Aradus is to be accepted by default.<sup>6</sup> In the catalogue (p. 35) she cites Houghton's 1991 paper for its quantitative data without specifying which group or groups she considers Aradian; only by consulting the article itself can the reader ascertain that Houghton's Group III is the source of the figures. In contrast, Duyrat's treatment of the Ptolemaic «coins of an uncertain era» is exemplary (pp. 115-119). She describes her attempt to reconstitute Mørkholm's die study; provides a tabular summary of his results; catalogues the specimens that have appeared since 1976, assigning letters to the new dies; and reviews the problem of die links between coins with widely separated dates. Unlike Mørkholm, Duyrat accepts the dates as accurate and assumes the intermittent use of certain obverse dies.

Numismatic analyses are segregated in Chapter III, where the coinage of Aradus is examined by group or by series. Die frequencies show that despite Duyrat's often huge samples, the majority of her series remain very imperfectly known. For the royal coinage of Alexander type she derives averages of annual die use; for series dated according to the Aradian era she presents graphs showing annual variations in production, with die counts superimposed on the number of recorded coins. There are also histograms of weights and, for bronzes, diameters. Circulation patterns are illustrated, where possible, by summarizing all relevant hoards and locating their find spots on maps. The Aradian system of control marks involved the use of both Phoenician and Greek letters, and as a test case Duyrat investigates the controls of the Tyche/Nike tetradrachms (Series VII), whose sample is the most complete and representative of the entire corpus. She argues against the hypotheses that the six Phoenician letters represent either workshops of the mint or *dimenoi* (two-month divisions of the year), but tentatively accepts that the paired Greek letters contract the names of mint magistrates, some of whom served for exceptionally long periods.

The second half of *Arados hellénistique* recounts the history of Aradus and attempts to place its coinage in historical perspective. The scantiness of the literary and epigraphic evidence means that coinage can sometimes help to fill in the narrative. Duyrat sets the scene with descriptions of the island of Arwad and the geography

<sup>3</sup> A. HOUGHTON, Some Alexander Coins of Seleucus with Anchors, *Mediterranean Archaeology* 4, 1991, pp. 99-117.

<sup>4</sup> M.J. PRICE, The Coinage in the Name of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaeus (Zurich/London 1991), pp. 414-425, dates the «anchor Alexanders» (nos. 3339-3364) to the period c. 311-300 but suggests on pp. 415-416 that they were almost certainly minted in Mesopotamia.

<sup>5</sup> B. KRITT, The Early Seleucid Mint of Susa (Lancaster 1997), pp. 87-88.

<sup>6</sup> E.T. NEWELL, The Coinage of the Western Seleucid Mints (New York 1941), pp. 192-193, gave the «anchor Alexanders» to Aradus but denied their association with Seleucus.

of the surrounding region, supplemented by maps and photographs. To fill in the background before the Macedonian conquest, she summarizes the information available about Aradus and each of the cities of its *peraea* from early textual sources and from modern archaeological excavations. She also reports the principal results of excavations at other cities in coastal Syria, including Al-Mina, Ras el-Bassit (Posideion), Ras Shamra (Leukos Limen), and Ras Ibn Hani to the north, and Tell 'Arqa and Tripolis to the south, with brief surveys of the principal cities of the Orontes Valley (Emesa and Pharnacia-Pella-Apamea). The textual sources indicate that Aradus had been under the dominion of the kings of Amurru until the invasions of the Sea People c. 1180. During the chaos of the eleventh through ninth centuries, Aradus emerged as an independent city-state ruled by a king, the common pattern in Phoenicia. In this same troubled period, Aradus dominated numerous cities of the mainland, but lost them to Hamat by the mid-eighth century. The archaeology points to the conclusion that potential Syro-Phoenician rivals to Aradus, except for Marathus, were in decline on the eve of the Macedonian conquest or had not yet achieved importance, leaving Aradus itself in a favorable position to benefit from its harbor, its fleet, and the unusually hospitable coast of the opposing mainland. By this time Aradus again controlled extensive territories on the mainland. We lack specific evidence for the political institutions through which this domination was exercised. Henri Seyrig, followed by J.-P. Rey-Coquais, hypothesized a federation based on the sanctuary of Baetocaecé. Duyrat accepts the existence of a federation but questions the role of Baetocaecé, which appears to have belonged to the Seleucid Crown until the end of the dynasty. Thasos and Rhodes, each of which had a *peraea* on the mainland, provide possible parallels for the relation of Aradus to its mainland possessions.

