

The identity of the helmeted head of the "victory" coinage of SUSA

Autor(en): **Hoover, Oliver D.**

Objekttyp: **Article**

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

Band (Jahr): **81 (2002)**

PDF erstellt am: **21.09.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-175795>

Nutzungsbedingungen

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

Haftungsausschluss

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

OLIVER D. HOOVER

THE IDENTITY OF THE HELMETED HEAD
ON THE 'VICTORY' COINAGE OF SUSA*

PLATES 6–7

In 1974, Robert Hadley published his seminal article for the study of early Seleucid numismatic iconography.¹ He argued that a series of silver coins issued by Seleucus I from the mint of Susa and bearing the obverse type of a heroic bust wearing a horned helmet (*Pl. 6, 1*) should be identified as Alexander assimilated to Dionysus. This view stood in opposition to the traditional identification of the helmeted head as that of an idealized Seleucus wearing Dionysiac attributes to allude to his eastern conquests.² In 1980, Arthur Houghton took up the Hadley thesis in his study of the Susian victory series and since then it has become the standard view among numismatists and art historians.³

There is no doubt that Hadley is correct to see the helmet covered with panther skin and decorated with bull's ears and horns as well as the panther's skin tied at the neck as emblems of Dionysus intended to reflect the conquest of India and the

* I would like to thank Arthur Houghton, Brian Kritt, Catharine Lorber and Kenneth Harl for reading earlier versions of this paper and sharing their comments. All conclusions are the sole responsibility of the author. Special thanks are due to Ute Wartenberg and the American Numismatic Society for putting the Seleucid collection at my disposal for this article.

Bibliography

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| HADLEY | R.A. HADLEY, <i>Seleucus, Dionysus, or Alexander?</i> , NC 1974, pp. 9-13 |
| HOUGHTON | A. HOUGHTON, <i>Notes on the Early Victory Coinage of Persepolis</i> , SNR 59, 1980, pp. 5-14 |
| NEWELL, ESM | E.T. NEWELL, <i>The Coinages of the Eastern Seleucid Mints</i> , NS 1 (New York 1936) |
| STEWART | A.F. STEWART, <i>Faces of Power: Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics</i> (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1993) |

- ¹ At the time of HADLEY's writing it was believed that the helmeted head types were issued from both Susa and Persepolis, but it has since been shown that they were only struck at Susa, but see HOUGHTON, pp. 5-14.
- ² P. GARDNER, *BMC Seleucid Kings of Syria* (London 1878), p. xviii, 4, nos. 36-40; E. BABELON, *Les rois de Syrie d'Arménie et de Commagène* (Paris 1890), p. xv; NEWELL, ESM, pp. 156-157.
- ³ HOUGHTON, p. 5, n. 1; R.R.R. SMITH, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits* (Oxford 1988), p. 60; O. MØRKHOLM, *Early Hellenistic Coinage from the Accession of Alexander to the Peace of Apamea* (Cambridge 1991), p. 72; R. FLEISCHER, *Studien zur seleukidischen Kunst I: Herrscherbildnisse* (Mainz 1991), p. 5-6; STEWART, p. 314-315; B. KRITT, *The Early Seleucid Mint of Susa* (Lancaster, Penn. 1997), p. 108; I. TOURATSOGLU, *The Alexander of the Coins* (Nicosia 2000), p. 66.

East. This was already the opinion held by Ernest Babelon and Edward Newell in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. However, secure identification of the portrait becomes a problem not only because much of the head and cheek are hidden by the bowl and cheek-piece of the helmet, but also because the physiognomy has been idealized to look like the head of Heracles on the Alexandrine coinages that abounded in the early Hellenistic period.⁴ However, it is worth noting that the features of the head are different from those of the only portrait type issued by Seleucus, which securely depicts Alexander the Great (*Pl. 6, 2*).⁵ Likewise, the Susian type also seems to present an older man than that of the Alexander portraits produced by Lysimachus (*Pl. 6, 3*) and Ptolemy I Soter (*Pl. 6, 4*).⁶ On the other hand, the idealized helmeted head bears some very slight resemblance to the bust of Seleucus found in the Villa of the Papyri at Herculaneum. This bust also tends towards a heroic rendering of the king, but does not include the Dionysiac paraphernalia.⁷ Nevertheless, the posthumous horned portraits of Seleucus I (*Pl. 6, 5*) are much more rugged than the idealized image of the Susian silver. In any case the physiognomy of the helmeted head is not enough to provide a secure identification of the portrait.

