

# Two early Ptolemaic hoards found in Egypt

Autor(en): **Zervos, Orestes H.**

Objektyp: **Article**

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

Band (Jahr): **28-32 (1978-1982)**

Heft 120

PDF erstellt am: **11.09.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-171210>

## **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.

coin avec le groupe précédent des ailes du moulin <sup>14</sup>. Sa composition est proche de celle du trésor de Myrina 1970; on pourrait donc proposer à peu près la même date d'enfouissement que celle de Myrina, vers 440 av. J. C., ou bien un peu avant.

L'étude de Chavari et Koumadès nous donne la possibilité de suivre de près l'évolution du carré creux éginète au type le plus ancien («Union Jack»), jusqu'au type du grand carré creux éginète («large skew»). En même temps elle confirme certaines opinions exprimées dans des articles précédents <sup>15</sup>.

<sup>14</sup> Nicolet l. c. p. 8; l'auteur ne trouve pas une liaison de coin entre ces deux groupes.

<sup>15</sup> Holloway l. c. p. 8; Nicolet l. c. pp. 6, 8–10; Oeconomides l. c. pp. 238–239.

## TWO EARLY PTOLEMAIC HOARDS FOUND IN EGYPT

Orestes H. Zervos

In the year 1856 a large hoard of early Hellenistic tetradrachms came to light in Egypt <sup>1</sup>. As initially reported, its earliest coins were issues of Alexander the Great and the latest of the Ptolemaic kings – among them an issue of Arsinoe II. In the entry devoted to this hoard, Sidney P. Noe <sup>2</sup> put a question mark after the Arsinoe tetradrachm. He did not explain why, but the coin indeed turns out to be intrusive. This is proved by Edward T. Newell in a piece of writing never published, where it is also shown that the solitary coin actually came from a different, now practically unknown, coin hoard <sup>3</sup>. The facts about the forgotten hoard and some corrections to the other one (1856) are the reasons for this note.

I give Newell's comments in their entirety – with only minor editing – and add a commentary. The passage opens with the 1856 find:

«The hoard (cf. S. P. Noe, *A Bibliography of Greek Coin Hoards*, p. 82) is somewhat mysterious and its exact composition open to considerable doubt, as the following excerpts will show. It was apparently first mentioned by Joseph Curt in his description of C. G. Huber's collection: *Catalogue of the Unique Collection of Greek and Roman Coins, formed . . . by . . . C. G. Huber . . . which will be sold by auction by Messrs. . . Sotheby & . . . Wilkinson . . . 4th of June, 1862*. On page iv of the Preface, Curt states that no. 995 (tetradrachm of Arsinoe I [sic!] Queen of Ptolemy Philadelphus) was found with nos. 942, 943, etc. Further, on page 91 of the same catalogue in describing no. 942 he says: 'found in Egypt, with the following tetradrachm (as also the coins of Alexander Junior) in the vast level plain of the triangularly-formed Delta, in an ancient vase, with common tetradrachms of Alexander the Great and of Ptolemy 1st Soter.' Of the same hoard Waddington (*Mélanges de Numismatique, Deuxième Série*, Paris, 1867, p. 50) says: 'Enfin, M. Curt, rédacteur du catalogue de la collection Huber, formée en Égypte et vendue à Londres en 1862, m'écrit que, d'après une note manuscrite de M. Huber, les numéros 942 à 948, ainsi que le numéro 995 de ce catalogue, furent trouvés ensemble dans la Basse-Égypte, avec des tétradrachmes au nom de Ptolémée Soter et d'Alexandre le Grand. Ce dépôt

<sup>1</sup> M. Thompson, O. Mørkholm, C. Kraay, *An Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards* (1973), 1684.

<sup>2</sup> *A Bibliography of Greek Coin Hoards*, ANS NNM 25 (1st ed., 1925), p. 82; ANS NNM 78 (2nd ed., 1937), no. 359.

