

Le trésor de Meydancikkale [A. Davesne, G. Le Rider]

Autor(en): **Westermark, Ulla**

Objekttyp: **BookReview**

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

Band (Jahr): **70 (1991)**

PDF erstellt am: **15.08.2024**

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.

lui-même n'a pas été sûrement identifié jusqu'ici – et enfin par Orchomène. La présence d'une monnaie de Corinthe (trouvée en 1895; n'y aurait-il pas des trouvailles plus récentes?) dans cette dernière ville me semble intéressante, vu qu'Orchomène était au carrefour de plusieurs routes vers la Phocide et la Locride opontienne. C'est par là qu'ont dû venir les pièces recueillies dans les fouilles de «Livanata» (la forme usuelle du toponyme est plutôt Livanates), car ce site côtier où l'on vient de mettre au jour un important trésor monétaire du IV^e s. ap. J.-C. (cf. BCH 113, 1989, 630) est celui de l'antique Kynos, port de la ville d'Oponite (Atalanti); or, de Kynos une route menait directement à Corinthe par la Béotie et la Mégaride, comme cela ressort de Polybe (IV 67,7, avec le commentaire de Walbank). De Thèbes les bronzes corinthiens ont été acheminés vers l'Eubée (qui certes a pu être alimentée aussi par l'intermédiaire d'Athènes): c'est évidemment un hasard si Erétrie est encore la seule cité eubéenne à en avoir fourni (aux trois exemplaires qu'allègue Amandry on ajoutera l'as signalé dans Prakt. Arch. Et. 1984 A, 227, n° 4, type SNG Copenhague 211; cette dernière pièce, aux coins sans doute non identifiables, ne figure pas dans le catalogue de l'émission XIII): il est probable que l'avenir en verra apparaître non seulement à Chalcis mais aussi à Carystos (l'une et l'autre plus florissantes qu'Erétrie à cette époque: cf. Mela II 108). La présence de bronzes corinthiens à Andros et à Délos implique d'ailleurs leur circulation à Carystos, comme aussi à Ténos. Bref, il reste certainement, dans ce domaine, beaucoup de découvertes à faire, qui s'intégreront au cadre d'ores et déjà bien tracé.

La deuxième partie de l'ouvrage est constituée par un très précieux catalogue qui recense et classe de façon remarquablement claire (pour les liaisons de coins à l'intérieur de chaque émission) tous les exemplaires utiles (env. 2500). C'est le répertoire auquel numismates et archéologues devront nécessairement renvoyer désormais: autrement dit, ne serait-ce qu'à ce titre, un livre absolument indispensable dans toute bibliothèque de sciences de l'Antiquité.

Denis Knoepfler
Université de Neuchâtel
Neuchâtel

A. Davesne/G. Le Rider

Le trésor de Meydancikkale

Gülner II. Institut français d'études anatoliennes (Paris 1989) Tome 1, Texte, 377 pp.
 Tome 2, Planches 1–157, FF 592.

This fantastic hoard, discovered in 1980, has already been known for a number of years as the Gülner hoard. The authors have spared no effort to make it known by presenting it in many lectures in several countries, some of which have resulted in printed reports. Both authors have also used the material beforehand in numismatic articles, published in recent years. The final publication of the hoard fully confirms its outstanding importance. The name has here been changed to Meydancikkale, the actual find spot, undoubtedly more correct though less practical than the already familiar short name Gülner. But we shall get used to the new, long name; the publication is a masterpiece of meticulous scholarship, which will undoubtedly become a standard reference work for the coinages

of the hellenistic period. The printing is also of a high standard. Thanks to generous economic contributions from the CNRS, Paris, and the funds from Bank Leu AG, Zürich, and Münzen und Medaillen, Bâle, it has been possible to illustrate the majority of the 5215 coins on 157 excellent plates. Only some duplicates from identical dies and some worn specimens have been left out. The full illustration further enhances the value of the book.

