

Zeitschrift: Schweizer Münzblätter = Gazette numismatique suisse = Gazzetta numismatica svizzera

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Numismatische Gesellschaft

Band: 38-42 (1988-1992)

Heft: 168

Artikel: Berytos-Laodigea revisited

Autor: Moore, Wayne

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-171538>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. 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. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

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. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

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. [See Legal notice.](#)

Download PDF: 30.01.2025

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

BERYTOS-LAODICEA REVISITED

Wayne Moore

During the 2nd century B.C., the Phoenician city of Berytos (modern Beirut) served the Seleucid kings by issuing coinage with their portraits in both silver and bronze. These include issues for Antiochus IV Epiphanes, Alexander I Balas, Demetrius II Nicator (both reigns), Alexander II Zabinas and, very likely also, Antiochus VIII Grypus. Of these kings, only Alexander I and Demetrius II (1st reign) issued silver coins (i.e. tetradrachms) from Berytos, and these only on the Phoenician standard¹.

The bronze coins with Seleucid regal portraits from the city were issued by authority of the king and were bilingual (both Phoenician and Greek) in their inscriptions. Their reverse types express the local civic religious iconography of the god and goddess of the city, Poseidon and Astarte, as found on the concurrent municipal bronze coinage issued by authority of the city government. The municipal bronze coinage, initiated about 176 B.C., invariably has the head, or bust, of the City-Tyche on the obverse, and either Poseidon in

I wish to thank the following for their help in the preparation of this article, including provision of casts and coins photographed for the plate, as well as for essential reference materials: Michel Amandry, Cabinet des Médailles, Paris; Arthur Houghton, Washington, D.C.; Kent Rigsby, Duke University, North Carolina, and H.-D. Schultz, Staatliche Museen, Berlin. The opinions expressed in this article are my own.

Abbreviations

AHNS	Arthur Houghton New Series.
Babelon	E. Babelon, <i>Les Rois de Syrie, d'Arménie et de Commagène</i> (Paris 1890).
Choix	F. Durrbach, <i>Choix d'inscriptions de Délos</i> , Vol. 1 (Paris 1921/22).
CSE	A. Houghton, <i>Coins of the Seleucid Empire from the Collection of Arthur Houghton</i> , ACNAC 4 (New York 1983).
De Clercq	G. Le Rider and H. Seyrig, <i>Objets de la collection Louis De Clercq</i> , RN 1967, pp. 7–53 (nos. 1–259).
Hunter 3	G. Macdonald, <i>Catalogue of Greek Coins in the Hunterian Collection</i> , Vol. 3 (Glasgow 1905).
Imhoof-Blumer	F. Imhoof-Blumer, <i>Zur syrischen Münzkunde</i> , NZ 33, 1901, pp. 3–15.
Insc. Delos	F. Durrbach, P. Roussel, M. Launey, <i>et al.</i> , <i>Inscriptions de Délos</i> , Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres (Paris 1926–).
Rouvier	J. Rouvier, <i>Numismatique des villes de la Phénicie, Béryte-Laodicée de Canaan</i> , JIAN 3, 1900, pp. 263–312 (nos. 432–619).

¹ CSE 706, 707 and 709; Rouvier 450, 451 and 453–455; BMC Seleucid Kings, p. 51,5 and p. 58,6 and 7.

a biga of hippocamps, or Astarte standing on a prow on the reverse, exclusively², until the last decade of the 2nd century B.C., when other local types begin to make their appearance.

The quasi-municipal bronze issues of Berytos, issued by authority of the king, are the subject of this article. The obverse of these coins presents the portrait of the reigning Seleucid king facing right, while the reverse depicts Poseidon standing facing (largest denomination = chalkous); Astarte standing left on prow (hemi-chalkous); dolphin enrolled around trident, and rose (fractional denominations)³. The larger denominations are inscribed with the name of the king in Greek, circling the reverse from top to bottom on the right, while a Phoenician inscription of thirteen letters circles the reverse from top to bottom on the left. A more complete description of the reverse of the principal denomination (chalkous), as a convention throughout the series, is as follows:

Around on r.: ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ [ANTIOXOY, ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ or ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ]

Around on l.: 𐤋𐤍𐤃𐤌𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍

Poseidon, wearing *polos*, standing facing with *chlamys* around waist and over l. shoulder; in extended r. he holds a patera; in l., an upright trident. In field l., ΛΑ; in field r., ⚡ (monogram for «Phoenicia»).

