

Studies in Economic and Social
History of the Ancient Near East
in Memory of Péter Vargyas

| ANCIENT NEAR EASTERN
AND MEDITERRANEAN STUDIES |
VOLUME 2

SERIES EDITORS

ZOLTÁN CSABAI

DEPARTMENT OF ANCIENT HISTORY

AND

TIBOR GRÜLL

DEPARTMENT OF ANCIENT HISTORY

THE UNIVERSITY OF PÉCS, HUNGARY – L'HARMATTAN HUNGARY

S

tudies in Economic and
Social History of
the Ancient Near East in
Memory of Péter Vargyas

EDITED BY: ZOLTÁN CSABAI

DEPARTMENT OF ANCIENT HISTORY, THE UNIVERSITY OF PÉCS
L'HARMATTAN, BUDAPEST

2014

Ancient Near Eastern and Mediterranean Studies
edited by Zoltán Csabai and Tibor Grüll

Volume 2

Supporters:
The University of Pécs



The Hungarian Society for Ancient Studies.

The editorial work was supported by the European Union and the State of Hungary, co-financed by the European Social Fund in the framework of TÁMOP-4.2.4.A/ 2-11/1-2012-0001 'National Excellence Program'.

© Authors, 2014

© Zoltán Csabai, 2014

© L'Harmattan, 2014

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means – for example, electronic, photocopy, recording – without the prior written permission of the publisher. The only exception is brief quotations in printed reviews.



PÉTER VARGYAS (1950 – 2009)

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Foreword | 11 |
| In memory of Péter Vargyas (1950–2009) | |
| LÁSZLÓ TÖRÖK | 13 |
| Publications of Péter Vargyas | 19 |
| Abbreviations | 25 |

PART ONE

THIRD AND SECOND MILLENNIUM B.C.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Le prix de rachat des captifs d'après les archives paléo-babyloniennes | 33 |
| DOMINIQUE CHARPIN | |
| Les problèmes économiques d'un sheich | 71 |
| JEAN-MARIE DURAND | |
| On Old Babylonian Palastgeschäft in Larsa. The meaning of <i>sūtum</i> and the 'circulation' of silver in state/private business | 79 |
| ZSOMBOR FÖLDI | |
| The Sumerian verb <i>huĝ</i> | 119 |
| SZILVIA JÁKA-SÖVEGJÁRTÓ | |
| Große „private“ Haushalte in der altbabylonischen Zeit in der Mittlerrolle zwischen Königtum und Untertanen | 139 |
| GÁBOR KALLA | |
| From Agade to Samaria: The Inflationary Price of Barley in Situations of Famine | 167 |
| JACOB KLEIN | |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Les clauses en <i>tukum-bi</i> dans les textes de prêt de l'époque d'Ur III | 181 |
| BERTRAND LAFONT | |
| Le rôle économique des dattes dans l'Égypte du Nouvel Empire | 199 |
| BERNADETTE MENU | |
| Some questions of prices, metals and money in „Old Assyriology” | 217 |
| ZOLTÁN PÁLFI | |
| From Counting to Writing: The Quest for Abstraction | 227 |
| DENISE SCHMANDT-BESSERAT | |
| Aspekte einer Sozialgeschichte der spätfrühdynastischen Zeit. Das Beispiel Lagas, oder: „The inhabited ghosts of our intellectual ancestors” | 239 |
| GEBHARD J. SELZ | |
| Eighteen Cuneiform Inscriptions from the Ur III and Old-Babylonian Periods | 283 |
| MARCEL SIGRIST AND URI GABBAY | |
| Alašian products in Hittite sources | 317 |
| ITAMAR SINGER (Z''L) AND GRACIELA GESTOSO SINGER | |
| Zulapi – eine Grossmacht im spätbronzezeitlichen Syrien? | 337 |
| BÉLA STIPICH | |
| The semantics of verbal plurality in Sumerian | 355 |
| BÁLINT TANOS | |
| Silver in Old Assyrian Trade. Shapes, Qualities and Purification | 393 |
| KLAAS R. VEENHOF | |
| Understanding Economic Growth: The Importance of Money in Economic History and Theory | 423 |
| DAVID A. WARBURTON | |

PART TWO
FIRST MILLENNIUM B.C.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Jenseits der assyrischen Grenze. Das Bild des Feindes in den neuassyrischen Königsinschriften | 485 |
| TAMÁS K. ÁRVAI | |
| Interpretation of a medical commentary text BAM 401 | 503 |
| ANDRÁS BÁCSKAY | |
| Elements of the Royal Ideology in Urartian Texts | 521 |
| ATTILA BUHÁLY | |
| Did Seleucid kings impose payments made only in fresh coins of their own coinages? Units of account, not real coins | 531 |
| FRANÇOIS DE CALLATAÏ | |
| The Economic Determination of the Changing Interests. A Survey Based on the Loan Documents of the Neo-Babylonian <i>Sîn-uballiṣ</i> Archive | 557 |
| HENRIETTA CSEKE | |
| Documentary Evidence on Wine from the Eanna Temple Archives in Uruk | 579 |
| MUHAMMAD A. DANDAMAYEV | |
| Babyloniaca from Qumran – Mesopotamian lore in Qumran Aramaic texts | 587 |
| IDA FRÖHLICH | |
| Les marchands mésopotamiens et la théorie des jeux | 603 |
| LAETITIA GRASLIN-THOMÉ | |
| Expositio totius mundi et gentium. A peculiar work on the commerce of Roman Empire from the mid-fourth century – compiled by a Syrian textile dealer? | 629 |
| TIBOR GRÜLL | |
| Die <i>datio in solutum</i> in neubabylonischer Zeit | 643 |
| ALESSANDRO HIRATA | |
| A Late Babylonian Astrological Tablet | 657 |
| HERMANN HUNGER | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Neues zur Verwendung von <i>maḥir</i> im Eanna-Archiv eine Anomalie? | 671 |
| BOJANA JANKOVIĆ UND MICHAELA WESZELI | |
| Spätbabylonische Sklavenpreise | 683 |
| JOACHIM OELSNER | |
| A Sasanian taxation list or an Early Islamic booty? A Medieval Persian source and the Sasanian taxation system | 701 |
| MIKLÓS SÁRKÖZY | |
| Remarks on the Anatolian Background of the Tel Reḥov Bees and the Historical Geography of the Luwian States in the 10th c. BC | 715 |
| ZSOLT SIMON | |
| Greeks on Phoenicians. Can we rely on what the Greeks have said? | 739 |
| LÁSZLÓ VILMOS | |
| Double Family Names in Neo-Babylonian Records: The Case of the Ēṭīru and Ṭābiḥu Families and Their Butchers' Prebends | 751 |
| CORNELIA WUNSCH | |
| Neo-Assyrian <i>kārus</i> in the Zagros | 789 |
| ÁDÁM VÉR | |
| Chronologische Aspekte der babylonischen Zinsen in der frühneubabylonischen und neubabylonischen Zeit | 811 |
| ZOLTÁN CSABAI | |
| Databasing the Commodity Chits of the Idumean Ostraca | 825 |
| BEZALEL PORTEN | |

Foreword

Family, friends, colleagues and all those who knew them stood bereft of speech following the deaths of Péter Vargyas and Éva Darvas, and were trying to make sense of the personal tragedy of these two wonderful people, looking for ways to alleviate the pain their absence had caused. It was only several months later that we realized the irretrievable loss Hungarian Assyriology had suffered. Péter Vargyas had been the first and until today only Doctor of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences within the discipline, whose excellence was acknowledged by both the domestic and the international scholarly community. We had been robbed of a scientist with a number of friends in the field, with formidable international experience, and a wide range of connections in the discipline all over the world.

He was a charismatic figure of Hungarian Assyriology, who prioritized the quality and the far-reaching, valuable results of research. He always underlined the researcher's objectivity, and stressed the equality of the participants of a debate. This is the attitude that students at university, and young scholars at domestic academic programs could learn from him, and this won him recognition outside Hungary, as his numerous invitations to international events testify. He intended to use the innovative experiences gathered during his study trips abroad in Hungary as well, but these intentions were sadly not always well-received. The two decades spent at two major Hungarian universities nevertheless have left their mark. The Department of Ancient History at the University of Pécs will attempt to carry on this scholarly and spiritual legacy.

Three research topics stood out from the diverse fields that Péter Vargyas's work touched upon. These were the society and economy of Ugarit, the history of Babylonian prices, and the monetary history of the Ancient Near East. When we first contemplated producing a memorial volume in honour of his scholarly work, these were the areas

that came to mind, so we asked the authors to choose their essay topics, if possible, within the broader area of Ancient Near Eastern economic and social history. We hope we have succeeded in assembling a volume that reflects adequately on Péter Vargyas' scholarly career.

We would like to thank all the authors of the essays dedicated to the memory of Péter Vargyas, who accepted our call and enriched these volumes with their contributions. We are especially grateful for the patience they displayed during the prolonged editing process. Sadly two of our collaborators could not live to see the publication of the volumes. We learned with great sadness of the death of Itamar Singer in 2012, who repeatedly expressed his support for our efforts, and always offered us words of encouragement when we needed them most. It is also with great sorrow that we were informed of the passing of János Everling in spring 2013, who was an exceptionally talented former student of Péter Vargyas.