To solve the problem of the portrait Hadley appealed to history. He claimed that the helmeted head, with its attendant Dionysiac associations, would be inappropriate for Seleucus because he was not officially deified until after his death in 281.⁸ While it is certainly true that it was left to Antiochus I to make his father into a god with a state organized cult, we should be careful about using this fact as an argument to exclude the possibility that the helmeted head represents Seleucus. A review of some of the early Hellenistic coinages that clearly do bear the portraits of living kings is instructive.

If official deification is as important for dictating the appearance of early Hellenistic royal portraits, as Hadley has argued, it becomes difficult to explain the portraits of both Demetrius Poliorcetes (*Pl. 6, 6*) and Ptolemy I (*Pl. 6, 7*) on their respective coinages. Just as in the case of Seleucus, there is no evidence that Demetrius and his regime ever tried to establish a centrally organized cult to promote the divinity of the Besieger. And yet, his statues and coin portraits often depict him with bull's horns,⁹ the same symbol of divine power worn by the helmeted head. Similarly, as far as we know, there was no official Greek cult established for the worship of Ptolemy I during his lifetime,¹⁰ although in his role as Pharaoh

⁴ HADLEY, p. 9-10; STEWART, p. 158-159.

⁵ NEWELL, ESM, nos. 291-297, 450-460. Cp. STEWART, figs. 114-116.

⁶ SMITH (*supra*, n. 3), p. 60.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pl. 16, 1-2.

⁸ HADLEY, p. 12.

⁹ R.R.R. SMITH, *Hellenistic Sculpture* (London 1991), fig. 10 (the Demetrius bust from the Villa of the Papyri); E.T. NEWELL, *The Coinages of Demetrius Poliorcetes* (Oxford 1927), p. 25 no. 20; p. 48 nos. 34 and 74; p. 86-87; p. 103 no. 99; p. 105.

¹⁰ His state sponsored deification did not take place until 279/8 when Ptolemy II Philadelphus proclaimed his dead father as *Theos Soter* and celebrated the great Ptolemaieia in his honor.

he was certainly a living god to the native Egyptians. However, on his silver coinage his portrait is displayed wearing the aegis of Zeus, an unequivocally Greek divine attribute.¹¹ Based on Hadley's reasoning, neither of these divine attributes should be found on the coins of Seleucus' royal opponents.

What has been overlooked in the debate is the fact that although there was no state cult for Seleucus during his lifetime, he was certainly granted divine honors by the Greek cities of Asia. The epigraphical evidence shows that the cities of Ilium, Erythrae, Colophon, Magnesia-on-the-Maeander and possibly Nysa, all honored Seleucus as if he were a god.¹² For him altars were erected and festivals celebrated, and the names of certain months and tribes were even changed to *Seleukis*. Admittedly, the inscriptions from Asia Minor primarily date to the immediate aftermath of Seleucus' victory against Lysimachus in 281 while the helmeted head coinage was issued from Susa almost two decades earlier. Nevertheless, if Seleucus could receive cult honors from the cities that were added to his empire after Corupedium, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the Greek cities that had fallen under his authority prior to 281 might have decreed similar honors. There were several good occasions for it, such as the conquest of the Upper Satrapies in c.304 and the victory over Antigonos at Ipsus in 301.