The Meydancikkale hoard is the largest coin hoard ever found in a regular excavation. The site is in Cilicia, 8 km from Gülnar and circa 20 km north-east of the ancient Celenderis. Excavation works have been carried out on the spot by a French team since 1971. It was the French archaeologist Emmanuel Laroche, who first draw attention to the site and who started the excavations. After him both Georges Le Rider and Alain Davesne have in turn been leader of the campaign and both have a first hand knowledge not only of the coins but also of the site and the area. The hoard was found in the remains of a hellenistic building, originally built over the foundation walls of an older house. The account of the discovery by Davesne, who was himself present when the coins came to light, is exciting (pp. 7–11). The 5215 pieces were concealed in three clay vases hidden away under the foundation walls of the building. The discovery was strictly supervised and the coins immediately counted. It thus seems fully certain that no specimens escaped (cf. *Coin Hoards VII*, 1985, no. 80). After completion of the present study the hoard is now on display at the local museum of Silifke (anc. Seleucia ad Calycadnum), circa 50 km from the original find spot.

The text volume contains an introduction, a catalogue (pp. 27–218) and a commentary (pp. 221–370). The two main groups consist of Alexander coins, tetradrachms and drachms (2554 pieces) and Ptolemaic coins, mostly tetradrachms, a few octadrachms and 13 decadrachms of Arsinoe types, in all 2158 pieces. The remaining lots are of much smaller proportions: Demetrius Poliorcetes, 31 tetradrachms and drachms; Antigonus Gonatas, 3 tetradrachms; Lysimachus, 148 tetradrachms and drachms; Seleucid kings, 261 tetradrachms and drachms; Attalids, 60 tetradrachms. Alain Davesne is responsible for the Ptolemaic section, Georges Le Rider for the Alexanders and, together with C. Joannès, for the smaller lots. The catalogue is admirably concise without leaving out any necessary information. A hoard of this size is bound to contain a large number of coins struck from common dies, and die evidence plays an important role for the classification of the coins.

In the commentary the coins are studied from many points of view. The mass of Ptolemaic coins has given Davesne reason for a renewed and fruitful study of the early Ptolemies down to circa 240 B.C. The results are highly important and this section will no doubt prove very useful as a modern complement to or even substitute for Svoronos for all series present in the hoard. The dated series of Syria and Phoenicia, which go down to 243/2 B.C. and thus include all years except the last one 242/1, form the basis for the classification also of the undated series. A detailed study of die links, monograms, symbols and legends has enabled the author to establish a relative and absolute chronology for these series. Much attention has been given to the weights and the wear of the coins. The dated series of Tyre from the period 265/4–256/5 reveal a loss of weight of 0.086 g for these nine years, thus nearly 1 cg pro year, and the author calculates with the same figure for all series. For the Ptolemaic series, which are divided into small issues, the arithmetic mean weight has been used and not the frequency tables as for the Alexanders. The mean weight of each issue has been calculated and has proved useful for illucidating chronological problems, especially for establishing the sequence of the issues. The tables presenting the

theoretical sequence of yearly issues at the end of the study (pp. 293–296) may seem too perfect, but with the reservations in mind as formulated by the author (p. 294) they summarize in a clear way the new structure of the series.

The bulk of the hoard consists of lifetime and early posthumous coins of Alexander. His main mints, Amphipolis and Babylon, are especially well represented. The number of drachms is high (1330), and most of them come from the so-called drachm mints of Asia Minor. The majority of the coins date from the period circa 336–circa 294 B.C., and only 323 specimens belong to the period thereafter. Some 60 of them are municipal issues from mints in Asia Minor. The hoard is a good example of how the old Alexanders remained the dominating currency far down into the 3rd century B.C. At the same time it shows that the municipal Alexanders as well as the regal coinages of the period, the Seleucid and Attalid series, played a less important role (p. 242).