The participants, apart from the friends and colleagues of Péter Vargyas, also include former students who now work at various Hungarian universities: Henrietta Cseke (Kodolányi János University of Applied Sciences), András Bácskay (Pázmány Péter Catholic University), Miklós Sárközy (Károli Gáspár University of the Hungarian Reformed Church), and the editor of this volume (University of Pécs). He also supported and encouraged several young talents, beginning in the 1980s, many of whom are today internationally known academics in the field of Assyriology.

There is not enough space to thank all the supporters and helpers who facilitated our work, yet we would like to express our gratitude to Ádám Vér and Vera Benczik for their continual assistance. We would also like to extend our thanks to Bálint Tanos, who in the autumn of 2012 substantially contributed to the editorial and pre-printing work of the first volume. I would like to thank Péter Vargyas' brother, Gábor Vargyas for his patience and the support he offered for our work in the past more than two years. Finally I would like to extend my thanks to L'Harmattan Hungary Publishers for accepting the work into their Ancient Near Eastern and Mediterranean Studies series, and for facilitating the publication process with offering us their infrastructure.

Z. Cs.

Abbreviations

Abbreviated titles of editions of cuneiform texts and of assyriological journals are those used in the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*, but note:

| | |
|----------------|---|
| AAAH | <i>Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae</i> |
| ABAW NF | Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Neue Folge |
| ADFU | Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka |
| Afo | <i>Archiv für Orientforschung</i> |
| AHw | Wolfram von Soden: <i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i> . 1–3 Bände. Wiesbaden, 1965–1981. |
| AJA | <i>American Journal of Archaeology</i> |
| AJSL | <i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures</i> |
| ALASPM | Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palästinas und Mesopotamiens |
| AMI | <i>Archaeologische Mitteilungen aus Iran</i> |
| ANEMS | Ancient Near Eastern and Mediterranean Studies |
| ANESS | Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement |
| AnOr | Analecta Orientalia |
| AnSt | <i>Anatolian Studies</i> |
| AOAT | Alter Orient und Altes Testament |
| AoF | <i>Altorientalische Forschungen</i> |
| ArOr | <i>Archiv Orientální</i> |
| ARM | <i>Archives Royales de Mari</i> |
| AS | Assyriological Studies |
| ASAE | <i>Annales du service des antiquités de l'Égypte</i> |
| ASSF | <i>Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae</i> |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| AUWE | Ausgrabungen in Uruk-Warka Endberichte |
| BA | <i>Beiträge zur Assyriologie</i> |
| BabAr | Babylonische Archive |
| BBVO | Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient |
| BIN | Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of James B. Nies |
| BiOr | <i>Bibliotheca Orientalis</i> |
| BaM | <i>Baghdader Mitteilungen</i> |
| BM | cuneiform tablets in the collection of the British Museum, London |
| BPOA | Biblioteca del Próximo Oriente Antiguo |
| BRM | Babylonian records in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan |
| CAD | <i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i> . Chicago, 1956–2010. |
| CDA | Black, J. – George, A. – Postgate, N. 2000: <i>A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian</i> , Wiesbaden. |
| CDOG | Colloquien der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft |
| CHANE | Culture and History of the Ancient Near East |
| CHD | <i>The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i> , Chicago 1989– |
| CM | Cuneiform Monographs |
| CT | Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum |
| CTH | Laroche, E. 1971: <i>Catalogue des textes hittites</i> . Paris. |
| CTN | Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud |
| CUA | cuneiform tablets in the collection of the Catholic University of America |
| DMOA | Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui |
| DTC | <i>Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi</i> |
| EAH | Entretiens d'Archéologie et d'Histoire |
| ePSD | Electronic version of the <i>Pennsylvania Sumerian Dictionary</i> . http://psd.museum.upenn.edu/epsd/index.html |
| FAOS | Freiburger Altorientalische Studien |
| GMTR | Guides to the Mesopotamian Textual Record |
| HANES | History of the Ancient Near East, Studies |
| HdO | Handbuch der Orientalistik |
| HSAO | Heidelberger Studien zum Alten Orient |
| IBoT | Istanbul Arkeoloji Müzelerinde Bulunan Boğazköy Tabletleri |
| IEJ | <i>Israel Exploration Journal</i> |
| ISCANEE | International Scholars Conference on Ancient Near Eastern Economies |
| JA | <i>Journal Asiatique</i> |

| | |
|--------|---|
| JAC | <i>Journal of Ancient Civilizations</i> |
| JAOS | <i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i> |
| JBL | <i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i> |
| JCS | <i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i> |
| JEA | <i>The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology</i> |
| JESHO | <i>Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient</i> |
| JNES | <i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i> |
| JRAS | <i>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society</i> |
| KUB | Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi |
| KBo | Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi, 1916– |
| Kt | Sigla of texts from Kültepe (kt) found in <i>kārum Kanīš</i> |
| LAOS | Leipziger Altorientalistische Studien |
| LAPO | Littératures Anciennes du Proche-Orient |
| LD | Lepsius, K.R. <i>Denkmäler aus Ägypten und Äthiopien</i> , 12 vols. Berlin. 1849–1859 |
| MBAH | <i>Münstersche Beiträge zur Antiken Handelsgeschichte</i> |
| MC | Mesopotamian Civilization |
| MDOG | <i>Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft</i> |
| MEFRA | <i>Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Antiquité</i> |
| MSL | Materialien zum sumerischen Lexikon; Materials for the Sumerian Lexicon |
| MVAEG | Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft |
| MVN | Materiali per il vocabolario neo-sumerico |
| NABU | <i>Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires</i> |
| NEA | <i>Near Eastern Archaeology</i> |
| Nisaba | Studi Assiriologici Messinesi |
| OAA | Old Assyrian Archives |
| OBO | Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis |
| OECT | Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts |
| OIP | Oriental Institute Publications |
| OIS | Oriental Institute Seminars |
| OJA | <i>Oxford Journal of Archaeology</i> |
| OLA | Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta |
| OLZ | <i>Orientalistische Literaturzeitung</i> |
| OrSP | Orientalia Series Prior |
| ÓTI | Ókor-Történet-Írás |
| PBS | Publications of the Babylonian Section, The Museum of the University of Pennsylvania |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| PIHANS | Publications de l'Institut historique et archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul |
| PNAS | <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America</i> |
| PSBA | <i>Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology</i> |
| RA | <i>Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale</i> |
| RB | <i>Revue Biblique</i> |
| RdE | <i>Revue d'Égyptologie</i> |
| RGTC | Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes |
| RIMA | The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia. Assyrian Periods |
| RIMB | The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia. Babylonian Periods |
| RIME | The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Early Periods |
| RINAP | The Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period |
| RLA | <i>Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie</i> . Begründet von E. Ebeling und B. Meissner, fortgeführt von E. Wiedner, W. von Soden und D. O. Edzard, herausgegeben von M. P. Streck, München, 1928– |
| ROMCT | Royal Ontario Museum Cuneiform Texts |
| SAA | State Archives of Assyria |
| SAAB | <i>State Archives of Assyria Bulletin</i> |
| SAAS | State Archives of Assyria Studies |
| SAK | <i>Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur</i> |
| SCCNH | <i>Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians</i> |
| SD | Studia et Documenta ad Iura Orientis Antiqui Pertinentia |
| SMEA | <i>Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici</i> |
| StBOT | Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten |
| TCL | Textes cunéiformes du Louvre |
| TCS | Texts from Cuneiform Sources |
| THeth | Texte der Hethiter |
| TIM | Texts in the Iraq Museum |
| TMH | Texte und Materialien der Frau Professor Hilprecht Collection |
| UAVA | Untersuchungen zur Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie. Ergänzungsbände zu <i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie</i> |
| UCP | University of California Publications in Semitic Philology |
| UET | Ur Excavations Texts |
| VS | Vorderasiatische Schriftsdenkmäler |
| WAW | Writings from Ancient World |
| WdO | <i>Die Welt des Orients</i> |
| WOO | Wiener Offene Orientalistik |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| WVDOG | <i>Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft</i> |
| YBC | cuneiform tablets in the Yale Babylonian Collection |
| YOS | Yale Oriental Series, Babylonian Texts |
| ZA | <i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie</i> |
| ZAR | <i>Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte</i> |
| ZÄS | <i>Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde</i> |
| ZDPV | <i>Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins</i> |
| ZDMG | <i>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i> |
| ZSSR | <i>Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte</i> |

PART TWO

FIRST MILLENNIUM B.C.

D

id Seleucid kings impose
payments made only in fresh
coins of their own coinages?
Units of account, not real coins

FRANÇOIS DE CALLATAÏ

Royal Library of Belgium, Bruxelles



PICTURE TAKEN IN THE NEW
MUSEUM OF IOS (JULY 1ST, 2009)
FROM LEFT TO RIGHT: EVELINA
AND SERGEI KOVALENKO
(PUSHKIN MUSEUM), ÉVA AND
PÉTER VARGYAS, THE AUTHOR.

It is with great sadness that I dedicate this study to the memory of Péter Vargyas, tragically deceased with his wife Eva a couple of months after we shared delightful moments on the Greek island of Ios.