It is worth noting that just as Seleucus was honored with divine status for the defeat of Lysimachus at Corupedium, both Demetrius Poliorcetes and Ptolemy I also became gods to the Greek cities as a result of their deeds. In 304 Ptolemy saved the people of Rhodes from the assault of Demetrius by breaking the naval blockade and sending supplies into their city.¹³ According to Pausanias, the Rhodians responded to Ptolemy's benefaction by establishing a cult for the Egyptian king and by granting him the divine epithet, *Soter*, the Savior.¹⁴

The divinity of Ptolemy was further bolstered in 287/6 by a religious festival established on the island of Delos by the Nesiotic League in gratitude for the exclusion of Demetrius from the Aegean.¹⁵ Likewise, Demetrius was given divine honors several times by the Athenians in recognition of his military victories, which led to the freedom of the city. In 307, both he and his father were worshipped in Athens as *Soter*es for their removal of the Antipatrid garrison and in 291/0, thankful for previous assistance and mindful of his naval power, the Athenians praised

¹¹ J. SVORONOS, *Ta Nomismata tou Kratous ton Ptolemaion* (Athens, 1904-1908, in modern Greek), p. 18-19 no.101; p. 1-32 nos. 181-187.

¹² OGIS 212; IG 12.1.6; J.U. POWELL, *Collectanea Alexandria* (London 1925), p. 140; B.D. MERITT, *Inscriptions of Colophon*, *AJP* 56, 1935, no. 6; I. Magnesia nos. 5, 69 and 98; L. ROBERT, *Études anatoliennes* (Paris 1937), p. 172ff.

¹³ Diod. 20.100.7-8.

¹⁴ Paus. 1.8.6; C. HABICHT, *Gottmenschen und griechische Städte* (Munich 1956), p. 109; R.M. BERTHOLD, *Rhodes in the Hellenistic Age* (Ithaca 1984), p. 78. R. HAZZARD, *Did Ptolemy I get his Surname from the Rhodians in 304?* *ZPE* 93, 1992, pp. 52-56, argues that Pausanias' connection of Ptolemy's epithet to the Rhodian victory of 304 should not be trusted because of the general unreliability of his source concerning Ptolemaic history. However, he fails to provide a reasonable alternative for the origin of the usage.

¹⁵ SIG I 390 (= Austin 218).

Demetrius as both the son of Poseidon and a new Poseidon.¹⁶ He was made into the son of a god and a god in his own right.

As we have seen, the situation of these two early Hellenistic kings is virtually identical to that of Seleucus with respect to ruler cult. None of them had a centrally organized cult, but in their relations with the Greek city-states they received divine honors. What is most significant about this arrangement is that when the designs were made for the coinages of both Demetrius and Ptolemy the divine attributes chosen to adorn the royal portraits reflect the divine titles that the kings received from the cities. Demetrius wears the bull's horns as a sign of his power at sea, for the bull was an animal held sacred to the Greek god of the deep. Ptolemy also wears the aegis because of the cult title granted to him by the Rhodians. *Soter* was a traditional epithet of Zeus and as such the Rhodians assimilated, or at least associated, their benefactor with the greatest of the Hellenic gods.

Based on the model provided by his two contemporaries it seems most likely that the helmeted head of the Susa coinage is that of Seleucus himself with the divine attributes of Dionysus, rather than a Dionysiac Alexander. Hoard evidence suggests that the helmeted head issues were struck between *c.*304 and *c.*295/4, making it probable that the victory referred to by the reverse type of Nike erecting a trophy is that of Seleucus' great Indian campaign of *c.*304.¹⁷ Hadley and others have argued that Seleucus celebrated his triumphant return from the East, not by showing himself as the new master of the Upper Satrapies, but by creating a new image of Alexander conflated with Dionysus, the two great conquerors of India, through which he could only allude to his own victory. This view seems far too self-effacing for a Hellenistic ruler, and particularly one who had just recently claimed the kingship after years of hardship and reversals at the hands of his enemies. Besides, Seleucus had very little reason to develop such a unique Alexander portrait. Although Hadley would see Alexander as a tutelary divinity of Seleucus solely on the basis of his supposed appearance to Seleucus in a vision around 312,¹⁸ the Seleucids actually «made no traceable attempt to work Alexander into their pedigrees or to pay any particular attention to him».¹⁹ Only the Ptolemaic-backed pretenders to the Seleucid throne, Alexander I Balas (150-145) and Alexander II Zabinas (128-123) made serious allusion to Alexander the Great on their coins by having themselves depicted wearing Heracles' lion skin (*Pl.* 6, 8-9).²⁰

¹⁶ Plut. *Dem.* 10.3-4; HABICHT (*supra*, n. 14), pp. 44-48; Athen. 6.253e (= *FGrH* 78 F 13 = Austin 35).