The Alexanders have also been subject to a penetrating metrological study. With the help of a number of frequency tables the author attempts to find out the original weight standard at the date of striking, weight reductions and the annual wear of the coins. Differences in the mean weights between the groups I–III of Amphipolis indicate that the annual wear was in the size of 0.5 cg, a figure only half of the one which Davesne worked out for the Ptolemaic series. The calculations point to an original weight standard of 17.32 g and indicate reductions for Babylon II–III (323–318/7 B.C.) and for Amphipolis IV (281/0–271 B.C.). For the drachms the calculations give an annual wear of 0.26 cg. One would assume that the smaller coins circulated more and therefore were subject to a heavier wear than the larger coins, but that does not seem to have been the case. The interesting results tally with those arrived at by other scholars (p. 246, p. 256. For another version of the discussion of coin wear cf. Le Rider's article in *Mélanges de la Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne offerts à André TUILIER* 8, 1988, 70–83).

The composition of the hoard is unusual in that respect that coins of Attic weight are mixed with Ptolemaic coins which were struck on a lighter standard and normally did not circulate outside Egypt. The authors draw the conclusion that the hoard was buried in an area occupied by Ptolemaic forces at the border between Seleucid and Ptolemaic possessions. Other mixed hoards have been found in such border areas. In the course of the so-called Laodicean war (246–241) between Syria and Egypt, Ptolemy III came into possession of several places in Cilicia. The strategically important site of Meydancikkale might have served as a military station. The size of the hoard, 2.5 talents, would be suitable for military funds.

For the burial date the reflexions on the nature of the hoard are important (pp. 221–26). The content of the three vessels, called A, B, C, were not exactly similar. The smallest vase, C, which was furthest away and had been buried first, contained only old coins and none of the latest issues represented in the hoard. In vase A, discovered first, the top layer consisted of exclusively Ptolemaic coins; the rest of the content was mixed. In vase B the content was also mixed except for the 13 Ptolemaic decadrachms, which were placed at the top of the pot. The authors consider the question whether we have to do with one or two deposits. Could the coins in vase C have been taken out of circulation and concealed some twenty years before the others? Due to the fact that the three vases were found close together and that no stratigraphic data speak for a double concealment, the authors conclude that the containers were buried at the same occasion. A special weight study of five groups of Alexander coins is appended to show that coins from the three pots have

the same weight peak, which would mean that they were taken out of circulation at the same time. One could add that some coins of identical dies come from different pots, a further support for the opinion that the coins were buried together.

The authors imagine that the hoard was buried in connection with some military event in the years 240–235 B.C. The date is based mainly on the dated Alexander coins from Aradus from the years 17–18, corresponding to 243/2 and 242/1 B.C. According to the chronology worked out by Davesne the Ptolemaic coins stop around the same years. The group of Arsinoe coins belong to the period circa 270–242/1 as demonstrated by H. Troxell, whose chronology is followed by Davesne for this group. The latest of the dated coins from Syria-Phoenicia are from Joppa year 243/2, but as the dated series stop already in the following year these coins are not really decisive for the chronology as pointed out by the author. However, as mentioned above, a detailed study of the undated series has enabled him to establish a chronological sequence for these series down to 243/2 B.C. He concludes that the Ptolemaic coins were withdrawn from circulation a few years later, circa 240/39, and buried soon after that.

The bulk of the hoard consists of really old Alexanders from the period before 294 B.C. Most of the Attic weight coins struck after that date belong to the period before 240, and the authors have admittedly strong arguments for placing the burial date at 240–235 B.C. Yet there are some groups of Lysimachi, Seleucid and Attalid coins which remain uncertain or are, in my view, difficult to push back to such an early date.

Laodicea ad Mare is represented by 17 pieces of Alexandrine types struck in the name of Seleucus (I), representing Newell's series III–V (WSM 1204–1225) and dated by him to 295–223 B.C. The later coins, nos 2777–2785 (WSM 1214–1225) show a close stylistic affinity, and Le Rider assumes that it points to a shorter minting period than that given by Newell, 260–223 B.C. However, it does not follow that the coins belong to the earlier rather than to the later part of the period. Newell has, rightly it seems, pointed out the close connection between the latest issues in the name of Seleucus (WSM 1225–26) and the following series (WSM 1227–34) with the portrait of Antiochus III.