Among the many achievements brought to the scientific community by the unique expertise of Péter Vargyas, one point has been left by him as most problematic since it divides philologists and numismatists without, as it seems, any hope of reconciliation (even if, in a late footnote, he ultimately changed his mind with his typical intellectual honesty: Vargyas 2010 : 59, footnote 14, see below). Péter Vargyas was the first to notice that all the payments made in Babylonia during Seleucid times were expressed in coins of the ruling king. This iron rule, with few or no exception after the first decades during which the name of Alexander often replaces those of Seleucus I or Antiochus I (see

the list of 103 occurrences, mostly from Uruk, in Vargyas 2004: 344–347), seems to imply that Seleucid kings imposed their own coinages, forbidding the use of any other, whether Seleucid or not: “Nevertheless, since the available texts offer ample evidence of a significant turnover of Seleucid money, and it can hardly be accidental than the money mentioned is always that of the ruling king, we must draw the conclusion that every Seleucid ruler was determined to promote the use of his own currency” (Vargyas 2001: 42). The point is not futile since, doing so, he both contradicts the largely accepted idea of a so-called monetary “liberalism” of the Seleucids (see also Vargyas 2004a: 339) and forces us to believe in a fully monetized Seleucid economy in Babylonia (see also Vargyas 2000b: 519 and 2004b [= Csabai 2010: 198]).

These statements created “une levée de boucliers” of the numismatists who attended the conference organized in Orléans in 2004. With his characteristic open mind and tenacity as well, Péter Vargyas specifies in the publication of his paper: “Ma conclusion a provoqué une grande discussion lors de la conférence. Les interventions des collègues numismates ont clairement montré qu’ils ne voient ni raison ni nécessité de modifier leur position. Les autres interventions ont essayé de résoudre la contradiction par l’interprétation moins littérale des termes analysés par moi. Toutefois, je dois remarquer que jusqu’à présent, c’est-à-dire jusqu’au point où nous avons essayé d’évaluer historiquement ces données dispersées, personne n’a eu l’idée de les interpréter autrement que d’une manière littérale. C’est-à-dire que tout le monde a traduit l’expression akkadienne *istarirru ša antikusu* (*siluku* etc.) comme « statère d’Antiochos (Séleucos, etc.) », voir e.g. la traduction donnée dans CAD I/J 204b : « in stateres of Antiochus in good condition ». De ce fait, je ne suis pas tout à fait convaincu du fait que ces statères d’Antiochos doivent être interprétés au sens large comme « tous statères ayant cours pendant le règne d’Antiochos », c’est-à-dire se référant aux monnaies émises par lui, mais également par ses prédécesseurs ou par d’autres monarques étrangers. Dans ce cas-là, nous ne devons pas renoncer à l’interprétation historique de la terminologie précise utilisée dans nos sources, collectées dans le tableau en annexe. Je soumetts donc la version préliminaire de mon intervention sans changement essentiel en attendant des remarques postérieures, ce qui n’exclut naturellement pas la possibilité d’un changement éventuel de ma position. Pour le moment je tiens plutôt compte de la remarque de L. Migeotte, selon laquelle on pourrait admettre que la politique monétaire des Séleucides est différente selon les provinces. Dans cette optique, il est envisageable qu’en Babylonie, pendant les transactions surveillées par l’Etat, le centre ait pu faire valoir ses directives mais ailleurs beaucoup moins » (2004: 339, footnote 27).

Open to change his mind, he was waiting for further comments. A task I was

distractedly pursuing when the tragic news of his death reached me. It is a bit unfortunate thus – but he liked to debate and I hope he will forgive me – to honor his memory with a paper which argues against one of his ideas. Like him, I don't believe that “stater of the ruling king” could describe any accepted coinage by the king (as supposed by some in Orléans), nor that transactions were intended to be paid with the best coins only (the most heavy and fresh ones) (as advanced by Makis Aperghis),¹ nor do I support the idea that Babylonia did things differently for the matter we are dealing with (as prudently hypothesized by Léopold Migeotte). What I would like to demonstrate in this paper is that this statement proceeds from a confusion often made by philologists who take for real coins what are simply units of account (for a similar case about the word *argurion*, see Callataÿ 2008).

But, before I focus on Seleucid matters, it is worthwhile to comment on another point made by Péter Vargyas who noticed that, from 517 BC onwards, the words *kaspu ginnu* appears on the transactions (Vargyas 1999 and 2001: 24–34). *Kaspu* is a substantive which means “silver” and is determined by a full set of technical attributes, among others *ginnu*.² The meaning of *ginnu* is problematic. It may refer to a weight standard since it will be later replaced by the word “stater” (2001: 31). In several contexts, it seems to qualify a degree of fineness (likely to be 875‰) but in others, it seems to be explicitly the opposite. Consequently, Vargyas refutes the commonly accepted meaning and endorses the hypothesis of Pogon: *ginnu* means “stamped silver” and,

¹ *Contra* M. Aperghis in Vargyas 2004: 341 (“Dans les contrats babyloniens qui mentionnent des paiements, le prix est donné presque toujours comme « tant de shekels, en statères d'un certain roi ». Nous pensons que la monnaie était pesée en Babylonie à cette époque, comme le demandait la longue tradition d'échange des Babyloniens fondée sur le métal précieux pesé. Que le roi qui était nommé dans chaque contrat ait été celui qui régnait à ce moment n'indique pas, à mon avis, que sa monnaie était la seule qui circulait, comme vous l'avez supposé. Nous savons que ce n'était pas le cas par le témoignage des trouvailles monétaires. Je pense que la meilleure monnaie était demandée pour la transaction : la plus récente, celle qui avait le plus haut degré de pureté et le plus grand poids, parce qu'elle avait le moins circulé”).

² See Vargyas 2000b: 514–515 and Vargyas 2001: 13–46: *kaspu qalû* = “burnt silver”, hence “pure (or good) silver” (attested until 309 BC downwards, in economic documents for silver with a higher content than 875‰); *kaspu epšu* = “good silver” (attested after 278 BC, mostly in astronomical diaries, *epšu* derives from the verb “to make”); *kaspu šibirtu* = “scrap silver”; *kaspu murruqu* = “silver of a controlled quality”, hence “silver of pure quality” (not attested in economic documents, for silver with a higher fineness than 875‰); *kaspu pešû* = “white silver”, hence “pure silver” (dominant in the 7th and 6th c. BC); *kaspu babbanû* = “very good” (hence “with legal tender?”); *kaspu ša ina 1 šiqli bitqa nuhhutu* = “silver in which in 1 shekel 1/8th is the alloy” (complete formula to designate silver with a fineness of 875‰ [*kaspu nuhhutu* doesn't mean “bad silver” but is an abbreviated form of the preceding]); *kaspu ša nadānu u mahāri* = “silver of giving and receiving” (often abbreviated, only for the years 535–499 BC, with the word *ginnu*). For long formula, see Vargyas 2001: 23–25.

as already noticed by Powell, “*ginnu* comes very close to denoting some type of coinage” (Vargyas 2001: 25). Although the words “*kaspu ginnu*” are first recorded under Cyrus in 535 BC, they mushroom in 518–517 BC, the first years of Darius. This, Vargyas writes, “can hardly be accidental” and “is probably linked with the monetary reform he undertook”. Therefore, he supports the idea that *kaspu ginnu* means coined money, although not without hesitation: “It is beyond doubt, however, that in the 6th century, the documented references to *ginnu*-silver denote silver of the same fineness (875‰) as the other types of uncoined silver and that the prices expressed in *ginnu*-silver are therefore directly comparable with the other references, whether this term refers to coined money or not” (2001: 32). As this set of words is well attested, he argues that “the financial reforms evidently permeated everyday life, the new money was circulating throughout the economy, and people were not averse to it and were not hoarding it. Nevertheless, coined money was not yet used exclusively, as it was in the Seleucid period, since the majority of data still record the use of uncoined silver” (2001: 31). Nonetheless, he states that: “thus, coined money was available in adequate quantities from the 1st year of Darius’ reign” (2001: 32). This is too much for the numismatist: until the end of the Persian Empire, coinages, gold darics and silver *sigloi*, were produced only at Sardes (and possibly Daskyleion), at a considerable distance from Babylon, and that, although some *sigloi* have reached Babylonia,³ it is absolutely unlikely that this area was monetized at the end of the 6th c., even on a very minor scale. It was not before Alexander the Great, two centuries later, that the Babylonian population may have experienced a real use of coined money (and even this has to be balanced carefully).⁴ As Georges Le Rider and I tried to demonstrate: even at the end of the Hellenistic period, monetization was confined to a minor part of the transactions. There is clearly a conflict between philological interpretation and material facts (location of mints, pattern of hoarding, isolated finds) to which preference must be given, all the more since this explanation is also at odds with other facts. *Primo*, the Persian *sigloi* were issued with a silver content much higher than the 875‰ level of purity firmly implied by the word *ginnu*. *Secundo*, this attribute nearly disappears after the reign of Darius (1 occurrence only), meanwhile *sigloi* continued to be struck after Darius without any significant change of type or alloy. Whatever the exact meaning of *kaspu ginnu* may

³ 1 has been found in the excavations of Uruk (Leisten 1986: 313, note 4) and 7 were part of a Persian hoard found in Babylon (Reade 1986).

⁴ Against the view developed in Vargyas 2000b: 517–519, it is unlikely that the large Alexander coinage of tetradrachms reputed to have been struck at Babylon (but even that point has been recently challenged, see Hoover) was ever used on Babylonian markets and, with a lower degree of likelihood, the same may hold for the lion staters.

be, it cannot imply the physical presence of coins. It may well describe a unit of account with some connections with coins.