¹⁷ KRITT (*supra*, n. 3), pp. 80-109; HOUGHTON, p. 8-9.

¹⁸ HADLEY, p. 12.

¹⁹ R.M. ERRINGTON, *Alexander the Great in the Hellenistic World*, in: O. REVERDIN, ed., *Alexandre le Grand, Image et Réalité* (Vandoeuvre 1976), p. 170.

²⁰ Alexander I: SNG Spaer nos. 1448-1464; Alexander II: SNG Spaer nos. 2348-2353; FLEISCHER (*supra*, n. 3), p. 62, 75. Although Fleischer identifies the elephant headdress occasionally worn by Alexander II as an attribute of Alexander the Great, as on his Ptolemaic portraits (see below), in the Seleucid context it seems to be a more general badge of victory in the East. On rare occasions it is also worn by Antiochus IV Epiphanes, Demetrius I Soter and Demetrius II Nikator, each of whom embarked on major campaigns aimed at the defeat of the Arsacid Parthians or rebel governors in the Upper Satrapies.

Seleucus was the new conqueror of India and the Upper Satrapies, so why should he not represent himself as a *Neos Dionysos*? It is not difficult to imagine that on the return march his soldiers, if not the Greek populations in the cities through which the army passed, exalted their king by comparison to Dionysus in the same way that the Rhodians and the Athenians praised Ptolemy and Demetrius. Seleucus had triumphed, and that was reason enough to be hailed a god, or at least to be depicted as god-like. The divine attributes simply indicate the deed for which the king had received honors. Demetrius had the horns of Poseidon's bull because he was master of the sea and Ptolemy wore the aegis of Zeus because, like that god, he too was a savior. The helmet decorated with panther skin and bull's ears and horns follows the same pattern. It links the wearer to Dionysus and eastern conquests. In the cases of the other two Hellenistic kings it is clear that the wearer of the various divine attributes is not Alexander, but one of the kings themselves. There is no good reason to assume that Seleucus is the exception to this pattern and that instead of having himself depicted in the guise of Dionysus he decided to have Alexander portrayed instead.

It is worth noting that helmets decorated with bull's ears and horns have a very long tradition among eastern rulers after Seleucus I and in no case are they used in conjunction with a portrait of Alexander. They seem to be the sole prerogative of living kings. In the second and first centuries BC the Indo-Greek kings, Demetrius I (c.200-190) (*Pl. 6, 10*), Eucratides I (c.171-145), Strato I (c.125-110), Lysias (c.120-110), Antialcidas (c.115-95), Philoxenus (c.100-95), Diomedes (c.95-90), Amyntas (c.95-90), Archebius (c.90-80) and Hermaeus (c.90-70) all appeared on their respective coinages wearing a Boeotian helmet adorned with these taurine symbols.²¹ Few would disagree that the bull's horns and ears for these later rulers was indicative of their authority in India and adjacent territories. The origin of the Indo-Greek and Graeco-Bactrian iconography can be traced back directly to the Seleucid 'victory' issues of Susa.

The fact that an image even loosely identifiable as Alexander wearing a horned helmet exists neither among the coin types of these later eastern kings, nor indeed anywhere else in the known corpus of ancient art, further problematizes the Hadley thesis. The great popularity of Alexander images in both the Hellenistic and the Roman periods caused his iconography to be widely spread and copied. Indeed, all of the major Alexander types were reproduced and imitated. For example, soon after 305, Lysimachus produced the celebrated coin portrait of Alexander wearing the diadem and ram's horns of Zeus-Ammon, which spawned an immense range of imitations throughout Asia Minor and particularly along the coast of the Black Sea (*Pl. 7, 11*).²² It also influenced glyptic artists on the borders of India and lies behind the portrait of Alexander used by the Roman administra-

²¹ SNG ANS 9, 463-617; 996-998, 1010-1011; 1037-1039; 1056, 1069-1084; 1181-1196, 1198; 1221-1224, 1230-1231; 1243; 1301-1305; 1344-1345.