The Seleucid portrait coins, 106 in all, go down to Seleucus II (247–226), who is represented by no less than 67 pieces. They have all been attributed to the early years of his reign. The tetradrachms nos 2765–68 (WSM 1146–1148) were attributed by Newell to Apamea but have been reattributed to Antiochia by A. Houghton (ANSMN 25, 1980, 38–41). Antiochia is also represented by the tetradrachms nos 2756–62 (WSM 990, 991, 1013), belonging to Newell's series I–III (244–228 B.C.). Le Rider sees them as small die-linked series struck over a short period of time and attributes them all to the early years of Seleucus II's reign, assuming that the Antiochean mint might have been very active down to circa 240 in connection with the Laodicean war and the expedition against Antiochus Hierax. This arrangement leaves only Newell's last series IV (WSM 1020–21, dated to 228–226/5) for Antiochia after 240. It seems rather strange that Seleucus should be deprived of coins from his capital and most important mint for the longer part of his reign.

The probably latest Seleucid coins in the hoard are a group of 34 tetradrachms with the portrait of Seleucus II in excellent condition and struck from a single obverse die and four reverse dies (nos 2792–2825). The series was known to Newell in only two specimens (WSM 1641–42). Newell attributed them to an uncertain mint south or east of the Taurus. Le Rider attributes them to an uncertain Cilician mint and concludes that «leur date... se trouve en fait déterminée par celle du trésor» (p. 330), an argument which Seyrig applied

to the posthumous Lysimachi as quoted by Le Rider p. 227, but here it cannot be used to demonstrate that this series belongs to the early years of Seleucus II.

The trickiest lot to fit into the proposed burial date are the 60 Attalid tetradrachms. They belong to groups II–VIA, which according to the current chronology are attributed to Eumenes I (263–241, groups II–III) and to the first half of the reign of Attalus I (241–197, groups IV–VIA). In order to accommodate the Attalid coins to the date 240–235 B.C. the author has had to envisage a thorough updating of all the Attalid series. He thus gives group II, showing Philaeterus wearing a taenia or *strophion* to the later part of Philaeterus' own reign (283–263); groups III–V to Eumenes I and group VIA to the very first years of the reign of Attalus I. Several objections can be raised to this arrangement. It does not seem likely that Philaeterus should have struck coins with his own portrait, as he was not king. Further it was only after the battle of Sardis, in 262, that Eumenes I achieved a higher level of independence, and it seems likely that it was this improved status which enabled him to inaugurate a new coinage with a local dynastic type, the posthumous portrait head of Philaeterus. Accepting the new chronology we get a vigorous, rich minting during the time of Eumenes I, who reigned over a still small country, whereas the coinage attributed to Attalus I, the most important of the Attalid rulers, becomes thin in the extreme except for the very beginning of his reign. After a large output before 235 B.C. (group VIA or the major part of it) there must follow a long interval of 15–20 years without any minting at all before group VIB begins. The current date for the beginning of VIB is circa 220/15 B.C., a date which is accepted here (p. 335. Cf. C. Boehringer, *Chronologie mittelhellenistischer Münzserien*, p. 41). As it is now generally believed that the not very large group VIB continued during the early years of Eumenes II (197–159) down to 188 B.C. or even longer, the rhythm of the Attalid coinage becomes very strange, even allowing for the fact that ancient minting was not always very regular (cf. A. Davesne, *Rythmes de la production monétaire* [1987], 25–26), and that the Alexanders continued to be the main currency during the 3rd century (p. 243).

As mentioned, the authors have clearly and convincingly demonstrated that the larger part of the coins were taken from circulation around 240 and have concluded that the burial followed soon after. They do not withhold contrary evidence but reject it (p. 290). It is, however, not unusual to find later pieces added to hoards which would otherwise fit an earlier date (cf. the remarks by H. Mattingly, *NC* 1989, p. 229). In this case it seems possible to me that some smaller lots might have been added to the hoard at intervals before the final burial, which in that case would have occurred some fifteen years later.

*Ulla Westermark
Royal Coin Cabinet
Stockholm*