After his victory at Issus in autumn of 333, Alexander elected not to pursue Darius until he had secured his rear by taking the coastal cities and Cyprus, whose contingents comprised the Achaemenid navy. Alexander wintered at Marathus, on the mainland close by Aradus. The Aradian crown prince and regent, Straton, offered his allegiance to Alexander, after which his father, King Gerostratos, defected from the Persian fleet with his flotilla. We have no record of the end of the Aradian monarchy, but Duyrat seeks some clues in the coinage. She suggests that the letter Γ in the left field of the earliest Alexander tetradrachms (her Group I) might be the initial of Gerostratos, in which case this coinage could have begun as early as c. 332, very soon after the invention of Alexander's royal types at Tarsus in 333 – a dating for which Duyrat finds support in the form of Ξ (with a vertical stroke) in the legend of Groups I and II. Group II consists of just four tetradrachms bearing the Phoenician inscription *mem aleph*, which also marks the fourth-century civic coinage of Aradus before the Macedonian conquest, and which Duyrat takes as evidence for the continuing survival of the monarchy. These *mem aleph* tetradrachms were considered the earliest Alexanders of Aradus by Ernest Babelon and by Newell; Duyrat chooses instead to bring them closer to the staters of her Group III, where *mem aleph* also appears. Group III is characterized by control letters on the obverse. There is a pronounced break in obverse style between Group III and the large Group IV, not noted by Duyrat, who instead finds continuity in control conventions (p. 11). This break may be indicative of intermittent production and

suggests an interval of mint inactivity between Groups III and IV; such an interruption seems the more likely because the volume of Groups I-III is hardly adequate to fill the allotted time period, 332?-c. 324/3.

The major Aradian coinage of the Macedonian period is represented by the Alexanders of Group IV, which bear the royal title and are mostly or entirely posthumous. Group IV represents a period of intense coin production, associated with the large-scale demobilizations of Alexander's army. Duyrat calculates annual die use of 1.75 dies per year for Groups I-III, assigned to the period 332?-324/3, and 45.5 dies per year for Group IV, dated to the period 324/3-320 (p. 123). The figure for Group IV is enormously larger than the average annual die use for Myriandrus/Issus,<sup>7</sup> Tarsus, Sardes, Miletus, and Lampsacus, derived from a study by François de Callataÿ.<sup>8</sup> (There is a methodological problem here: because of the huge disparity in size between Duyrat's sample and those of Callataÿ, one would have preferred comparisons based on statistical estimates of the original size of each coinage.) In order to smooth out the anomaly, Duyrat combines Groups I-IV to achieve an average of 16.33 dies per year. Yet the unevenness of the production is arguably its most interesting aspect: Group IV, Series 11, marked with a caduceus, is disproportionately large, accounting for 89 of the 181 obverse dies of Group IV. It might have been fruitful to ask if this sharp spike could be correlated with any specific historical event. Instead, Duyrat submits that the high production levels of Group IV and the mint's specialization in tetradrachms are evidence that Aradus served as a point of debarkation for demobilized soldiers, a proposition earlier rejected by Margaret Thompson.<sup>9</sup> The hoard record shows that fourth century Aradian tetradrachms enjoyed a wide international circulation, with their heaviest concentrations in Asia Minor and Egypt. Since Asia Minor was well known as a source of mercenaries, Duyrat suggests the dispersal of Aradian tetradrachms as far as Upper Egypt may indicate the existence of Egyptian mercenaries.

Gold production was significant only during the reign of Philip Arrhidaeus. Duyrat calculates that it accounted for 21% of the value of Group IV and 49% of the value of Group V (coinage issued in Philip's name). These calculations appear to have been made on the basis of dies actually recorded; again, it probably would have been preferable to work from statistical estimates of the size of the original production. Of the five hoards containing Aradian staters, three were found in northern Greece or the Balkans and a fourth in Ukraine. Duyrat follows Callataÿ in suggesting that gold staters were intended for the pay of Thracian mercenaries.