²² MØRKHOLM, EHC (*supra*, n. 3), pp. 145-148.

tion for its Macedonian coinage (*Pl. 7, 12*) of the first century BC.²³ Likewise, the well-known type of Alexander wearing an elephant scalp first produced by Ptolemy I had a wide popularity, being copied by Agathocles of Syracuse (*Pl. 7, 13*) and briefly by Seleucus himself²⁴ with minor alterations. The type also influenced the depiction of the later Roman personification of *provincia Africa* (*Pl. 7, 14*).

Two other Alexander types not linked to any particular king were also long lived in the Greek and Roman world. The image of Alexander wearing the lion scalp of Heracles was ubiquitous already in his lifetime. On the so-called Alexander Sarcophagus from the royal tombs at Sidon, Alexander appears riding into battle wearing the lion scalp of his heroic ancestor (*p. 57, fig. 1*). Whether the head of Heracles on Alexandrine silver coinage was ever designed with the features of Alexander in mind is still a contentious issue among numismatists and art historians. Regardless of whether any coins in this vast series are meant to represent the Macedonian king, people believed that they did. Alexander in the guise of Heracles continued to live on in ancient iconography at least until the Roman imperial period when he commonly appeared on the coinage of the Macedonian *koinon* (*Pl. 7, 15*).

The image of Alexander with windblown hair and an *anastole* is the final staple of his canonical iconography. The vast majority of his surviving statues, as well as the Pompeian Alexander mosaic (based on a Hellenistic original), show him with this distinctive hairstyle. Again, this type remained popular into the Roman Imperial period. It too was used on the coins of the Macedonian *koinon* (*Pl. 7, 16*) and influenced the representations of Roman dynasts and emperors with ambitions in the East.

If the helmeted head was really intended as a representation of Alexander the Great it must be counted as a remarkable failure, for it never became widely popularized within the canon of Alexander iconography. The official Seleucid coinage with this type was struck at Susa for less than a decade and was briefly imitated around the Gedrosian Desert in the reign of Antiochus I (*Pl. 7, 17*), but then it disappeared entirely.²⁵ The sudden disappearance of this type reputed to represent Alexander as Dionysus is especially surprising because there was a definite market for imagery conflating both Alexander and Dionysus. At the very least the Ptolemies would have been interested in adapting the helmeted head iconography, if it represented Alexander, much as Seleucus had borrowed the first Ptolemy's elephant imagery. The Ptolemaic dynasty claimed descent from both Alexander and Dionysus.²⁶

²³ STEWART, p. 319; J. BOARDMAN, M.-L. VOLLENWEIDER, *Engraved Gems and Finger Rings in the Ashmolean Museum, I Greek and Etruscan* (Oxford 1978), no. 280; R. BAUSLAUGH, *Silver Coinage with the Types of Aesillas the Quaestor* (New York 2000), p. 21.

²⁴ STEWART, p. 266-267; NEWELL, ESM, p. 112.

²⁵ NEWELL, ESM, p. 159; HOUGHTON, pp. 11-13.

²⁶ Satyros, *FHG* iii, 165.



Fig. 1 Alexander in Battle. Alexander Sarcophagus found in Sidon. Istanbul

Unfortunately there is no evidence that in either the Hellenistic or Roman period anyone ever associated bull's horns with representations of Alexander. He never appears horned in art (except with the ram's horns of Ammon), nor is there any mention in the ancient literature of the Macedonian king represented with taurine divine attributes, although he is said to have occasionally worn the attributes of Zeus-Ammon, Heracles, Hermes and even Artemis.²⁷ Admittedly, arguments *e silentio* are not compelling, but when it is also considered that ancient authorities emphasize bull's horns as a feature of Seleucus' personal iconography, it seems somewhat perverse to continue to insist that the helmeted head must be Alexander. Indeed, the bull's horns associated with representations of Seleucus seemed so remarkable to ancient writers that they found it necessary to explain

²⁷ Athen. 12.537e.

them. According to Appian, statues of Seleucus were horned because he held back a bull when it tried to escape during a sacrifice made by Alexander.²⁸ Pseudo-Callisthenes also considered the prodigious strength of Seleucus as an explanation of the horns, but Libanius preferred a more fanciful explanation.²⁹ In his encomium of Antioch he says that the horns were added to indicate the king's special devotion to the local cult of Io.³⁰ Clearly horns were thought to be a key feature of Seleucus' iconography. They also continued to be popular for his successors who occasionally had themselves depicted with horns on their coins, or, more frequently, with a hairstyle including a lock of hair curled to look like a horn.