In Hellenistic times, another word associated with *kaspu* (silver) is *istatirru*, meaning “stater”. It cannot be seriously doubted that this word refers to the Greek staters (see on this Vargyas 2000b: 516, footnote 17). But, as Péter Vargyas underlines: “it is, however, extremely striking that not one text can be found in which the price of goods is expressed as a certain number of staters. The usual practice was to mention the quantity and quality of the silver in the traditional way, even when paying in coined money (e.g. *x minas y shekels of silver or refined silver*). This was followed by a statement explaining which ruler’s staters – in most cases good, valid staters – were meant. It is no accident that good money is referred so frequently. Whenever the name of the ruler on the money mentioned in a document is specified, and can be compared with the name of the ruler in the date of the text, it is clear that both the money and the text were produced under the same ruler, with the exception of the currencies of Alexander the Great” (Vargyas 2001: 42). Since all the Seleucid coins, at least during the 3rd century, were issued with the same weight standard and the same level of silver purity, and it doesn’t make sense, from a financial point of view, to require new coins of the ruling king, Vargyas pursues: “The Seleucid rulers certainly laid far greater emphasis on the propagandist role of money than their Achaemenid predecessors, but this feature should be considered in a study devoted to money”. Numismatists have generally played down the so-called “propagandistic” role of coinages during recent decades. On the contrary, they have emphasized on how ancient coinages were first of all guided by pragmatism and financial reasons. “As far as silver as a standard of value is concerned, the main point – says Vargyas – is that although coined money had become the official and exclusive means of payment, this did not affect the way that prices were expressed, since staters, whose purity was the same as that of the uncoined silver used before, continued to be weighed in the traditional way. This is confirmed by the fact that, in most cases, the phrase “coined money” (*kaspu istatirru*) is followed by the attribute “refined” (*qalû*), which was the only epithet of (uncoined) silver in both the economic documents and the astronomical diaries as early as the 5th century” (Vargyas 2001: 43). The first sentence of this quotation makes three statements which are in total contradiction with what numismatists believe: a) the Seleucid economy was only partly monetized. Transactions in kind remained until the very end largely superior to transactions in cash (Callataÿ 2004 and Le Rider & Callataÿ 2006: 261–266); b) coined silver was, of the highest purity, at least until the mid of the second century BC, and generally of a much higher purity than silver for jewellery. And c) the very aim of issuing coins with legal tender is to

allow them not to be weighed anymore, but counted. Vargyas doesn't seem too much embarrassed by this last difficulty even if he is forced to notice that there is not a single cuneiform text to give prices in an amount of coins; they all refer to weights expressed in different forms.⁵

Other major objections can be added to the ones already put forward. Firstly, there is a broad gap between the amount of coinage effectively struck by every Seleucid king and the supposed requirement to pay all the transactions in fresh coins of the new ruler. Seleucid kings used to coin a very small portion of their revenues. Antiochus III the Great struck as a yearly average the equivalent of 44 obverse dies for Attic drachms (= 11 tetradrachms). Such an amount, even multiplied by the high estimate of 30,000 coins per die, makes no more than 220 talents a year, which is in the range of 1/50th of their supposed revenues (Callataÿ 2004). Moreover, the yearly average Seleucid coin production (220 talents) is located well under 1/100th of the monetary mass into circulation in their Empire (c. 30,000 talents? – see Le Rider – Callataÿ 2006: 228). In other words, even if they wished, Seleucid kings wouldn't be able to make even one percent of all the transactions paid in fresh coins.

Secondly, as exemplified by the full pattern of coin circulation and amply demonstrated by Georges Le Rider (1996), Seleucid coinages played only a minor role within the boundaries of the empire, loosely estimated at approximately 1/7th of the total mass of coined money into circulation (Le Rider – Callataÿ 2006: 226–228). To accept that all payments were made in Seleucid coinages looks incompatible with reality (on this see Vargyas 2004: 336).

Thirdly, hoards found on the territory of the Seleucid Empire, at its different moments of development, don't support at all the idea that every king imposed his own coinage. Table 1 gives a summary of silver Seleucid hoards (hoards recorded by the *Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards [IGCH]* and the 10 *Coin hoards [CH]* so far published with silver Seleucid coins) buried on Seleucid territory, from 312 BC to 64 BC (for a full list of these hoards given in chronological order of burial, see Annex I). A distinction is made between

⁵ Vargyas 2000b : 516 (“it is surprising that, in the sources, one can only meet weighed silver, but not silver in pieces. It is quite unexpected, since it emerges unanimously from texts and hoards alike, that by this time only coined money was already being used”) or 2004b = Csabai 2010: 198 (“Apparemment donc, on pouvait compter à la manière babylonienne aussi bien l'argent frappe que l'argent-métal. Cela indiquerait par conséquent qu'il ne s'agit pas de compter des pièces de monnaie. Par ailleurs, il n'existe aucune tablette en écriture cunéiforme qui indiquerait le nombre et non le poids des monnaies grecques désignées sous différents noms»). This is an accumulation of difficulties which, amazingly, didn't lead to the simple conclusion that these texts are referring to an accounting unit, not to real coins.

1) mixed hoards (Seleucid coins along other coinages), 2) hoards testifying only Seleucid coins (but for several rulers), and 3) hoards testifying the coinage of only one Seleucid ruler (hopefully the last one, if we want to substantiate the hypothesis of Vargyas):

Table 1. Pattern of silver Seleucid hoards (IGCH + 10 CH):

1) mixed hoards, 2) only Seleucid coinages, 3) coinage of only one Seleucid king

| PERIODS | NUMBER OF HOARDS | 1-MIXED HOARDS | 2-ONLY SELEUCIDS | 3-ONLY ONE SELEUCID KING | % OF 3 TO THE TOTAL |
|------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| 312–250 BC | 15 | 12 | - | 3 | 20,0% |
| 249–200 BC | 24 | 23 | 1 | - | 0,0% |
| 199–150 BC | 24 | 20 | - | 4 | 16,7% |
| 149–100 BC | 49 | 27 | 19 | 3 | 6,1% |
| 99–64 BC | 15 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 46,7% |
| TOTAL | 127 | 87 | 23 | 17 | 13,4% |

It turns out that, out of a total of 127 hoards, 87 (c. 68.5%) are mixed hoards, while only 13.4% (17 out of 127) conform to the expected pattern described by Vargyas. In reality, it is even worse. On the one hand, this table doesn't take into account the many hoards buried during Seleucid times within the boundaries of the Seleucid Empire but without any Seleucid coins. On the other hand, the 17 deposits with coins for only one Seleucid ruler deserve closer attention (see Table 2):

Table 2. List of Seleucid hoards whose content is entirely formed by the coinage of one king

IGCH 1759 (Hillah, near Babylon, before 1945; burial: 290 BC)

10+ AR – *Sel. I*: 10+ te.

IGCH 1734 (Diyarbakir, before 1938; burial: 290–280 BC)

3+ AR – *Sel. I*: 3 te.

IGCH 1525 (Syria ?, 1966 ; burial : after 280 BC)

17 AR – *Sel. I*: 17 dr.

CH X 281 (unknown findspot [Mesopotamia or Iran], 1965; burial: 200–175 BC)

4 AR: *Sel. VI*: 4 te.

IGCH 1551 (Syria?, 1937; burial: 150 BC)

19 AR – *Dem. I*: 19 te.

IGCH 1553 (Antakya, 1959; burial: 150 BC)

4 AV and 28 AR – *Dem. I*: 4 AV and 28 te.

IGCH 1775 (*Midyat, Nisibis, before 1950; burial: 150 BC*)

13+ AR – *Dem. I*: 13 te.

CH X 313 (*Saida or environs, 1993 ; burial: 136–135 BC*)

5+ AR : *Ant. VII*: 5+ te.

IGCH 1599 (*Phoenicia, 1966; burial: 126–125 BC*)

c. 30 AR – *Dem. II*: 30 te.

CH X 318 (*Syria or northern Lebanon, 2000; burial: 123–122 BC*)

9 AR: *Alex. II*: 9 te.

IGCH 1570 (*Antakya, before 1960; burial: 95 BC*)

8 AR – *Ant. VIII*: 8 te.

IGCH 1575 (*Aleppo, 1939; burial: after 80 BC*)

20 AR – *Phil. I*: 20 te.

CH X 345 (*Syria, early 1980; burial: 76–75 BC*)

53+ AR – *Phil. I*: 53 te.

CH X 346 (*unknown findspot, 1991; burial: 76–75 BC*)

16 AR – *Phil. I*: 16 te.

CH X 347 (*unknown findspot, 2003; burial: 76–75 BC*)

10 AR – *Phil. I*: 10 te.

IGCH 1583 = CH X 348 (*Akkar, Lebanon, 1951; burial: 76–75 BC*)

16 AR – *Phil. I*: 16 te.

These recorded hoards are small in size. Only 3 of them (including 2 for Philip Philadelphus at the end of the sequence) out of 17 exceed 30 coins in number. And, as none of them has been discovered during official excavations, it is not unlikely that some are actually not full hoards but only selected parts of larger ones. They mostly come from Syria and the Levantine coast (11), with only 4 reported cases of more Eastern provenances (IGCH 1759 – Hillah, near Babylon; CH X 281 – unknown findspot [Mesopotamia or Iran]; IGCH 1775 – Midyat, Nisibis; CH III 79 = CH X 355 – Hatra, Iraq). This is not surprising since 9 of them have been buried after 145 BC, once Mesopotamia was in the hands of the Parthians. We should notice that no less than 5 hoards are for the coins of Philip Philadelphus, while 3 others are for Seleucus I (hoards possibly formed at a time when no other Seleucid coinage had been issued) and still 3 others are for Demetrius I. With these additional comments in mind, we may conclude that the real percentage of coin hoards which behave as suggested by Vargyas' interpretation must be well below the 14% of Table 1 (last row of the last column).