Group V, in the name of Philip III, is the only royal Macedonian coinage assigned to Aradus that does not bear the city's mintmark; instead, the letter Z replaces the mintmark beneath Zeus's throne. Duyrat believes that Group V succeeded Group

<sup>7</sup> The location of the mint is challenged by J.D. BING, *Reattribution of the 'Myriandrus' Alexanders: The Case for Issus*, *AJN* 1, 1989, pp. 1-32.

<sup>8</sup> F. DE CALLATAÿ, *Recueil quantitatif des émissions monétaires hellénistiques* (Wetteren 1997).

<sup>9</sup> M. THOMPSON, *Paying the Mercenaries*, in A. HOUGHTON *et al.*, eds., *Festschrift für Leo Mildenberg* (Wetteren 1984), p. 246 n.19.



IV, but her handling of the chronology is inconsistent. On p. 213 she makes the transition contemporary with Ptolemy's conquest of Syria in 319.<sup>10</sup> On p. 215 she notes that Group IV is entirely represented in the Demanhur hoard, but that the hoard contained no coins of Group V; it follows that Group IV must antedate the hoard's burial in 318/7, and Group V must postdate it. But after presenting this argument, Duyrat announces that «for convenience» she will retain Price's date of c. 320 as the boundary between Groups IV and V. Thus she elides the fact that there is very little time for the production of Group V in the name of Philip, which appears throughout the book under the deceptive rubric c. 320-c. 316 (pp. 11, 30, 125, 215). The imprecision of the chronology also renders meaningless the calculations of average annual die use for Groups IV and V (pp. 123, 125).

In the Diadochic period, northern Phoenicia was briefly occupied by Ptolemy, but fell to Antigonus in 316 and remained in his possession until his defeat at Ipsus in 301, when the region passed under the rule of Seleucus. No coinage is attributable to Aradus during the Antigonid phase. This conclusion is contrary to the consensus reached by Kritt and Houghton in the late 1990s when, on the basis of die links, they reattributed to Aradus all the coinage formerly given by Newell to Marathus, associated the anchor with Seleucus' command of the Ptolemaic fleet, and claimed this as evidence that Seleucus held Aradus from the time of his navarchy, c. 315, until his occupation of Syria in 301.<sup>11</sup> Duyrat refutes the Houghton-Kritt chronology as inconsistent with the literary sources, which show that Antigonus and Demetrius were firmly in control of northern Syria and Phoenicia from 316 to 302. If the anchor was really Seleucus' personal emblem, the «anchor Alexanders» could not have been minted in northern Phoenicia until after 301. Duyrat also reports her inability to verify a key die link cited by Kritt and Houghton and suggests that the die links may imply die sharing by Aradus and Marathus, rather than reattribution. After these criticisms, it is somewhat disconcerting that Duyrat provisionally accepts the erstwhile Marathus «anchor Alexanders» as the Aradian coinage of Seleucus after 301. She emphasizes the modest volume of this coinage and its surprising interruption of a long period of mint inactivity. Its purpose, she surmises, was to pay the troops that fought for Seleucus at Ipsus, to finance his conquest of Syria, and/or to maintain the port of Aradus while Seleucus' new foundations were under construction. Duyrat doubts that Houghton's Group IV, Series G belongs to Marathus and rejects the historical conclusions drawn from the attribution by J.D. Grainger. Perhaps due to conflicting publication schedules, *Arados hellénistique* does not mention the reattributions proposed in *Seleucid Coins: the Philips and «anchor Alexanders»* of both Aradus and Marathus are there reassigned to Baby-

<sup>10</sup> The chronology of the early Diadochic period is currently under challenge. Duyrat follows the so-called low chronology. A return to the high chronology has been advocated by P.V. WHEATLEY, Ptolemy Soter's Annexation of Syria 320 BC, *Class.Quart.* XLV/2, 1995, pp. 433-440, who dates the Ptolemaic occupation of Syria and Phoenicia 320-315.

<sup>11</sup> KRITT, (*supra*, n. 5), pp. 87-88; A. HOUGHTON, Aradus, not Marathus, in: R. ASHTON/S. HURTER, eds., *Studies in Greek Numismatics in Memory of M.J. Price* (London 1998), pp. 145-146.

lonia, the Philips during Seleucus' first satrapy, the «anchor Alexanders» during his second.<sup>12</sup> This solution requires some adventurous arguments but has the advantage of allowing a single explanation for the anchor erasures that occur in both the «Aradian» and «Marathian» series – a phenomenon not confronted by Duyrat.