Although the evidence relating directly to the iconography of the helmeted head tends to speak against an identification with Alexander the Great, the proponents of the Hadley thesis also make the claim that it must represent Alexander on the grounds that a series of silver coins issued by Seleucus from Ecbatana depict a figure wearing the horned helmet and riding a horned horse (*Pl. 7, 18*).³¹ They argue that because the horse is horned it can be none other than Bucephalas, whose name means 'Ox-head'.³² If the horse is Bucephalas it follows logically that the rider can only be Alexander, and that if the rider is Alexander then the helmeted head on the Susian coins must also be Alexander.

The problem with this view is the fact that the horns on the horse do not assure a punning reference to Bucephalas. Horses are not the only animals on the coins of Seleucus I to have additional horns. On his widely issued elephant chariot coinage (*Pl. 7, 19*) which commenced around 295/4 the elephants are normally depicted with bull's horns. Surely we should not assume that these animals were also named 'Ox-head'. Similarly, it is hard to imagine why Seleucus, and later Antiochus I, should have had such a great interest in Alexander's dead charger. Not only does the horned horse appear on the horseman coinages of Ecbatana, but its head also graces a variety of silver and bronze coinages throughout the Seleucid empire. The horned horse can be found on coins struck as far east as Aï Khanoum (*Pl. 7, 20*) and as far west as Pergamum (*Pl. 7, 21*). It is, perhaps, far more reasonable to follow the views of earlier scholars like Babelon and Newell and see a more general symbol of power in the addition of horns to both horse and elephant images.³³ It may not even be unwarranted to follow these scholars a step further and accept the possibility that the horned horse actually represents Seleucus' own mount. After all, according to a late source, Seleucus honored his horse by erecting a bizarre golden monument in Antioch, consisting of a horse's head and a hel-

²⁸ App. *Syr.* 57; *Suda*, s.v. Σελεύκος.

²⁹ Ps.-Call. 2.28.

³⁰ Lib. *Or.* 11.92.

³¹ A. HOUGHTON, A. STEWART, *The Equestrian Portrait of Alexander the Great on a New Tetradrachm of Seleucus I*, SNR 78, 1999, pp. 27-35; A. HOUGHTON, C. LORBER, *Seleucid Coins, A Comprehensive Catalogue, Part I* (forthcoming), 197, 202, 205.

³² HOUGHTON, STEWART (n. 31), p. 28, 31.

³³ BABELON (*supra*, n. 2), p. xx.

met.³⁴ Admittedly, no mention is made of horns, but the helmet in conjunction with the horse is tantalizing. If the helmeted rider were indeed Seleucus, as the evidence presented here suggests, then it would make perfect sense for the helmet of the monument to be the horned helmet worn by the king when he rode his charger into battle. It would not be surprising if the horse's head of the monument were also horned, since the coins of Ecbatana make it clear that the helmeted rider and the horned horse are directly related to one another.

A further problem with the identification of the helmeted rider of the horned horse as Alexander the Great is the fact that he appears to wear trousers.³⁵ Diodorus explicitly says that although Alexander adopted many features of royal Persian dress, such as the diadem, the striped chiton and the Persian girdle, he never wore the sleeved jacket or trousers.³⁶ Apparently these last two items seemed excessively barbarous to Alexander and likely to offend his Macedonian troops. However, there could have been little upset caused by the wearing of trousers by Seleucus. His men were already accustomed to his eastern ways, his Iranian wife and his son, a *mixobarbaros*.

The heroic and idealized physiognomy of the head wearing the horned helmet on the Susian 'victory' coinage makes it impossible to ever be totally certain that it is not Alexander, as Hadley suggested. However, the historical evidence does not support this claim, and in many cases appears to speak against it both directly and loudly. Therefore it is probably judicious to look back to Newell and Babelon and recognize the person most likely represented by the helmeted head portrait at Susa: Seleucus I Nicator, conqueror of the East and founder of the dynasty that bears his name.