<sup>3</sup> E. T. Newell, *The Egyptian Coinages of Ptolemy I*, 31, note 2. The Manuscript, apparently composed in the early 1930s, is kept at the American Numismatic Society in New York. I thank the Society for permission to quote from it, and Mr. John Mancia for his editorial advice. The hoard noted by Newell is listed in neither Noe nor the Inventory.

contenait donc, outre les pièces communes de Ptolémée Soter et d'Alexandre: 1<sup>o</sup> deux exemplaires du rare tétradrachme à la tête d'Alexandre coiffée de la peau d'éléphant, et, au revers, de Jupiter assis; 2<sup>o</sup> cinq exemplaires du tétradrachme, au revers de Pallas; 3<sup>o</sup> un tétradrachme inédit d'Arsinoé, femme de Ptolémée Philadelphé.' What opinion Huber himself entertained concerning Curt's remarks in the above-mentioned catalogue may be judged from the following note found on page 104 of his *Zur alten Numismatik Ägyptens*, Vienna, 1867, where he says: ‚Die zu Nr. 983 des englischen Auctions-Cataloges meiner Sammlung beigefügte Bemerkung . . . fällt, sowie manche andere überraschend naive Bemerkung im gedachten Cataloge lediglich auf Rechnung des Zusammenstellers desselben (in London). Ich verwahre mich um so mehr gegen die Autorschaft dieser Zuwüchse fremder Gelehrsamkeit, als in dem systematisch geordneten Manuscript-Cataloge meiner Münzsammlung zu derlei Bemerkungen kein Anlaß geboten war!'

The Arsinoe tetradrachm, certainly, could never have been contained in the 1856 Delta hoard which was of a much earlier composition and burial. In no place in his writings does Huber claim this and the intrusion can only be laid to some misunderstanding on the part of Curt followed by Waddington. Huber himself says (*ibid.*, p. 123) of the Arsinoe tetradrachm: ‚daß diese Arsinoe-Tetradrachme im Nildelta zusammen mit einer Partie posthumer Soter-Tetradrachmen gefunden wurde, in welcher auch die oben Absch. II. D. aufgeführten datirten Stücke von Sidon und Tyrus enthalten waren. *Jener Fund bestand nur aus Vierdrachmenstücken, die im Gewichte wenig von einander abwichen.* Nach der Höhe der Münzdaten und der gleichförmig frischen Erhaltung der Exemplare zu schließen, mochte diese Münzpartie ungefähr zur Zeit des Regierungsantrittes des ersten Evergetes vergraben worden sein.' The italics are mine. Huber here states about as clearly as it is possible so to do that the hoard in which the Arsinoe tetradrachm appeared was, as is only natural, composed solely of tetradrachms of *Phoenician weight* struck by Ptolemy II; in other words, those with Soter portrait and eagle types. This «Arsinoe hoard» contained no tetradrachms of either Attic or debased Attic (i. e. pseudo-Rhodian) weights, and so constituted a hoard clearly other than the one Huber claims to have been unearthed in the Delta in 1856.

Possessing two specimens of the tetradrachms described (N. B., nos. 942, 943, with Ptolemy Soter's early types of Alexander in elephant scalp and seated Zeus) which he believed to have come from the 1856 Delta Hoard, Huber goes on to say (*ibid.*, pp. 17–18): ‚In meiner Sammlung befanden sich von dieser merkwürdigen Tetradrachme zwei vorzüglich erhaltene Exemplare, welche aus einem im J. 1856 im Nildelta gemachten bedeutenden Münzfunde stammen, wo sie mit Silbermünzen Alexander des Großen, des Philippus Aridaeus, Alexander des Jüngeren und des Ptolemäus Soter – sämtlich vortrefflich erhalten – beisammen waren.' Taking this statement at its face value it would seem to imply that coins bearing Ptolemy I's own types (Phoenician weight) were actually found in a single hoard intermingled with immediately preceding issues of Attic and debased Attic weights (N. B.: i. e., specimens of the standard Alexander variety and of Ptolemy I's early satrapal issue). As this happens to constitute the only instance known to the present writer of such an association (not in itself, however, impossible) in an Egyptian hoard, and as Huber gives no detailed list or careful description of the varieties thought by him to have come from the hoard in question but merely and somewhat superficially mentions the existence of such a hoard while discussing other matters, it may be best to await the discovery of further hoards of a similar nature before using Huber's as definite evidence.» – This is the information given by Newell.

A. *The Hoard of 1856*. Had Newell extended his research, he probably would have discovered that the Arsinoe tetradrachm was not the only intrusion among the coins of 1856. Some of the five tetradrachms with the «Pallas» reverse mentioned by Waddington (nos. 944 to 948 in the above passage) are also likely out of place. Nowhere does Huber directly associate them with the find of 1856; he only says that they formed part of his collection, as did Lot 949 (one drachm of the same type and six bronze pieces of Ptolemy I) in Sotheby's catalogue, and that «all these pieces were found as usual in Egypt<sup>4</sup>.» Since Huber mentions the find of 1856 on the same page, a few lines above this passage, but then lumps the five tetradrachms together with the small change of Lot 949 (almost certainly found separately), it is unlikely that the heavy silver could have belonged *as a group* to the find. Had that been the case, Huber would have clarified his wording.