From 301 until the conquest of the Ptolemaic province of Syria and Phoenicia by Antiochus III in 200-198, Aradus and its *peraea* lay at the southernmost boundary of Seleucid Syria and served as a buffer zone between the Seleucid and Lagid kingdoms. The importance of its port and fleet assured that Aradus could extract favorable treatment from the Seleucid king, especially during the Second and Third Syrian Wars. It was during the Second Syrian War, in autumn 259, that Aradus received a grant of autonomy. Alain Davesne has alleged a Ptolemaic occupation of Aradus during the Second Syrian War and has submitted that the grant of autonomy came from the Lagid, not the Seleucid king. The linchpin of his case is a speculative attribution to Aradus of two series of Ptolemaic provincial tetradrachms (Svoronos 894-896 and 897-898).<sup>13</sup> Duyrat demolishes this attribution, demonstrating that Davesne has misread the monogram he claims as an Aradian mintmark. She finds most of Davesne's reconstruction of the war to be dubious, though she is perhaps unduly skeptical when she questions the significance of Ptolemaic coin hoards found in Seleucid territory. Her own reconstruction of the war involves a brief Ptolemaic occupation of Cilicia and Syria Seleucis in 261/0, a rapid repulse of the invaders, and a renewed Lagid offensive, attested by a demotic ostrakon from Karnak that places Ptolemy II in Daphnae in autumn of 258 and further attested by allusions in the Zenon archives to military movements near the River Eleutheros in 257. Duyrat maintains that Aradus received its autonomy from Antiochus II, apparently as a mark of gratitude for the city's fidelity during these troubles.

The Seleucid kingdom suffered key losses during the Third Syrian War. Ptolemy III got possession of Seleucia in Pieria, the port of Antioch. An inscription found at Ras Ibn Hani attests to the presence there of a Lagid garrison that controlled access to the port of Laodicea. Ptolemaic coin finds have been cited to date this occupation to the Third Syrian War, and similar finds establish a Lagid presence at Ras el-Bassit (Posideion) as well. To refute Davesne's hypothesis of another Ptolemaic occupation of Aradus at this time, Duyrat notes the absence of Ptolemaic bronze coins in Aradian territory (though a hoard of Ptolemaic tetradrachms has to be explained away as a merchant's working capital). The production of autonomous Aradian coinage before 243/2 is also alleged to exclude a Ptolemaic presence, however the imprecision of the dating may leave the possibility alive. The autonomous coinage in question includes Alexander tetradrachms with the palm tree

<sup>12</sup> A. HOUGHTON/C. LORBER, *Seleucid Coins: A Comprehensive Catalogue, Part 1* (New York/Lancaster 2002), pp. 34-37, 43-48, 479-483.

<sup>13</sup> A. DAVESNE, *Les monnaies ptolémaïques d'Éphèse*, in: H. MALAY *et al.*, eds., *Erol Atalay Memorial* (Izmir 1991), pp. 27-28; *id.*, *La seconde guerre de Syrie (ca. 261-255 avant J.-C.) et les témoignages numismatiques*, in: M. AMANDRY/S. HURTER, eds., *Travaux de numismatique grecque offerts à G. Le Rider* (London 1999), pp. 123-134.

(Series I) as well as silver fractions and Tyche/prow bronzes (Series II-III, Series 1). The minting of tetradrachms probably commenced when Laodicea passed under Ptolemaic control and ceased to issue its own Alexanders. Although Aradian production was not large, Duyrat asserts that it may have doubled the annual rate of Laodicea, which had apparently been the most productive mint of the western Seleucid kingdom. (This is another comparison that may be considered suspect, since it is based on actual dies recorded rather than statistical estimates of total production.) The «palm tree Alexanders» were minted intermittently from 246/5(?) to 168/7, with peaks of production associated with the Third, Fourth, and Fifth Syrian Wars, suggesting that this coinage was struck to cover military expenses.