It could be argued, with Léopold Migeotte, that Babylonia and Mesopotamia, the places of the cuneiform texts, may have behaved differently. Table 2 gives a summary of hoardings for these areas (IGCH + 10 CH + hoards quoted in Houghton – Lorber 2002: 106–113 and Houghton – Lorber – Hoover 2008: 121–125):

Table 2. List of the gold and silver hoards with Seleucid coins buried in Mesopotamia
(in italics: only Seleucid coins; in bold: coins of only one Seleucid king)

H&L II,2, p. 121 (Babylon, c. 2001; burial: 305 BC)

106 lion staters of Sel. I; 39 pre-Seleucid lion staters; Babylonian imitative owls, Alex. III te.

IGCH 1759 (*Hillah, near Babylon, before 1945; burial: 290 BC*)

10+ AR – **Sel. I**: 10+ te.

IGCH 1761 (Babylonia, c. 1900?; burial: 280 BC)

108+ AR – Alex. III: 60 te., 1 didr. and 1 dr.; Phil. III: 7 te.; Athens imit.: 1 te.; Sel. I: 32 te., 4 dr. and 1 hemidr.; Tyre: 1 didr.

CH IV 33 (Mashtal, Baghdad; burial: 260 BC)

72 AR – Alex. III: te.; Phi. III: te.; lion sta.; Sel. I: 4+ te. ; Ant. I: 4+ te.

IGCH 1762 (Tigris River ; burial : 250)

20+ AR – Ath., Cor., Sidon, Tyre, etc., Alex. III, Ant. I or II

IGCH 1763 (Tell Halaf, Turko-Syrian border, 1913; burial: 235 BC)

352 AR – Alex. III: 53 te. and 212 dr.; Phil. III: 3 te. and 8 dr.; Dem. Pol.: 3 te.; Lys.: 26 te. and 4 dr.; Attalids: 5 te.; Sel. I: 5 te.; Ant. I: 8 te.; Ant. II: 25 te.

IGCH 1764 (Mesopotamia, before 1920; burial: 230 BC)

94+ AR – Alex. III: 19 te. and 20 dr.; Phil. III: 1 te. and 3 dr.; Dem. Pol.: 5 te.; Lys.: 3 te. and 2 dr.; Eumenes I: 2 te.; Sel. I: 12 te. and 9 dr.; Ant. I: 4 te.; Ant. III: 3 te.; Interregnum: 2 te.; Sel. II: 8 te.; Ant. Hie.: 1 te.

H&L II,2, p. 121-122 (Unknown provenance, 2003; burial: 210 BC)

Alex. III: te.; Lys. : te. ; Eum. I : te ; Sel. I: 1 te.; Ant. I : 7 te. ; Ant. II: 24 te. ; Sel. II: 2 te.; Sel. III: 6 te.; Ant. III : 9+ te.

IGCH 1766 (Nimrud on the Tigris, 1957; burial: late 3rd c. BC)

6 AR – Lys.: 4 te.; Attalus I: 1 te.; Sel. III: 1 te.

IGCH 1767 (Failaka, 1960; burial: 210–200 BC)

13 AR – Alex. III imit.: 12 te.; Ant. III: 1 te.

CH VIII 342 (Failaka; burial: 200 BC)

16 AR – Gerra,, ; Abyatha ; Sel. II: 1 te.; Ant. III: 3 te.

IGCH 1769 (Mesopotamia, 1914–1918; burial: 195–190 BC)

100 AR – Alex. III: 5 te. and 10 dr.; Lys.: 39 te.; Attralus I: 8 te.; Ant. I: 8 te.; Ant. II: 8 te.; Interregnum: 2 te.; Ant. Hie.: 1 te.; Sel. III: 1 te.; Ant. III: 18 te.

CH X 281 (unknown findspot [Mesopotamia or Iran], 1965; burial: 200–175 BC)

4 AR: *Sel. IV*: 4 te.

IGCH 1771 (Zivnik, near Mardin, 1962; burial: 175 BC)

26 AR – Lys.: 1 te.; Ant. I: 1 te.; Sel. III: 2 te.; Ant. III: 8 te.; Sel. IV: 13 te.; Ant. the young: 1 te.

IGCH 1772 (Urfa, Edessa, 1924; burial: 185–160 BC)

c. 200 AR – Alex. III: 15 te. and 29 dr.; Ant. Gon.: 5 te.; Ant. Dos.: 1 te.; Lys.: 29 te. and 1 dr.; Athens: 1 te.; Prusias I: 9 te.; Eumenes II: 2 te.; Cymle: 1 te.; Ant. I: 7 te.; Ant. II: 9 te.; Sel. II: 1 te.; Sel. III: 1 te.; Ant. III: 55 te.

IGCH 1774 (Babylon, 1900; burial: 155–150 BC)

100 AR – Alex. III: 50 te.; Samothrace: 1 te.; Eretria: 3 te.; Athens: 1 te.; Mithridates III: 1 te.; Cyzicus: 1 te.; Eumenes II: 8 te.; Alexandria Troas: 1 te.; Ilium: 5 te.; Mytilene: 1 te.; Cos: 2 te.; Side: 6 te.; Sel. II: 1 te.; Ant. IV: 3 te.; Dem. I: 12 te.

IGCH 1775 (Midyat, Nisibis, before 1950; burial: 150 BC)

13+ AR – *Dem. I*: 13 te.

CH V 46 (Iraq, burial: 150–145 BC)

Sel. I: 1+ te. ; *Ant. V*: 1+ te. ; *Dem. I*: 5+ te. ; *Alex. I*: 5+ te.

IGCH 1776 (Mesopotamia, 1953; burial: 145 BC)

5+ AR – *Ant. IV*: 1 te.; *Alex. I*: 4 te.

IGCH 1777 (Mesopotamia, 1925; burial: 140 BC)

15+ AR – *Ant. II*: 2 te.; *Sel. II*: 1 te.; *Sel. III*: 2 te.; *Ant. III*: 4 te.; *Ant. V*: 1 te.; *Dem. I*: 1 te.; *Alex. I*: 3 te.; *Dem. II*: 1 te.

IGCH 1778 (Baghdad, 1954; burial: 136 BC)

212 AR – Aradus: 71 dr.; *Ant. IV*: 30 te.; *Ant. V*: 10 te.; *Dem. I*: 85 te.; *Alex. I*: 13 te.; *Ant. VII*: 3 te.

Coin hoards are much less plentiful in Mesopotamia than in Syria. Although caution is required (the level of recovery depends on many factors, both ancient and modern), it is tempting to see here an argument in favor of a higher ratio of monetization in Syria than in Mesopotamia, all the more since the estimated populations of these areas are in the opposite order (c. 2 million people for Syria to compare with 5–6 for Mesopotamia). Out of a (admittedly small) total of 21 hoards, 3 (14.3%) are constituted by coins of a unique Seleucid ruler.⁶ Conversely, 15 hoards are mixed (71.4%). These results are perfectly in line with the general pattern and don't create something like a Babylonian exception.

⁶ 1) IGCH 1759 (Hillah, near Babylon – c. 290 BC): 10+ tetradrachms of Seleucus I (coins from

To resume, the philological interpretation developed by Péter Vargyas makes six untenable statements: there could be no question that the Seleucid economy was 1) fully monetized; that coins 2) in bad silver (875 ‰) were 3) still weighed just like uncoined silver but 4) never used to express values; and that kings who 5) had no financial interest in coin production, 6) succeeded to require payments in their own new currency. In front of so powerful counter-arguments we may be certain, on the contrary, that the term *kaspu istatirru* doesn't refer to real staters but is used as a unit of account, a standard of value, just like the word *argurion* in Greek doesn't mean "coined silver", as it was commonly believed until recently, but gives the value expressed in coined silver (Callataÿ 2008).

I am not the first (Belgian) numismatist to argue react against this kind of widespread philological ingenuity about coinage and units of account. Paul Naster published a set of papers along that line (Naster 1954, 1970a and 1970b). It is worth repeating his conclusion valid both for the labourers of Persepolis and the Jewish community of Elephantine: "Pour les documents d'Éléphantine comme pour ceux de Persépolis, mais pour des raisons différentes, nous concluons de manière analogue. Pendant la majeure partie du Ve siècle avant notre ère, l'usage de la monnaie (du métal monnayé) n'avait pas encore pénétré auprès des Juifs qui étaient installés dans le sud de l'Égypte. Karsha, sheqel et les autres termes indiquent tous des unités pondérales et non pas monétaires" (Naster 1970b : 35) I translate the last sentence : "Karsha, sheqel and the other terms all point to ponderal units, not monetary ones".

This is also the implication of an important astronomical Babylonian tablet commented on by Péter Vargyas himself (2010: 59): in 274 BC, preparing war against the Ptolemies, Antiochus and Seleucus removed from Babylonia 20 war elephants and all the silver. It is explicitly said that payments were made in bronze that year. Nonetheless, prices are still expressed in silver. In a footnote, he adds: "Je continue de penser que la donnée citée (that particular text) a une importance cruciale, et que l'on peut en tirer des conclusions considérables. Pour moi, cette source prouve que l'argent servait en premier lieu d'équivalent général et que son utilisation en tant que moyen de paiement n'était que secondaire" (Vargyas 2010 : 59, footnote 14).