Now it is just possible that two of the five tetradrachms in Sotheby were actually part of the find. In a late insertion to an article finished on June 29, 1857, another coin collector, A. Schledehaus<sup>5</sup>, mentions a large groupe of tetradrachms which are understood to have originated from the hoard found the previous year. He writes: «Seitdem dies geschrieben wurde, erwarb Hr. Gen.-Consul Huber in Kairo eine bedeutende Anzahl gewöhnlicher Tetradrachmen Alexanders des Großen, die in Ägypten gefunden wurden, und mit denselben auch vier Tetradrachmen mit den Elephanten-Exuvien, deren zwei den Jupiter Aëtophores . . . und zwei andere die Pallas Promachos . . . auf der Kehrseite haben.» The date of purchase, the description of the coins – particularly of the two pieces with the «elephant's exuvia», almost certainly the same as Sotheby Lots 942 and 943 – make it most likely that the coins mentioned by Schledehaus all came from the find of 1856. Thus two out of the five tetradrachms in Sotheby (nos. 944 to 948) are probably part of the hoard – though which two is impossible to tell – the rest deriving from other sources.

Not all ambiguities and errors are to be laid on Curt's doorstep. A reading of Huber's various articles<sup>6</sup> shows that, under a somewhat primitive classification, this writer ascribes to Ptolemy I not only issues properly that king's, but also issues belonging, as shown by Svoronos<sup>7</sup>, to Ptolemy II. Therefore some of the coins of «Ptolemy Soter» attributed by Huber to the hoard may actually be later. All the information collected about the find is outlined in the following summary<sup>8</sup>.

### *Hoard of 1856*

Provenance: Nile Delta

Contents: silver tetradrachms (large find)

Alexander III: numerous

Philip III

Ptolemy I (Alexander head / seated Zeus): Sotheby Lots 942, 943; the one in London (*BMC Ptolemies*, p. 1, no. 1, pl. 1.1, g 17.21), the other as Svoronos, no. 22.

<sup>4</sup> C. G. Huber, *Essay on the Classification of Ancient Greek Coins found in Egypt*, NC 1862, 163.

<sup>5</sup> A. Schledehaus, *Die ersten Königsmünzen Ägyptens*, in H. Grote's *Münzstudien* 1 (1857), 462, Note 1.

<sup>6</sup> See the article quoted by Newell (p. 2 above) and loc. cit.

<sup>7</sup> J. Svoronos, *Ta Nomismata tou Kratous ton Ptolemaion* (1904–1908).

<sup>8</sup> Huber says, *Zur alten Numismatik Ägyptens*, 30, that the portion of eagle-type tetradrachms of Ptolemy I in the hoard was a considerable one («eine große Anzahl»).

Ptolemy I (Alexander head / Athena): of unknown varieties but some probably struck in debased Attic weight (15.7 g). Two probably acquired by Huber.

Ptolemy I (portrait / eagle): numerous

Preservation: excellent

Disposition: R. Odescalchi (dealer), C. G. Huber, H. Reichardt, A. Schleddehaus.

*B. The «Arsinoe» Hoard.* Turning now to the second find, we can locate Huber's «posthumous Soter» tetradrachms in the place he indicates (section II. D.)<sup>9</sup> where he lists them along with many *unrelated* pieces. Huber gives enough information to make the separation of the two classes of coins possible but, unfortunately, not enough to satisfy the reader that his list is exhaustive of all the varieties originally in the hoard. This ambiguity might cast some doubt on Huber's claim that the hoard was buried shortly after Philadelphus's death. The reason is the same as that mentioned in connection with his attributions to Ptolemy I, namely, a defective classification of the Ptolemaic coins. Since some coins assigned by Huber to Ptolemy Philadelphus turn out to be of a later date<sup>10</sup>, the same possibility holds for any hoard coins left out of his catalogue (section II. D). On the basis of the present evidence, then, the description of the second hoard is as follows<sup>11</sup>:

#### *The «Arsinoe» Hoard*

Provenance: Nile Delta (before 1867).

Contents: silver tetradrachms (Ptolemaic standard).

Arsinoe II (queen's head / eagle): Sotheby Lot 995, now in London (*BMC Ptolemies*, p. 43, no. 7, pl. 8.3, g 14.16). About 271–265 B.C. (Svoronos 410 b). Letter X between eagle's legs and ΑΡΣΙΝΟΗΣ ΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦΟΥ.