The Phoenician inscription, as read from right to left, is L L'DK' 'M B KN`N (*l^e Ladika am b^e Kanaan*) and can be translated as «belonging to Laodicea, mother (i.e. metropolis) in Canaan»⁴.

«Laodicea» was a temporary name given to the city, in honor of one of the many Seleucid queens of the same name, from the reign of Seleucus IV⁵ until about 123 B.C., when the

² Rouvier 457–467; BMC Phoen., pp. 51–52, 1–7. It is noteworthy that Berytos tetradrachms of Demetrius II (Rouvier 454; De Clercq 154), dated year 168 of the Seleucid Era (= 145/4 B.C.), are signed by the same official (ΓΔ or ΓΔ) who appears on an extensive series of municipal issues (Rouvier 458–460). This allows us to date these municipal issues (some 13 examples listed by Rouvier within the same category) quite plausibly to the 1st reign of Demetrius II. See O. Mørkholm, *The Monetary System in the Seleucid Empire after 187 B.C.*, in: *Ancient Coins of the Graeco-Roman World, The Nickel Numismatic Papers* (Calgary 1984), pp. 101 and 102, for a discussion of the extent and differing types of the quasi-municipal bronze coinages and their relationship with the municipal issues. Where Mørkholm has used the terms «municipal» and «civic», I have preferred to use the synonymous terms «quasi-municipal» and «municipal».

³ For the «Poseidon» types, see CSE 704–705, 708 and 710; Rouvier 442–447, 449, 452 and 456; Hunter 3, p. 49, 55 and 56, p. 91, 38. For «Astarte» types, Rouvier 441 and an unpublished example in the Houghton collection (AHNS 329). For the «dolphin enrolled around trident» types, Rouvier 448 and two unpublished examples in the Houghton collection (AHNS 18 and 112), one of which was referred to in the commentary under CSE 710. For the «rose» type, see Imhoof-Blumer, p. 7, 1. On the quasi-municipal issues, the «Astarte» types seem limited to the reign of Antiochus IV, while the «dolphin enrolled around trident» and «rose» types seem limited to the reign of Alexander I.

⁴ See Babelon 660–664, 1258–1260 and 1335; J. Rouvier, *Une métropole phénicienne oubliée, Laodicée, métropole de Canaan*, RN 1896, pp. 265–282, 377–396. See also, Mørkholm (see above n. 2), p. 101, «of Laodicea the Metropolis of Canaan».

⁵ J. Rouvier, *Les monnaies autonomes de Béryte*, RN 1898, pp. 445–446 and 657; E.R. Bevan, *The House of Seleucus*, Vol. 2 (London 1902), p. 125; P. Roussel, *Laodicée de Phénicie*, BCH 35, 1911, pp. 433–434; Ch. Picard, *Observations sur la société des Poseidoniastes de Bérytos et sur son histoire*, BCH 44, 1920, p. 297 and n. 8.



1



2



1a



2a



3



4



3a



5



6

7

8

9



Phoenician inscription L BYRT (*≠ Biarut*)⁶ replaces the Seleucid dynastic name on the municipal issues, and BH replaces ΛΑ as the Greek abbreviation for the city name⁷.

The correct reading of the third word, 𐤇𐤍 (‘M = «mother»), has long been in dispute and, since the turn of the century, has been almost universally accepted as being 𐤇𐤍 (‘Š = *ash* = «which») because of the opinions of Ch. Clermont-Ganneau⁸. Thus, we see in much of the recent historical literature, and in recent numismatic catalogues, the Phoenician inscription translated as «belonging to Laodicea which (is) in Canaan»⁹.

Recently, P. Bordreuil and N. Tabet have published chalkoi of Antiochus IV and Alexander I from Berytos, of the Poseidon types, which clearly show the third word as 𐤇𐤍 (‘M = «mother»)¹⁰. In support of the translation of Laodicea as «a mother in Canaan», particular note should be made of the recent opinions of J. Lewy¹¹, where he makes a strong case against the interpretation of Clermont-Ganneau and his followers.

In further support of Laodicea as «mother» in Canaan, *plate page 119, nos. 1–5*, illustrates examples for each of the Seleucid kings subsequent to Antiochus IV, who issued quasi-municipal chalkoi from Berytos-Laodicea, where the word 𐤇𐤍 (‘M = «mother») is clearly evident. They are:

1. Alexander I, 150–145 B.C.

4.86 ↑ Private collection. See Rouvier 449; CSE 708. The *mem* has the form 𐤇 and the *nun* is cursive. See enlargement 1a.