The consequences of such philological ingenuity are damaging for the whole appreciation we may have of the ancient economy. Encouraged by wrong transcriptions

Seleuceia ad Tigrim); 2) CH X 281 (unknown provenance – c. 200–175 BC): 4 tetradrachms of Seleucus VI (2 coins from the "Wreath mint", probably Damascus, and 2 others from a mint located in Mesopotamia or Media); and 3) IGCH 1775 (Nisibis – c. 150 BC): 13+ tetradrachms of Demetrius I (12 coins from Antioch on the Orontes and 1 from Nisibis ?).

which postulate the overall concrete presence of silver in the Achaemenid economy (and before), some colleagues were not afraid to reconstruct an Hellenistic world where monetization is greatly exaggerated. A large deconstruction of such a vision is much in demand upstream and will affect the whole Mesopotamian world (see *e.g.* Joannes 1994, Powell 1996 or Jursa 2010).⁷

It remains to explain why it was felt appropriate to express values of goods or services in the equivalent of silver staters (= the high value of the system, here tetradrachms – see Psoma 2009) of the ruling king? The purity of Seleucid silver coins having been maintained at the highest point until the mid-second century BC (Buckley 1985 – less than 0.5% of copper before 150 BC; see also Hammer 1908: 85, 103 and 105), it cannot be linked with the level of fineness. By elimination, it must be linked with the weight standard. We know that (at least some) Seleucid commercial weights display the name of the ruling king, as it is the case with a lead mina of Seleucus VI sold through a recent auction:



FIG. 1. LEAD WEIGHT (MNA = MINA) OF THE KING SELEUCUS VI EPIPHANES NIKATOROS (YEAR 218 = 95/94 BC), DEMETRIUS BEING AGORANOMOS (SALE GORNY & MOSCH, 175, MARCH 9TH, 2009, NR. 324 - 665G)

⁷ Here are some typical sentences from Jursa 2010: 772 (“From a methodological point of view it is worth emphasizing that the texts have to be approached with the basic assumption that references to silver means ‘physical silver’ unless the opposite can be proven. Silver is sometimes used as a mere money of account in institutional contexts, but this occurs fairly rarely overall and is generally pointed out explicitly by the scribes”), 775 (“Silver was the near-exclusive means of payment for all transactions reaching beyond the confines of the temple household”), 777 (“The vast amounts of surplus silver that the Neo-Babylonian monarchy could spend in this way originated from the benefits of empire: the spoils from Assyria, the tribute from Syria. It is unlikely that the monetization of the economy that we see in the sixth century would have been as far-reaching as it was had it not been for these particular political background conditions”) or 779 (“In sum, our view on the Babylonian economy of the sixth century suggests that exchange was monetized to a considerable degree”).

At that stage of documentation (see Kushnir-Stein 2011 with references to past literature), it may be argued that measures, including commercial weights, were verified from time to time and likely at the beginning of every new reign, and that the only measures to be accepted were those of the ruling king. In other words, to specify his name was a means to make sure transactions would not be conducted with obsolete measures.

In guise of conclusion, I would venture to make two comments. First, this debate offers a modern variant of the old quarrel of antiquarians, between two sub-species of historians: philologists and archaeologists, literary evidence *versus* material facts. Péter was a great philologist, not too inclined to abdicate before archaeology.⁸ Second, in a world where we have all been trained to be obsessed by economic growth as a marker of development *tout court*, it is no great surprise that some empathy for the chosen topic may have pushed some practitioners to re-create a world conforming to their views. Mesopotamian economy is a fascinating case-study in that positions are never neutral, being explicitly assumed or not. The topic in itself, passing from Karl Polanyi to Morris Silver or Michael Jursa, well deserves a detailed study. In a changing world less obsessed by growth and the subsequent theme of monetization, it will also be fascinating to follow how Mesopotamian economy will be described by the future generations of scholars.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Buckley, J. A.

1985 An Analysis of thirty-one coins from Hellenistic Period. *Archaeometry* 27: 102–107.

Callataÿ, F. de

2004 La richesse des rois séleucides et le problème de la taxation en nature. Pp. 23–47 in V. Chankowski – F. Duyrat (eds.) *Le roi et l'économie. Autonomies locales et structures royales dans l'économie de l'empire séleucide*. (= *Topoi. Orient-Occident, Suppl.* 6) Lyon.

2008 La monnaie de compte à l'époque hellénistique : le nécessaire réexamen des textes (en particulier du sens du terme *argurion*) à la lumière de la documentation numismatique. *Annali dell'Istituto Italiano di Numismatica* 54 : 19–34.

⁸ Vargyas 2004: 336 (“De plus, comme ces textes nous apprennent aussi qui utilisait ces monnaies et à quelles fins, nous y puisons des informations beaucoup plus crédibles sur les transactions et sur les monnaies de l'époque que dans n'importe quel trésor”). True, except that these texts are not referring to real coins...

Csabai, Z. (ed.)

2010 *From Elephantine to Babylon. Selected Studies of Péter Vargyas on Ancient Near Eastern Economy.* (= ANEMS 1) Budapest.

Hammer, J.

1908 Der Feingehalt der griechischen und römischen Münzen. Ein Beitrag zur antiken Münzgeschichte. *Zeitschrift für Numismatik* 26: 1–144.

Houhgtton, A. – Lorber, C.

2002 *Seleucid coins. A comprehensive catalogue. Part 1. Seleucus I through Antiochus III. Vol. II. Appendices, indices, and plates.* New York – Lancaster.

Houghton, A. – Lorber, C. – Hoover, O.

2008 *Seleucid coins. A comprehensive catalogue. Part II. Seleucus IV through Antiochus XIII, vol. II. Appendices, Indices, and plates.* New York – Lancaster.

Joannès, F.

1994 Métaux précieux et moyens de paiement en Babylonie achéménide et hellénistique. *Transeuphratène* 8 : 137–144.

Jursa, M.

2010 *Aspects of the economic history of Babylonian the first millennium BC. Economic geography, economic mentalities, agriculture, the use of money and the problem of economic growth.* (= AOAT 377) Münster.

Kushnir-Stein, A.

2011 Inscribed Hellenistic Weights of Palestine. *Israel Numismatic Research* 6: 35–60.

Leisten, T.

1986 Die Münzen von Uruk-Warka. *BaM* 17: 309–367.

Le Rider, G.

1996 Les alexandres d'argent en Asie Mineure et dans l'Orient séleucide au III^e siècle av. J.-C. (c. 275–c. 225). Remarques sur le système monétaire des Séleucides et des Ptolémées. *Journal des Savants* 1996 Jan.-Sept.: 3–51.

Le Rider, G. – F. de Callataÿ

2006 *Les Séleucides et les Ptolémées. L'héritage monétaire et financier d'Alexandre.* Paris.

Naster, P.

1954 Les textes économiques de Persépolis. *Bulletin de la Société française de Numismatique* 9 (6): 282.

1970a Were the labourers of Persepolis paid by means of coined money? *Ancient Society* 1: 129–134.

1970b Karsha et Shequel dans les documents araméens d'Eléphantine (Ve s. av. J.-C.). *Revue belge de Numismatique* 116: 31–35.

Powell, M. A.

1996 Money in Mesopotamia. *JESHO* 39: 224–242.

Psoma, S.

2009 Monetary Terminology in Pre-Roman Asia Minor. I. Cistophori in Latin Authors and Greek Inscriptions: the Date of the Introduction of Cistophoric Coinage. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 42: 170–180.

Reade, J. E.

1986 A hoard of silver currency from Achaemenid Babylon. *Iran* 24: 79–87.

Thompson, M. – Mørkholm, O. – Kraay, C. M.

1973 *An inventory of Greek coin hoards*. New York.

Vargyas, P.

1999 *Kaspu ginnu* and the monetary reform of Darius I. *ZA* 89: 263–284.

2000a Darius I and the Daric reconsidered. *Iranica Antiqua* 35: 33–46.

2000b Silver and money in Achaemenid and Hellenistic Babylonia. Pp. 513–521 in J. Marzahn – H. Neumann (Hg.) *Assyriologica et Semitica. Festschrift für Joachim Oelsner anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstages am 18. Februar 1997*. (= AOAT 252) Münster.

2001 *A history of Babylonian prices in the first millennium BC. 1. Prices of the basic commodities*. (= HSAO 10) Heidelberg.

2004a Le libéralisme séleucide et l'essor économique de la Babylonie : un rapport de cause à effet ? Pp. 333–347 in V. Chankowski and F. Duyrat (éds.) *Le roi et l'économie. Autonomies locales et structures royales dans l'économie de l'empire séleucide. Actes des rencontres de Lille (23 juin 2003) et d'Orléans (29-30 janvier 2004)*. (= Topoi Orient-Occident, suppl. 6) Lyon.

2004b La monétarisation de l'économie rurale en Babylonie et en Egypte pendant le 1^{er} millénaire av. J.-C. Pp. 109–120 in B. Menu (éd.) *La dépendance rurale dans l'antiquité égyptienne et proche-orientale*. Cairo.

2010 Les prix des denrées alimentaires de première nécessité en Babylonie à l'époque achéménide et hellénistique. Pp. 55–75 in **Csabai 2010**.