Ptolemy II (portrait / eagle): with ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ.

##### a) Sidon (ethnic ΣΙ and letters ΔΙ)

- 1) Letters Α instead, year Λ and ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ (no. 30). Svoronos 732 (with ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ), B.C. 256.
- 2) Year ΚΘ (no. 36). Svoronos 730, B.C. 257.
- 3) Letters Α instead, year ΛΑ (no. 37). Svoronos 734, B.C. 255.
- 4) Year ΛΓ (no. 38). Svoronos 741, B.C. 253.
- 5) Year ΛΔ (no. 39). Svoronos 744, B.C. 252.
- 6) Year ΛΙ (no. 40). Svoronos 751, B.C. 249.

##### b) Tyre (ethnic ΤΥ and symbol CLUB)

- 7) Year ΚΔ and ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ (no. 32). Svoronos 649, B.C. 262.
- 8) Same year (no. 41, but no *ethnic* or *symbol* mentioned). Svoronos –, B.C. 262 (?)
- 9) Same year (no. 42). Svoronos – (with ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ, no. 649) B.C. 262.
- 10) Letters ΑΒ and Θ, year Λ (no. 43, but no *symbol* mentioned). Svoronos 658, B.C. 256.

<sup>9</sup> Loc. cit. (p. 2 above), 36 f. (catalogue).

<sup>10</sup> Loc. cit., *passim*.

<sup>11</sup> In listing the dated issues of Sidon and Tyre, I follow Huber's descriptions as well as serial notation (in parantheses), but allow for possible discrepancies with Svoronos loc. cit.

- 11) Letters AB and «Phoenician character like M», same year (no. 44, but no *symbol* mentioned). Svoronos 660 (with ΑΛ) B.C. 256.
- 12) Letters MA, year ΛB (no. 45). Svoronos 663–670, B.C. 254.
- 13) Same letters, year ΛΓ (no. 46). Svoronos 671–678, B.C. 253.
- 14) Same letters and Δ, year ΛΔ (no. 47). Svoronos 682 (with ΔI instead of Δ) B.C. 252.

Preservation: «uniformly fresh».

Disposition: C. G. Huber.

This is perhaps as far as we can go in determining the composition, still uncertain, of the two coin finds. Since the time of Newell's speculations about the contents of the hoard of 1856, the Egyptian Delta has yielded up another deposit not dissimilar to the last, found near Phacous in 1956 and covering just about the same span of time<sup>12</sup>. Interestingly, the coins in the new find, mainly tetradrachms, were carefully segregated by their owner – those with the name of Alexander or Philip Arrhidaeus in one jar, and those with the name and types of Ptolemy I, in another. I have recently argued<sup>13</sup> that the two Phacous jars, though buried together, were actually distinct accumulations with distinct cut off points and that their collective contents represent coins put away over an *extended* period of time. Now if what Huber means by «excellent preservation» also includes «circulation wear», then the condition of the coins in the 1856 find would preclude a formation of that deposit in a single instant of time (which normally results in graduated coin wear) making more probable repeated draws as in Phacous. If so, the hoard's unusual composition, the source of Newell's concern, would not reflect in any way the pattern of coin circulation at the time of concealment any more than it did in Phacous, but rather would give evidence of an assemblage of coins formed gradually so as to permit the inclusion of consistently fresh pieces. Whatever the explanation, this find has an unmistakable international cast which is a strong contrast to the local character of the «Arsinoe» deposit. It is possible that the two hoards were also chronologically mutually exclusive, the find of 1856 covering the reigns from Alexander the Great to Ptolemy I and the other the reign of Ptolemy II alone; but this is not certain. In any case, thanks to Newell's astute observations, old errors have been corrected and a hoard, long shelved, is now back on the record.

<sup>12</sup> Inventory 1678.

<sup>13</sup> ANS MN 21 (1976), 54 ff.

## EINE UNBEKANNTE BRONZE AUS GERME (MYSIEN)

Hubert Emmerig

Germe, Mysien, Gordian III., 238–244 n. Chr.

Aes 2,72 g; 21 mm Ø.

Vs. AVKMANTΓOPAIANOC Drapierte, gepanzerte Kaiserbüste mit Lorbeerkranz nach rechts, das Ganze im Linienkreis.

Rs. ΓEP – MH/ΝΩΝ um den auf einem nach rechts schreitenden Löwen gelagerten Herakles mit Keule in der Linken und Eros auf den Knien; das Ganze im Perlkreis.