2. Demetrius II (2nd reign), 129–125 B.C.

5.85 ↑ Private collection. See Rouvier 452 («1st reign»); De Clercq 210 («2nd reign»). In upper r. field, 𐤇. The *mem* has the form 𐤇, the *aleph* the form 𐤀, the *kaph* 𐤁. See enlargement 2a.

3. (As above)

5.96 ↑ Private collection. See Hunter 3, p. 91, 38, pl. 69, 5 («2nd reign»). Monogram as above. The *mem* has the form 𐤇, the *aleph* appears as both 𐤀 and 𐤀, the *kaph* 𐤁 and 𐤁. See enlargement 3a.

⁶ The vowels in L BYRT are conjectural; cf. Z. Harris, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language* (New Haven 1936), p. 85.

⁷ J. Rouvier, RN 1896 (see above n. 4), p. 279.

⁸ Ch. Clermont-Ganneau, *Recueil d'archéologie orientale*, Vol. 2 (Paris 1898), pp. 80–82. His reading of the *mem* as *shin* in the word, changing the meaning from «mother» («metropolis») to «which», has been followed by subsequent scholars, including E.R. Bevan (see above n. 5), p. 152; G.A. Cook, *A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions* (Oxford 1903), p. 46, n. 3 and p. 349; B.V. Head, HN, p. 790; P. Roussel, BCH 1911 (see above n. 5), p. 438 and n. 4, and R. Mouterde, *Regards sur Beyrouth* (Beirut 1966), p. 16, to name a few. G.F. Hill in BMC Phoen., p. 1, n. 7, acknowledges the dispute over the reading, but leaves the question open. Earlier lapidary inscriptions show the *shin* as 𐤍 or 𐤍; see, for example, J.B. Pritchard, *Recovering Sarepta, A Phoenician City* (Princeton 1978), p. 101, figs. 98 and 99, and N. Jidejian, *Sidon through the Ages* (Beirut 1971), plates 85 and 182/83.

⁹ CSE, pp. 69–70, followed by recent sales catalogues.

¹⁰ Syria 62, 1985, pp. 180 and 181, fig. 7; Syria 63, 1986, pp. 421 and 423, fig. 6, and p. 424, fig. 8.

¹¹ *The Old West Semitic Sun God Hammu*, Hebrew Union College Annual 18, 1944, pp. 439–440, nn. 68 and 73. See also, SNG Cop., *Seleucid Kings*, 199–200, «= Laodicea, metropolis of Canaan».

4. (As above)

4.28 ↑ Private collection (AHNS 138). See CSE 710 («1st reign»)¹²; Babelon 1258–1260 («2nd reign»). Monogram as above. The *mem* appears to be **ϣ**.

5. Alexander II, 128–123 B.C.

4.17 ↑ Private collection (AHNS 236). See Rouvier 456; Babelon 1335. The *mem* has the form **ϣ**.

Plate page 119, nos. 6–9, presents a series of quasi-municipal bronzes from Berytos-Laodicea which seem anomalous, in both module and portrait style, when compared with the well-documented series from Antiochus IV to Alexander II. The following four coins have the portrait of a king «Antiochus» facing right on the obverse, while the reverse depicts Poseidon as above, and with the legends in the same configuration. The Phoenician inscription, LL'DK' MBKN'N, is engraved in a cursory manner on these and is complete, though barely decipherable, only on no. 6. The Greek abbreviation for «Laodicea», ΛΑ, and the monogram for «Phoenicia», ϕ, appear across the reverse field as above. They are:

6. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ

5.39 ↑ Private collection (AHNS 365).
The Phoenician inscription is complete, though poorly cut.

7. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ

4.24 ↑ Paris, Cabinet des Médailles (photo from cast).
Babelon 664 («Ant. IV»)¹³. Both the Greek and Phoenician inscriptions are unclear from the cast; Babelon's reading from the original coin thus stands. In lower l. field, *aphlaston*. Behind the head of the king on obv. A ?