ANNEX I

*List of the gold and silver hoards with Seleucid coins buried
within the boundaries of the Seleucid kingdom
(in italics: only Seleucid coins; in bold: coins of only one Seleucid king)*⁹

IGCH 1519 (Beirut, 1964; burial: 300 BC)

27 AR – Alex. III: 19 te.; Phil. III: 7 te.; Sel. I: 1 te.

IGCH 1759 (Hillah, near Babylon, before 1945; burial: 290 BC)

10+ AR – **Sel. I**: 10+ te.

IGCH 1523 (Latakia, 1940; burial: 290–280 BC)

9 AR – Alex. III: 3 te.; Sel. I: 6 te.

IGCH 1524 (Aleppo, 1933; burial: 290–280 BC)

92 AR – Alex. III: 58 te.; Phil. III: 4 te.; Dem. Pol.: 1 te.; Sel. I: 17 te.

IGCH 1734 (Diyarbakir, before 1938; burial: 290–280 BC)

3+ AR – **Sel. I**: 3 te.

CH IX 83 (Phoenicia, 1997; burial: 285–280 BC)

800 AR: Alex. III te.; Phil. III: te.; Dem. Pol.: te.; Sel. I : te.

CH X 265 (unknown findspot, “Seleucus I” hoard”, 2005; burial: 281 BC)

5000+ AR – Alex. III; Phi. III; Dem. Pol.; Lys.; Sel. I : 218

IGCH 1525 (Syria ?, 1966 ; burial : after 280 BC)

17 AR – **Sel. I**: 17 dr.

IGCH 1761 (Babylonia, c. 1900?; burial: 280 BC)

108+ AR – Alex. III: 60 te., 1 didr. and 1 dr.; Phil. III: 7 te.; Athens imit.: 1 te.; Sel. I: 32 te., 4 dr. and 1 hemidr.; Tyre: 1 didr.

IGCH 1794 (Pasargadae, 1963; burial: 280 BC)

34 AR – Alex. III: 20 te.; Phil. III: 6 te.; Sel. I: 8 te.

IGCH 1795 (Pasargadae, 1962; burial: 280 BC)

14 AR – Alex. III: 5 te.; Phil. III: 3 te.; Sel. I: 3 te. and 3 dr.

IGCH 1796 (Kaswin, near Teheran, 1964; burial: 275 BC)

c. 150 AR – Alex. III: 40 te.; Sel. I: 43 te., 1 didr. and 1 dr.

CH IV 33 (Mashtal, Baghdad; burial: 260 BC)

72 AR – Alex. III: te.; Phi. III: te.; lion sta.; Sel. I : 4+ te. ; Ant. I : 4+ te.

⁹ Coins struck by Seleucus I but with non-Seleucid types (i.e. Alexander the Great, Lion staters) have not been integrated in the list.

CH VIII 280 (Turkey, 1989; burial: 260 BC)

AR – Alex. III: te; Ant. I; te.

IGCH 1797 (Persepolis, 1934-1935; burial: 250 BC)

10 AR – Sel. I: 1 te.; Bagadat: 1 te.; Oborzus: 1 te.; Autophradates I: 7 te.

----- (249 BC–200 BC)

IGCH 1534 (Bab, 1944; burial: 250–200 BC)

1080 AR – Alex. III: hundreds of dr.; Phil. III: 36 dr.; Dem. Pol.: 6 dr.; Lys.: 17 dr.; Sel. I: 1 dr.; Ant. I: 1 dr.

IGCH 1527 (Syria?, before 1917; burial: 245 BC)

13+ AR – Ant. I: 12 te.; Ant. II: 1 te.

IGCH 1763 = CH VIII 302 (Tell Halaf, Turkey, 1913; burial: 246–240 BC)

353 AR – Alex. III: te. et dr.; Lys.: te. et dr.; Dem. Pol.: te.; Sel. I: 4 te.; Ant. I: 8 te.; Ant. II: 26 te.

IGCH 1528 (Tell Sukas, near Gabala, 1958; burial: 240 BC)

10 AR – Alex. III: 3 te. and 2 dr.; Ant. Gon.: 1 te.; Lys.: 2 te.; Ant. I: 1 te.; Ant. II: 2 te.

IGCH 1299 = CH IX 499 (Sardes, Lydia, 1911; burial: 240 BC)

55 AR – Alex. III: 20 te., 8 dr.; Lys.: 9 te.; Ant. I: 4 te.; Ant. II: 9 te.; Sel. II: 1 te. etc.

CH VIII 308 (Meydancikkale, near Gülnar, Turkey, 1980; burial: 240–235 BC)

5215 AR – Alex. III; Sel. I.; Ant. I; Sel. II.

IGCH 1529 (Homs, 1927; burial: 230 BC)

50+ AR – Lys.: 39 te.; Eum. I: 1 te.; Att. I: 1 te.; Ant. I: 5 te.; Ant. II: 4 te.

IGCH 1764 (Mesopotamia, before 1920; burial: 230 BC)

94+ AR – Alex. III: 19 te. and 20 dr.; Phil. III: 1 te. and 3 dr.; Dem. Pol.: 5 te.; Lys.: 3 te. and 2 dr.; Eumenes I: 2 te.; Sel. I: 12 te. and 9 dr.; Ant. I: 4 te.; Ant. III: 3 te.; Interregnum: 2 te.; Sel. II: 8 te.; Ant. Hie.: 1 te.

IGCH 1530 (Tartus, Syria, 1940; burial: 230–220 BC)

15+ AR – Alex. III: 9 te.; Dem. Pol.: 1 te.; Ant. I: 1 te.; Ant. II: 3 te.; Sel. II: 1 te.

CH VIII 317 (South-West Asia Minor, 1991; burial: 225 BC)

190+ AR – Sel. to Ant. Hie.: 160 te.; Alex. III: 15 te.; Dem. Pol.: 3 te.; Phile.: 20+ te.

CH VIII 321 (unknown findspot, 1990 or earlier; burial: 225 BC)

43 A – Sel. to Ant. Hie.: 27 te.

CH X 272 (unknown findspot, “Seleucus III” hoard, 2002; burial: 225–224 BC)

6500 AR – Alex. III; Phi. III; Dem. Pol.; Ant. Gon.; Lys.; Atta.; Sinope; Perge; Side; Sel. I; Ant. I; Ant. II; Sel. II; Ant. Hie.; Sel. III

IGCH 1531 (Syria?, 1962; burial: 220 BC)

15+ AR – Dem. Pol.: 1 te. and 1 dr.; Ant. Dos.: 1 te.; Att. I: 3 te.; Ant. I: 2 te.; Ant. II: 4 te.; Sel. II: 2 te. and 1 dr.; Ant. Hie.: 1te.

IGCH 1369 = CH VIII 324 (Kirazlı, near Amasya, 1939; burial: 220 BC)

13 AV et 822 AR – Alex. III: 2 st., 120 te.; 550 dr.; Phil. III: 2 st., 14 te. and 42 dr.; Dem. Pol.: 1 te. and 1 dr.; Lys.: 5 st., 17 te. and 13 dr.; Sinope: 2 te.; Chalcedon: 1 dr.; Attalus I: 1 te.; Perge: 2 te.; Sel. I: 13 te. and 3 dr.; Ant. I: 9 te.; Ant. II: 6 te. and 2 dr.; Sel. II: 2 st., 5 te. and 2 dr.

IGCH 1766 (Nimrud on the Tigris, 1957; burial: late 3rd c. BC)

6 AR – Lys.: 4 te.; Attalus I: 1 te.; Sel. III: 1 te.

IGCH 1532 (Homs, 1934; burial: 210 BC)

60 AR – Alex. III: 1 te.; Lys.: 34 te.; Eum. I : 1 te. ; Att. I : 7 te. ; Ant. I: 5 te.; Ant. II: 6 te.; Inter.: 1 te.; Sel. III: 2 te.; Ant. III: 3 te.

IGCH 1533 (Syria northern, 1960; burial: 210 BC)

18 AR – Alex. III: 5 te.; Ant. Gon.: 1 te.; Ant. Dos.: 1 te.; Lys.: 3 te.; Ant. II: 2 te.; Sel. II: 3 te.; Sel. III: 1 te.; Ant. III: 2 te.

CH X 274 (unknown findspot, 2003, burial: 210 BC)

61 AR – Alex. III; Lys.; Eumenes I; lion stater : 1; Ant. I; 7 te.; Ant. II; 24 te.; Sel. II; 2 te.; Sel. III: 6 te.; Ant. III: 9-10 te.

IGCH 1535 (Syria, 1959 ; burial : 210–200 BC)

250+ AR – Alex. III: 8 te.; Ant. Dos.: 2 te.; Lys. : 4 te.; Cavarus: 1 te.; Att. I: 3 te.; Perg.: 3 te.; Sel. I: 1 te.; Ant. I: 2 te.; Ant. II: 3 te.; Sel. II: 3 te.; Ant. Hie.: 2 te.; Sel. III: 2 te.; Ant. III: 15 te.

IGCH 1767 (Failaka, 1960; burial: 210–200 BC)

13 AR – Alex. III imit.: 12 te.; Ant. III: 1 te.

IGCH 1735 (Diyarbakir, 1955; burial: 205 BC)

35+ AR – Alex. III: 6 te.; Lys.: 8 te.; Attalids: 3 te.; Side: 1 te.; Ant. I: 7 te.; Ant. II: 3 te.; Sel. III: 1 te.; Ant. III: 3 te.