The first peak of production of the «palm tree Alexanders» lasted through the War of the Brothers. During this fratricidal conflict Aradus sided with Seleucus II and was rewarded with a treaty allowing the city to give sanctuary to fugitives from his kingdom; Duyrat considers this to be the political form of *asylia*, limited in scope and a proof of the city's subjection to the Crown. The treaty also led to territorial gains in the *peraea*. Citing the opinion of Rey-Coquais that this was a turning point in Aradian history, Duyrat speculates that Aradus may have installed colonists on the mainland, in effect extending its civic territory after the model of the Rhodian *peraea*. Nevertheless, in the following years there is evidence for the autonomy of several of the mainland cities. Duyrat names Simyra as the only royal Seleucid mint within the *peraea*, associating its Seleucid-type tetradrachm, dated year 35 (225/4), with Porphyry's report that Seleucus III prepared a campaign against Ptolemy III in that year (Hier. *In Dan.* 11.44-45). Since *Arados hellénistique* went to press, an earlier tetradrachm of this type, apparently undated, was published as an issue of Seleucus II by Arnold Spaer.<sup>14</sup> In addition, Carne is now known to have struck tetradrachms and probably also drachms with the types of Seleucus II, the former in 229/8 and the latter in either 230/29 or 229/8.<sup>15</sup> This coinage, probably a contribution to Seleucus' Parthian campaign, indicates that Carne, like Simyra, was autonomous and allied with the Seleucid king. Also datable c. 230-225 are drachms of Marathus imitating the Athena/Nike types of Seleucia on the Tigris under Seleucus II.<sup>16</sup> Marathus reaffirmed its *symmachia* in 218, in the course of the Fourth Syrian War. Duyrat recalls the discussion of Elias Bickerman concerning the status of such allied cities. They could send embassies to the king and engage in diplomacy with other cities and polities. They were not subject to conscription but maintained their own armed forces, from which they supplied contingents to the king. These criteria seem to apply to Aradus.

The series of Ptolemaic tetradrachms (and later, didrachms) «of an uncertain era» began in the decade of the 220s. In an appendix to Chapter VII (pp. 266-272),

<sup>14</sup> A. SPAER, The Seleucid Mint of Simyra, SM 212, December 2003, pp. 75-76.

<sup>15</sup> A. HOUGHTON/C. LORBER/O. HOOVER, Seleucid Coins: A Comprehensive Catalogue, Part 2 (New York/Lancaster), forthcoming, Addenda to Part 1, Ad154 (= AHNS 993) and Ad172.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, Addenda Ad156.



Duyrat summarizes the arguments supporting Mørkholm's attribution to Aradus and those supporting the hypotheses of R.A. Hazzard, who submitted that the coinage was dated according to an era of Ptolemy Soter commencing in 262, and proposed Pelusium as the mint.<sup>17</sup> For various reasons, including the lack of mint-marks, Duyrat is reluctant to assign the era coinage to Aradus; she tends to favor the Soter era over the Aradian era because it yields better correspondences between periods of coin production and historical events. Though she offers perceptive critiques of both Mørkholm's and Hazzard's mint attributions, she cannot solve the mystery. She concludes that this was a royal Ptolemaic coinage whose mint remains to be determined but was probably in Egypt or Syro-Phoenicia. A listing of thirteen hoards in Chapter III (pp. 175-178) shows that the era coins circulated in the ancient zone of Lagid domination, on Cyprus but predominantly in the Syro-Phoenician province, apart from two hoards found on Aradian territory. Duyrat suggests that the current picture of their circulation may be distorted by the uneven pace of archaeological excavations in different Middle Eastern countries. She concedes that the circulation as presently known makes it difficult to envision an Egyptian mint, as we would have to assume that its entire output was exported, even at times when Egypt was struggling with a shortage of silver. But her alternative is problematic. Since the era coinage lasted into the 140s, a Syro-Phoenician mint could only be Aradus or an unidentified Ptolemaic outpost that somehow survived the Fifth Syrian War.