¹² I have given issues 2–4 to the 2nd reign of Demetrius II for the following reasons: no. 2 has the same portrait style as De Clercq 210, also given to the 2nd reign; SNG Cop., Seleucid Kings, 357, a coin of Tyre dated 184 S.E. (= 129/8 B.C.), presents a close portrait style with our no. 2 and De Clercq 210; dated silver issues of the 2nd reign from Tyre, CSE 767–769 and Naville 10, 1925, plates 50–51, have the same portrait style as our nos. 3 and 4 – while the 1st reign silver issues of Demetrius II from Berytos present a quite different portrait style (CSE 709). The «unpublished bronze» of Alexander I (AHNS 18, see above n. 3), mentioned by A. Houghton as having the same monogram as CSE 710, actually displays the superscribed letters for «Laodicea», ΛΑ, which were mistaken for the monogram ϕ. Until further evidence suggests otherwise, I am inclined to believe there may not have been any quasi-autonomous bronze issues from Berytos for Demetrius II during his 1st reign, but rather that the city increased its municipal issues for local commerce instead (see above n. 2).

¹³ The ticket for this coin in the trays of the Cabinet des Médailles has apparently been emended in recent years to read «Antiochus VI», however, no coinage is known for Antiochus VI from Berytos, as the city appears to have been continuously loyal to Demetrius II; see G. Le Rider, *Un trésor de monnaies séleucides trouvé dans le Hauran en 1979 ou 1980: Antiochos VI à Ptolémaïs*, in: *Studies in Honor of Leo Miltenberg* (Wetteren 1984), p. 169, and A. Houghton, *A Didrachm Issue of Antiochus VI of Byblus*, *INJ* 9, 1986/87, p. 22. The portrait of Babelon 664 is not «radiée», as described.

8. ΒΑΣΙ ΑΝΤΙ

- 3.45 ↑ Berlin, Staatliche Museen (photo from a cast).
Imhoof-Blumer, p. 7, 2 («Ant. VIII?»). The initial letters ... **ΑΛ** are all that I read from the Phoenician inscription. In lower l. field, *aphlaston*. Behind the head of the king on obv. A ?

9. ΒΑΣΙ ΑΝΤΙ

- 4.47 ↑ Private collection. The letters ... **ΑΛ** are all that remain, as above. In lower l. field, *aphlaston* (partially obscured by corrosion).

The unifying features of these issues are the stylistic elements of the portrait including the general shape of the head, the treatment of the hair with curls at the back of the neck, and the similarity of profile with its lidded eye and apparently smiling mouth. In addition, nos. 7–9 share the *aphlaston* symbol in the lower l. field, which appears in the same configuration on the municipal bronze issues subsequent to 123 B.C.¹⁴, where the city has adopted its original Phoenician name, L BYRT, in place of the Seleucid dynastic name, L'DK' (= «Laodicea»).

Which «Antiochus» then, is represented by the portrait on these issues¹⁵? If we consider the introduction of the *aphlaston* symbol on these issues to be concurrent with its reintroduction on the later municipal issues (after 123 B.C.)¹⁶, then the portrait of Antiochus VIII Grypus becomes a distinct possibility. In the reference to no. 8 above, Imhoof-Blumer

¹⁴ Rouvier 465–467, which he places between 123–109 B.C.; Rouvier 463, placed between 123–116 B.C., displays both the Greek abbreviation, ΛΑ, for «Laodicea», and the original Phoenician name of the city, L BYRT; the issue is of the «Astarte» type and does not have the *aphlaston* as a separate symbol in the field, although Astarte does hold one as part of her traditional motif on these issues.

¹⁵ Antiochus IV is excluded on the grounds of the portrait style and the fabric and weight of his prolific bronze issues from Berytos; CSE 704–705, Rouvier 442–446 (Rouvier 447 is not illustrated and, because of its lighter weight and the non-radiate portrait, may not represent Antiochus IV; I have seen a hemi-chalkous of Antiochus IV from Berytos of the «Poseidon» type, in commerce, and the portrait is radiate). Antiochus V is also excluded because of portrait style and the tendency for his rare Phoenician bronze issues to be either dated, or engraved with his epithet, «Eupator»; Rouvier 653 (Byblos). Antiochus VI is excluded because he was always the protégé of Tryphon, who destroyed Berytos in 140 B.C., which presumes the city's loyalty to Demetrius II; Rouvier, RN 1896 (see above n. 4), p. 276 (see above n. 13). Antiochus VII is unlikely to have been able to issue coinage from Berytos because of its destruction by Tryphon. However, the city must have been sufficiently restored within some ten years, in order to have been a mint for both Demetrius II, 2nd reign, and Alexander II; Rouvier, RN 1896 (see above n. 4), pp. 276–278 and 396 (Rouvier places the bronze issues of Demetrius II in his 1st reign).

