

KING ANTIOCHUS IN 151/0 B. C.

DR. F. S. Heichelheim has been doing excellent service in calling attention to rare and important coins in British collections. In *Hesperia*, XIII, 1944, pp. 363 f., pl. XIV, 3, he publishes a piece from the Leake Collection of the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge: a bronze coin of a "King Antiochus," struck in 151/0, the year of the death of Demetrius I of Syria and the accession of the pretender Alexander Balas. In spite of several references in numismatic literature, it has not been used by historians.

The name and date are certain; the evidence for the mint is the fact that the monogram is that used on the last drachms and tetradrachms of Demetrius from Antioch. Heichelheim believes—mistakenly I think—that Antioch was also the mint of this coin. He suggests three possibilities: (1) That Demetrius' son Antigonus, put to death by Alexander Balas (Livy, *Periocha* I), may have been "proclaimed king under the dynastic name of Antiochus." He accepts Bevan's conjecture (*The House of Seleucus*, II, p. 218, note 1) that Antigonus was Demetrius' eldest son, which Bouché-Leclerq (*Histoire des Séleucides*, p. 335, note 3) rejects. (2) That an otherwise unknown pretender named Antiochus was in temporary possession of Antioch in 151/0. (3) Following a conjecture of Haym, that the sons of Demetrius I, Demetrius and Antiochus, had been declared joint rulers "for separate parts of the empire" during the war with Alexander.

The first two choices seem to me to raise awkward difficulties. In the first case, supposing that Antigonus was the eldest son, why the change of name? Though Antigonus was a name that had been borne by no previous Seleucid king, neither had there been an earlier Seleucid Demetrius. In the second case, it is against all probability that a third party, unconnected with either rival, could establish himself even momentarily in a realm defended by its legitimate king and attacked by a pretender "totius ferme Orientis viribus succinctus" (Justin, XXXV, 1, 9).

Haym's conjecture, however, has interesting possibilities. Demetrius the younger and Antiochus both ultimately came back to Syria as legitimate kings, and it is not impossible that the royal title had been conferred on them in their youth by their father. We know that Demetrius I, at the beginning of the war, entrusted his two sons to a Cnidian friend "cum magno auri pondere" to bring up as his avengers if the war should go against him (Justin, XXXV, 2, 1). We know that Antiochus grew up in Side in Pamphylia, whence his popular name "Sidetes" (Eusebius, ed. Schoene, I, p. 255). Of the whereabouts of Demetrius we know nothing until 148/7, when he left Crete with an army of mercenaries to regain his kingdom (Justin, XXXV, 2, 2; I Maccabees, 10, 67; Josephus, *Antiquities*, XIII, 4, 3. Josephus says that he sailed to Cilicia. Bevan [Appendix N] suspects an error of ΚΙΛΙΚΙΑΝ for

ΣΕΛΕΥΚΕΙΑΝ). The princes were probably taken to different places for refuge. That they were not acting in concert is shown by the fact that Antiochus made no move until he had news of the capture of Demetrius II by the Parthians. We may assume that, besides the desire to keep his children safe and provide himself with possible avengers, the elder Demetrius intended his sons, aged about 14 and 13, to watch over his possessions outside of Syria.¹

But if Antiochus was out of the country, coins in his name would be struck at his own capital and not at Antioch. The monogram certainly shows that this bronze was struck by the same magistrate who was in charge of the last issues of Demetrius I, but there are other cases of mint officials leaving one city to work for their lords in another (Newell, "The Seleucid Mint of Antioch" [*American Journal of Numismatics*, 1918], p. 91; *Late Seleucid Mints in Ake Ptolemais and Damascus* [*Numismatic Notes and Monographs*, No. 84], New York, 1939, pp. 8 f., 54, 61). The type of the Fitzwilliam piece, a filleted thyrsus in a vine wreath, is not found on any other Seleucid coin of Antioch, and while this cannot be held to prove that it was not struck there, it reduces the evidence for Antioch to the monogram alone, which is not sufficient to overcome the historical probabilities.

We cannot be sure that Antiochus was in Side in 151/0, but doubtless he was somewhere in Asia Minor. Wherever he was, it would have been easy enough for his father's mint official to join him after the catastrophe and supervise the issue of a small bronze coinage of which this specimen only is known.

YALE UNIVERSITY

ALFRED R. BELLINGER

¹ There is a dispute about the age of Antiochus. Eusebius (Schoene, I, p. 255) says he was 35 at his death in 129, in which case he would have been 13 or 14 at the time of striking the coin. Wilcken (Pauly-Wissowa, *R.E.*, I, p. 2478) accepts Eusebius' date, but Bevan (p. 232 and Appendix R) rejects it on the grounds that "we may be sure that Demetrius I did not take his official wife till after his accession in 162/1." In this case, since Demetrius II was the elder son, Antiochus would have been no more than 9 or 10 in 151/0. But this does not seem to be sufficient grounds for refusing to follow Eusebius' explicit statement. Bevan's theory is connected with his desire to prove that, at the time of his accession, Demetrius II was too young to be responsible, that the reign of terror of his Cretan mercenaries was beyond his control, and that the first enterprise of his own independent administration, the expedition against the Parthians in 140/39, was undertaken when he had "perhaps, reached the age of twenty, and was old enough for his own personality to assert itself in distinction from the ministers who had given his reign such a bad name." Eusebius' words (Schoene, I, pp. 255 f.) "regnabatque clx olompiadis anno primo," χειροῦται τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔτη γ', do certainly support the view that he was not acting independently until 140, but they do not prove that the change was the result of his coming of age. Lasthenes and his Cretan brigands would hardly sacrifice their power until they had to, no matter what the king's age. Justin's characterization of Demetrius (XXXV, 2, 2) as "annos pubertatis egressus" when he set out from Crete in 148 can hardly mean that he was only 12 or 13. If Eusebius' date for Antiochus is right, Demetrius would have been 16 or 17 at the time of his restoration. We may conclude, therefore, that Antiochus was at least 13 when his coin was struck. Is the head of Dionysus on the obverse given his features? Comparison with his mature portrait makes it seem likely.