The conquests of Antiochus III in the Fifth Syrian War changed the geopolitical organization of Syria and Phoenicia. No longer a border state, Aradus lost its strategic importance and its power to extract special benefits from the Crown. The Treaty of Apamea affected Aradian naval operations inasmuch as the city was an ally of the Seleucid king; Duyrat proposes that this, rather than the Roman indemnity, may explain the cessation of regular annual issues of «palm tree Alexanders» after 191/0. A few fitful emissions followed, the last probably in 168/7. By that time Aradus had already initiated a new silver coinage, its first-ever drachms, imitating the bee/stag drachms of Ephesus (Series VI). These were intended to replace the very old drachms of Alexander III, which were finally disappearing from circulation, and to supplement the drachms of Ephesus, which also circulated in the Seleucid kingdom but whose production had effectively ceased. The pseudo-Ephesian drachms, though well represented in the corpus with 436 specimens, exhibit unusual die ratios that suggest they were not actually produced in great abundance. This probably resulted from the fact that the obverse dies bore the dates and control marks, so that they had to be discarded at the end of each year. However Duyrat offers an alternative explanation: to account for an anomalous (probably double struck) drachm, she hypothesizes that multiple obverse dies may have been engraved on a single piece of metal, so that the mint worker could strike different dies alternately. The inaugural date of the pseudo-Ephesian drachms

<sup>17</sup> R.A. HAZZARD/M.P.V. FITZGERALD, *The Regulation of the Ptolemaieia: A Hypothesis Explored*, *Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society of Canada* 85/1, February, 1991, pp. 6-23; R.A. HAZZARD, *Imagination of a Monarchy: Studies in Ptolemaic Propaganda* (Toronto 2000), pp. 3-79.

(172/1?) and their heavy production through 169/8 are adduced to support the notion that they played a role in military preparations for the Sixth Syrian War, as well as in the actual campaigns. The absence of a drachm issue for 168/7 and the end of the palm tree Alexanders in the same year might be related to Porphyry's report that Antiochus IV ravaged the territory of Aradus in 168 to punish a rebellion by the city. However Duyrat questions whether such a rebellion occurred, citing the resumption of drachm production in 167/6 and the regular annual issues beginning in 165/4. An increase in drachm output from 162/1 to 160/59 may reflect Aradian support for the cause of Demetrius I. On the other hand, the very wide distribution of these drachms, from Smyrna to Tehran, including a sizable number in a Baghdad hoard, argues for at least a secondary circulation in commerce. There was a long interruption in drachm production after 152/1, with a second period of feeble issues between 129/8 and 111/10.

Around 140 Marathus seems to have passed under the control of Aradus, perhaps through a *sympoliteia* as suggested by Rey-Coquais. Around this same time (in 138/7) Aradus introduced a new silver coinage (Series VII), tetradrachms pairing the head of Tyche and a figure of Nike holding an aphlaston, the latter type symbolic of Aradian naval power. At this point Aradus abandoned the international Attic standard, instead striking these tetradrachms to a reduced weight standard, with an average weight of c. 15.00-15.29 grams. This reduced standard was also employed for the later pseudo-Ephesian drachms and was retained until the end of the city's silver coinage in the first century BC. Toward the end of the second century the Aradian standard was adopted by other regional cities: Seleucia in Pieria from 109/8, Tripolis c. 100, and Laodicea from 81/0. A comparative survey of hoards reveals that the adoption of this epichoric standard entailed the creation of a closed monetary zone that prevented the escape of silver currency while providing a regular revenue stream in the form of commissions on currency exchange. The Tyche/Nike tetradrachms were produced in regular annual issues of modest size, consistent with their function as a local currency and much in contrast to the fluctuations of earlier coinages that were linked to Seleucid military activity. Nevertheless Duyrat finds a correlation between periods of elevated coin production before 120/19 and events in the Seleucid kingdom, even as she rules out any military or financial involvement of Aradus in the rivalries of the Seleucid dynasty. Her narrative of these rivalries, unfortunately, involves a number of careless errors, whose survival suggests the dissertation did not receive much editorial attention on its way to becoming a book. The biography of Demetrius I is attached to Demetrius II, who is described as a Roman hostage who escaped to Syria (p. 264). Ptolemy Euergetes II is referred to both as Ptolemy VIII (p. 264) and as Ptolemy VII (p. 265) – perhaps a response to the currently unsettled state of the numbering of the latter Ptolemies. Cleopatra Thea is called Cleopatra II (p. 265), a numeration that is not justified in the Seleucid line and invites confusion with her mother, Cleopatra II of Egypt, who took refuge at the Seleucid court during the second reign of Demetrius II.