¹⁶ See above, n. 14. See Rouvier 457, for the earlier appearance of the *aphlaston*, as a symbol in the reverse field, on the initial municipal issues of Berytos during the reign of Seleucus IV. Rouvier places this issue between 187–176 B.C. and it is noteworthy that the letter Δ appears behind the head of the City-Tyche, just as it does behind the head of Antiochus IV on some of his quasi-autonomous issues from Berytos; Rouvier 443, CSE 704. We perhaps see the same individual signing a dated Berytos tetradrachm of Demetrius II in 145/44 B.C.; CSE 709. See above, n. 2, for another instance of a mint official signing both the municipal bronze issues and Berytos tetradrachms of Demetrius II.

tentatively suggests an attribution to Antiochus VIII. Also, tetradrachms of Antiochus VIII with dates between the years 117/6–114/3 B.C. have been published from the mints of Sidon (CSE 724), Ascalon (CSE 823, 824) and Damascus (CSE 852 and 854) which display a similar portrait style with that of nos. 6–9, including the same general shape of the head and the curls of hair at the back of the neck.

These factors, when taken together with the maladroit and cursory treatment of the Phoenician inscription, suggesting a hiatus in its use, point to a small dedicatory issue for Antiochus VIII from Berytos – after the city had officially dropped the Seleucid dynastic name in favor of its traditional name. This small issue then, would seem to represent the temporary resurrection of the old Seleucid dynastic name of «Laodicea» in honor of Antiochus VIII¹⁷. To find an explanation for such a seemingly anomalous quasi-municipal issue from Berytos, we need only look to an inscription from the French excavations at Delos¹⁸:

Βασιλέα Ἀντίοχον Ἐπιφανῆ Φιλομήτορα
 Καλλίνικον τὸν ἐγ βασιλέως Δημητρίου,
 ὁ δῆμος ὁ Λαοδικέων τῶν ἐν Φοινίκη τῆς ἱερᾶς
 καὶ ἀσύλου, τὸν ἑαυτοῦ σωτῆρα καὶ εὐερ-
⁵ γέτην Ἀπόλλωνι.
 Ἐπ' ἄρχοντος Πολυκλείτου, ἐπὶ ἐπιμελητοῦ δὲ
 τῆς νήσου Διονυσίου τοῦ Νίκωνος Παλληνέως.

«(Statue of) king Antiochos Epiphanes Philometor Kallinikos, son of king Demetrios, (consecrated) to Apollo by the citizens of Laodicea in Phoenicia, (city) sacred and inviolable, for their savior and benefactor. Under the archon Polykleitos and the governor of the island, Dionysios, son of Nikon of (the *deme*) Pallene.»

The inscription is positively dated to 110/09 B.C. by the name of the Athenian archon «Polykleitos»¹⁹, and represents the dedication of a statue of Antiochus VIII to Apollo, the god of Delos, by the citizens of «Laodicea in Phoenicia» in honor of their «savior and benefactor». From whom they were saved was undoubtedly Antiochus IX Cyzicenus, who had attacked the dominions of his half-brother, Antiochus VIII Grypus in, or about, 113 B.C.²⁰ In 111/10 B.C., Cyzicenus held Damascus and, on the Phoenician coast, Sidon and Ake-Ptolemais²¹. From these places, we might assume that he menaced Berytos. However,

¹⁷ P. Roussel, BCH 1911 (see above n. 5), p. 439; Ch. Picard, BCH 1920 (see above n. 5), p. 301.

¹⁸ Choix, 122; Insc. Délos, 1551.

¹⁹ P. Roussel, Délos colonie athénienne (Paris 1916), p. 365; Ch. Habicht, The Eponymous Archons of Athens from 159/58 to 141/40 B.C., Hesperia 57, 1988, p. 237.

²⁰ E.T. Newell, The Seleucid Mint of Antioch, AJN 51, 1917–1918, p. 95; A.R. Bellinger, The End of the Seleucids, Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences 38, June 1949, p. 66 and n. 37. Recently published, and ongoing, research concerning the chronology of the reigns of Antiochus VIII and Antiochus IX make an absolute date for the attack of Antiochus IX somewhat uncertain at this time; A. Houghton, The Antioch Project, Mnemata: Papers in Memory of Nancy M. Waggoner (New York 1991), p. 78 and n. 19.

²¹ For Cyzicenus at Damascus and Ake-Ptolemais in year 202 of the Seleucid Era (= 111/10 B.C.), see A. Houghton and W. Müseler, The Reigns of Antiochus VIII and Antiochus IX at Damascus, SM 40, 1990, No. 159, pp. 60–61 and the references cited; at Sidon, Naville 10, 1925, lot 1459.

in the following year (110/09 B.C.), Grypus held Berytos and granted the city the coveted status of sacredness and inviolability (*asylia*)²². In the same year, he granted freedom to the city of Seleucia in Syria Seleucis²³. Such concessions on the part of Grypus were no doubt meant to gain the allegiance of these cities against the threat of Cyzicenus.