Oliver D. Hoover
c/o The American Numismatic Society
Broadway at 155th Street
New York, N.Y. 10032
USA

³⁴ Malalas 202.17-19; *cf.* Amm. Marc. 21.15.2.

³⁵ HOUGHTON, STEWART (*supra*, n. 31), p. 28.

³⁶ Diod. 17.77.5.

Zusammenfassung

Lange war es allgemeiner Konsens, dass der behelmte Kopf auf den 'Siegesprägungen' des Seleukos I. Nikator aus Susa den König selbst darstellt. Nun setzte sich in den frühen 80er Jahren die Auffassung durch, dass es sich beim Dargestellten nicht um Seleukos, sondern um den vergöttlichten Alexander den Grossen mit Attributen des Dionysos handle. In diesem Artikel werden die Argumente, die zur Identifikation mit Alexander geführt hatten, neu überprüft. Sowohl das historische Quellenmaterial wie der ikonographische Vergleich mit andern Münztypen des Seleukos und seiner Nachfolger lassen den Schluss zu, dass die ursprüngliche Identifikation des behelmten Kopfes als das idealisierte Porträt des Seleukos doch vorzuziehen ist.

S. H.

Key to PLATES 6–7

- 1 Seleucus I. Tetradrachm, Susa. *Leu* 52, 1991, 109
- 2 Seleucus I. Tetradrachm, Seleucia. *Leu* 22, 1979, 154
- 3 Lysimachus. Tetradrachm, Pergamum. *Leu* 52, 1991, 45
- 4 Ptolemy I. Tetradrachm, Alexandria. *Leu* 30, 1982, 217
- 5 Antiochus I. Tetradrachm, Sardes. *CSE* 596, ex *Hess-Leu* 24, 1964, 233
- 6 Demetrius Poliorcetes. Tetradrachm, Amphipolis. *Leu* 54, 1992, 90
- 7 Ptolemaios I. Tetradrachm, Alexandria. *Münzen und Medaillen* 37, 1968, 286
- 8 Alexander I Balas. *AE, BMC* 8, Pl. 16, 10
- 9 Alexander II Zabinas. *AE, BMC* 27, Pl. 22, 10
- 10 Demetrius I. Tetradrachm. *Leu* 83, 2002, 430
- 11 Lysimachus. Tetradrachm, Byzantium, early 1st cent. BC. *F. DE CALLATAÏ, Guerres mithridatiques*, Pl. 32, D 5/R 1
- 12 Aesillas. Tetradrachm. *Münzen und Medaillen* 13, 1954, 1120, ex coll. Imhoof-Blumer
- 13 Syracuse. Agathocles. *AV Stater. ANS (John D. Leggett Bequest)*, ex *Leu* 52, 1991, 27
- 14 C. Caecilius Metellus Scipio and M. Eppius. *Denarius, Africa, 47-46. Naville* 8, 1924 (Bement), 96
- 15 Macedonia, time of Alexander Severus. *AE, SNG Cop.* 1363
- 16 Macedonia, time of Gordianus III. *AE, AMNG* 563. *Ars Classica* 15, 1930, 544
- 17 Time of Antiochus I. *Drachm, eastern imitation. A. HOUGHTON, SNR* 59, 1980, Pl. 2, 4
- 18 Seleucus I. Tetradrachm, Ecbatana. *A. HOUGHTON, A. STEWART, SNR* 78, 1999, Pl. 5, 1
- 19 Seleucus I. Tetradrachm, Seleucia (?). *Hess-Leu* 49, 1971, 249
- 20 Antiochus I. Tetradrachm, Ai-Khanoum. *Sotheby* 1958 (General Haughton), 148
- 21 Seleucus I. Tetradrachm, Pergamum. *Leu* 45, 1988, 256
- p. 57, fig. 1 Alexander Sarcophagus, from the royal tombs at Sidon. Istanbul Museum. Photo from M. Bieber, *Alexander the Great in Greek and Roman Art* (Chicago 1964), Pl. 19, 36



Oliver D. Hoover, The Identity of the Helmeted Head on the 'Victory' Coinage of Susa (1)



11



13



12



14



17



15



16



18



19



20



21