After the Seleucid civil wars brought the dynasty to its nadir, Tigranes II of Armenia occupied Syria. Neither the literary record nor archaeology hints at any contact with Aradus, but Duyrat notes the cessation of two Aradian bronze series

in 84/3 and 83/2 and the impressive number of Armenian bronzes overstruck on Aradian issues as evidence that Tigranes probably passed through the Aradian *peraea*.<sup>18</sup> She disputes the numismatic arguments of Grainger, who claims that Gabala escaped the Aradian orbit between 129 and 86. She also rebuts the theory of B.E. Levy that the letters ΜΣ, which appear on many Aradian tetradrachms between 90/89 and 67/6, reflect a long mint magistracy held by Mithradates VI of Pontus. The arrival in the region of Pompey the Great correlates with increased tetradrachm production at Aradus and Laodicea, leading Duyrat to suggest some vague involvement of these cities with the stationing of Roman troops in Syria. After 64 many cities abandoned the Aradian era in favor of a Pompeian era and Aradus, while maintaining its own era, may have gained control over the important sanctuary of Baetocaecé. The region was subsequently caught up in the Roman civil wars. That Aradus participated in the preparation of a Pompeian fleet in 49 is known from an inscription but scarcely reflected in its coinage. Duyrat believes that Caesar punished Aradus for its Pompeian sympathies by depriving it of Gabala, which henceforth dated its coinage by the Caesarian era commencing in 46/5. Aradus declined steadily thereafter, striking its last silver coinage in 44 (at which point Laodicea abandoned the Aradian standard for the Ptolemaic). Aradus showed consistent hostility to Mark Antony and Cleopatra and, after the repulse of the Parthian invasion of 41/0-39, was the only city not to submit to the Romans. In 37 it was besieged by Antony's governor C. Sossius and fell after suffering famine and epidemic. Aradus is rarely mentioned in texts of the imperial period and did not enjoy the favor of the Roman emperors or their client-kings in the region.

Aradian bronze coinage, in Duyrat's view, was intended for small daily transactions and generally did not respond to historical events unfolding in Syria and Phoenicia. It circulated throughout the *peraea*, where it was far more abundant than the coinages of the mainland cities, and even farther abroad. Duyrat's 18 series are classified by their types, which seem usually to have served as denomination markers. But three series – Series 1, Series 3, and Series 7 – changed weights and modules abruptly, either doubling or halving the original denomination. Duyrat shows that the currency system involved four bronze denominations, not necessarily issued simultaneously, but circulating together. In many cases the same denomination was struck with different types over a short period of time, but normally one of the types disappeared soon thereafter, suggesting that this was a method of assuring a smooth transition.

Duyrat herself describes Aradian coin types as banal. The deities depicted are completely hellenized in their iconography, though the gods actually worshipped at Aradus were Phoenician. Thus Zeus on the coinage represents the Ba'al of Aradus, a god of rain, thunder, and high places, but also of the sea. The great Phoenician female divinity, Astarte, appears on the obverse of ten different Aradian coin series, sometimes in the guise of Europa or of Tyche. The poverty of imagina-

<sup>18</sup> The bronze overstrikes will be reconsidered in a forthcoming paper by Oliver Hoover, which concludes that Tigranes' Syrian invasion should be dated around 75 BC. This is the date accepted in Houghton, Lorber, and Hoover, *Seleucid Coins*, Part 2 (*supra*, n. 15).

tion contrasts strikingly with the inventive bronze types of the more southerly Phoenician cities under Antiochus IV.

*Arados hellénistique* concludes with a set of nine appendices, in the form of tables or lists that summarize such practical information as the dates of issue for each Aradian coin type; Phoenician and Greek dates on Aradian coins; a synopsis of the controls of Aradian coins; hoards found in the Aradian *peraea*; the dated coinage of the Seleucid rivals Antiochus VIII and IX, by mint; the eras of the Syrian cities; and a chronology of the Seleucid kings and Roman governors of Syria. There is a four-page résumé in Arabic at the very end of the book. One wonders how it can begin to do justice to the breadth and importance of Duyrat's contribution.

Catharine C. Lorber  
5450 Fenwood Ave  
Woodland Hills, CA 91367 USA