By the reign of Seleucus IV, the merchants of Berytos had an established trading colony on Delos²⁴, and by the middle of the 2nd century B.C. had formed themselves into a corporation (*koinon*) of the «Berytian Poseidoniasts», which included «merchants, shipmasters and warehousemen»²⁵. This prominent and flourishing Berytian mercantile association existed on Delos until the devastation of the island in 69 B.C. by the pirates of Athenodoros²⁶, and the proceeds from their trade may have materially contributed toward the restoration of their native city after the attack of Tryphon in 140 B.C. (see above n. 15). The principal deity of their association was that of their namesake, Poseidon, the marine-Baal of Berytos-Laodicea who consistently appears on the coinage of the city well into the Roman Imperial period²⁷.

The maritime symbol of the *aphlaston* on the initial municipal issues of the city (Rouvier 457), then again appearing on both the municipal issues subsequent to 123 B.C. (Rouvier 465–467) and on the proposed quasi-municipal issues of Antiochus VIII, may well be the sacerdotal emblem of the Poseidonian clerics, rather than the symbol of a mint official. Its appearance on the coins might suggest a theocratic connection between the Berytian civil government and the Poseidonian priesthood, as well as with, perhaps, the mercantile institution of the «Berytian Poseidoniasts» on Delos, whose trading activities would have naturally brought material wealth to their native city.

Plate page 119, no. 6 is somewhat problematic, as it lacks the *aphlaston* symbol of nos. 7–9; however, the portrait style is in the same convention and the issue may precede the latter by a short period, with the resurrected Seleucid dynastic ethnic, «Laodicea», in honor of the city's «savior», Antiochus VIII Grypus²⁸. This may have been shortly before

²² See above n. 18; see H. Seyrig, *Notes on Syrian Coins*, NNM 119 (New York 1950), pp. 20–21, for the significance of such privileges to the cities of the Hellenistic Levant. True autonomy for Berytos did not begin until 81 B.C., by the concession of Tigranes, when the city commenced its own era for the dating of its coinage; H. Seyrig, *Antiquités syriennes* 42, *Sur les ères de quelques villes de Syrie*, etc., Syria 27, 1950, p. 38.

²³ C.B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* (New Haven 1934), pp. 288–293 (Letter 71, dated to «summer of 109 B.C.»). While it cannot be said with certainty that Grypus was the author of this letter, rather than Cyzicenus, Welles is more inclined toward Grypus. E.T. Newell (see above n. 20), pp. 104–105, is certain that the author is Grypus and dates the grant to «autumn of 108 B.C.».

²⁴ E.R. Bevan, P. Roussel and Ch. Picard (see above n. 5).

²⁵ *Insc. Délos*, 1520; see W.A. Laidlaw, *A History of Delos* (Oxford 1933), p. 212.

²⁶ Ch. Picard, *BCH* 1920 (see above n. 5), pp. 304, 306.

²⁷ *BMC Phoen.*, p. 90, 253 (Gordian III).

²⁸ *Insc. Délos*, 1777 (Choix, 118) from the same monument as that of *Insc. Délos*, 1551 (presented in full above), and very likely of the same date (110/09 B.C.), is a dedication in honor of the Athenian people made by the *koinon* of the «Berytian merchants, shipmasters and warehouseman», while the contemporary (or very close in time) *Insc. Délos*, 1774 (Choix, 119) is a dedication to their national gods made by the *koinon* of the «Berytian Poseidoniasts». Thus, we have the traditional city ethnic appearing on dedications which are contemporaneous with that in honor of Antiochus VIII, where the Seleucid dynastic ethnic, «Laodicea», is temporarily revived (viz. *Insc. Délos*, 1551 and coins 6–9) out of respect for the royal family. See Ch. Picard, *BCH* 1920 (see above n. 5), pp. 299–301 and commentary under Choix, 118.

the official grant of *asylia* given to Berytos by Grypus in 110/09 B.C., when the *aphlaston*, as an hieratic (as opposed to a secular) symbol, would seem to make its only appearance in the reverse field of the royally sanctioned quasi-municipal coinage of Berytos-Laodicea.

Wayne Moore
P.O. Box 19353
Portland, OR 97280 (USA)