CH X 277 (unknown findspot, “Achaeus” hoard, 2002; burial: 203 BC)

87 AR – Alex. III: 49 te.; Ant. Dos.: 1 te.; Phi. V: 1 te.; Aetolian L.: 1 te.; Lys.: 3 te.; Pru.: 1 te.; Side: 3 te.; Abyatha: 1 te ; Ant. II: 1 te.; Sel. II: 12 te.; Ant. Hie.: 3 te.; Sel. III: 3 te.; Achaeus: 3 te.; Ant. III: 3 te.

CH VIII 342 (Failaka; burial: 200 BC)

16 AR – Gerrha., ; Abyatha ; Sel. II: 1 te.; Ant. III: 3 te.

----- (199 BC–150 BC)

IGCH 1769 (Mesopotamia, 1914-1918; burial: 195–190 BC)

100 AR – Alex. III: 5 te. and 10 dr.; Lys.: 39 te.; Attralus I: 8 te.; Ant. I: 8 te.; Ant. II: 8 te.; Interregnum: 2 te.; Ant. Hie.: 1 te.; Sel. III: 1 te.; Ant. III: 18 te.

CH X 281 (unknown findspot [Mesopotamia or Iran], 1965; burial: 200–175 BC)

4 AR: *Sel. VI*: 4 te.

IGCH 1536 (Latakia, 1946; burial: 198 BC)

34+ AR – Alex. III: 17 te.; Ant. Dos.; 2 te.; Alabanda: 1 te.; Side: 6 te.; Sel. I: 1 te.; Sel. II: 1 te.; Ant. III: 6 te.

CH X 288 (unknown findspot, “Antiochus III” hoard, 2005; burial: 197 BC)

61+ AR – Alex. III: 10 te.; Antigo.: 5 te.; Lys.: 14 te.; Atta.: 8 te.; Perge.: 1 te.; Ant. I: 6 te.; Ant. II: 8 te.; Ant. « Soter »: 1 te.; Ant. Hie.: 2 te.; Sel. III: 4 te.; Ant. III: 18 te.

CH IX 501 (Oylum Höyüğü, 1989; burial: 200–195 BC)

134 AR: Alex.: te. et dr.; III; Lys.: te. et dr.; Philetair, Side, Ephèse, Ant. I: 3 te.; Ant. II: 5 te.; Ant. Hier.: 1 te.; Sel. III: 3 te.; Ant. III: 13 te.

CH II 81 = CH X 289 (Syria, 1971; burial: 195–194 BC)

90 AR – Alex. III; Ant. Dos.; Phi. V; Alabanda; Side; Ptol. II: 2 te.; Ptol. IV: 1 te.; Ptol. V: 2 te.; Sel. I: 1 te.; Ant. I: 2 te.; Ant. Hie.: 3 te.; Ant. III: 11 te.

IGCH 1537 (Kosseir, near Antakya, 1949; burial: 190 BC)

82+ AR – Alex. III: 21 te.; Lys.: 5 te.; Prusias I: 1 te.; Side: 9 te.; Ant. III: 4 te.

IGCH 1538 (Dniye, pereia of Aradus, 1952; burial: 190 BC)

41 AR = Alex. III: 15 te. and 2 dr.; Lys.: 2 te.; Ant. II: 2 te.; Ant. Hie.: 2 te.; Arados: 1 dr.; Ptol. I: 4 te.; Ptol. II: 12 te.; Ptol. III: 1 te.

IGCH 1543 (Idlib, near Antioch, 1959; burial: 200–180 BC)

c. 1,400 AR (600 te. and 800 dr.) – Alex. III: dr.; Lys.; Cavarus; Seleucid kings to Ant. III; Marathus.

CH X 292 (unknown findspot, 2000; burial: 187–186 BC)

800 AR – Alex. III; Phi. III; Lys.; Ant. Dos.; Atta.; Ephesus; Alabanda; Sel. I: 4 te.; Ant. I: 3 te.; Ant. « Soter »: 1 te.; Sel. II: 7 te.; Ant. Hie.: 6 te.; Sel. III: 2 te.; Ant. III: 50 te.

IGCH 1544 (Latakia, 1759; burial: 169 BC)

c. 92 AR – Alex. III: 45 te. and 3 dr.; Lys.: 3 te.; Mithri. III: 2 te.; Alabanda: 5 te.; Side: 1 te.; Aradus: 12 dr.; Sel. I-Ant. III: 15 te.; Ant., son of Ant. IV: 1 te.; Ant. IV: 6 te.

IGCH 1771 (Zivnik, near Mardin, 1962; burial: 175 BC)

26 AR – Lys.: 1 te.; Ant. I: 1 te.; Sel. III: 2 te.; Ant. III: 8 te.; Sel. IV: 13 te.; Ant. the young: 1 te.

IGCH 1772 (Urfa, Edessa, 1924; burial: 185–160 BC)

c. 200 AR – Alex. III: 15 te. and 29 dr.; Ant. Gon.: 5 te.; Ant. Dos.: 1 te.; Lys.: 29 te. and

- 1 dr.; Athens: 1 te.; Prusias I: 9 te.; Eumenes II: 2 te.; Cymle: 1 te.; Ant. I: 7 te.; Ant. II: 9 te.; Sel. II: 1 te.; Sel. III: 1 te.; Ant. III: 55 te.
- CH X 297 (unknown findspot, 2004; burial: 169 BC?)
16? AR – Alex. III; Ant. III; Sel. IV; Ant. IV.
- CH X 298 (Qal’at el-Moudiq, Apameia region, shortly before 1996; burial: 165 BC)
44 AR – Lys.; Eumenes I; Sel. I: 1 te.; Ant. II: 3 te.; Ant. Hie.: 1 te.; Ant. III: 9 te.; Sel. IV: 10 te.; Ant. IV: 17 te.
- IGCH 1546 (Aleppo, 1931; burial: 164 BC)
35+ AR – Alex. III: 17 te.; Side: 12 te.; Ant. IV: 6 te.
- IGCH 1548 (Syria, northern, 1912; burial: 160 BC)
AR – Alex. III; Lys.; Miletus: 1 te.; Ant. IV; Ant. V.
- IGCH 1801 (Persia, 1932-1933; burial: 160 BC)
17+ AR – Ant. III: 1 dr.; Sel. IV: 2 dr.; Ant. IV: 14 dr.
- IGCH 1774 (Babylon, 1900; burial: 155–150 BC)
100 AR – Alex. III: 50 te.; Samothrace: 1 te.; Eretria: 3 te.; Athens: 1 te.; Mithridates III: 1 te.; Cyzicus: 1 te.; Eumenes II: 8 te.; Alexandria Troas: 1 te.; Ilium: 5 te.; Mytilene: 1 te.; Cos: 2 te.; Side: 6 te.; Sel. II: 1 te.; Ant. IV: 3 te.; Dem. I: 12 te.
- CH X 301 (unknown findspot, “Demetrius I” hoard, 2002; burial: 151–150 BC)
3 AU, 529 AR – Alex. III: 194 te.; Lys.: 25 te.; Pru.: 1 te.; Orophernes: 1 te.; Ath.: 105 te.; cities of Asia Minor: 45 te.; Aradus: 78 dr.; Ant. III: 1 te.; Sel. IV: 1 te.; Ant. IV: 51 te.; Ant. V: 13 te.; Dem. I: 14 te. and 3 AU.
- IGCH 1551 (Syria?, 1937; burial: 150 BC)**
19 AR – *Dem. I*: 19 te.
- IGCH 1552 (Arab el Mulk, 1940; burial: 150 BC)
28+ AR – Ephesus: 13 dr.; Aradus: 14 dr.; Ant. III: 1 dr.
- IGCH 1553 (Antakya, 1959; burial: 150 BC)**
4 AV and 28 AR – *Dem. I*: 4 AV and 28 te.
- IGCH 1775 (Midyat, Nisibis, before 1950; burial: 150 BC)**
13+ AR – *Dem. I*: 13 te.
- (149 BC–100 BC)
- IGCH 1554 (Syria?, before 1917; burial: 148 BC)
17 AR – Ant. IV: 1 te.; Dem. I: 12 te.; Alex. I: 4 te.
- CH X 306 (Hamadan, Turkey, 1977; burial: 148–147 BC)
360+ AR – Ant. III: 16; Sel. IV: 33; Ant. IV: 107; Ant. V: 7; Dem. I: 194; Alex. I: 3.

CH X 307 (*unknown findspot, 2001; burial: 148–147 BC*)

12 AR - Sel. IV: 2 dr.; Ant. IV: 4 dr.; Dem. I: 3 dr.; Alex. I: 3 dr.

CH V 46 (*Iraq, burial : 150–145 BC*)

Sel. I : 1+ te. ; Ant. V : 1+ te. ; Dem. I : 5+ te. ; Alex. I : 5+ te.

IGCH 1555 (*Syria, 1971; burial: 145 BC*)

150+ AR – Sel. II: 1 te.; Ant. II: 1 te.; Sel. IV: 4 te.; Ant. IV: 8 te.; Ant. V: 2 te.; Dem. I: 11 te.; Alex. I: 22 te.; Dem. II: 5 te.

IGCH 1591 (*Tyre, 1954; burial: 145 BC*)

20+ AR – Alex. I: 1 te.; Dem. II: 2 te.; Ptol. VI: 17 didr.

IGCH 1776 (*Mesopotamia, 1953; burial: 145 BC*)

5+ AR – Ant. IV: 1 te.; Alex. I: 4 te.

CH 9 527 = CH X 308 (*Gaziantep, 1994; burial: 143 BC*)

1916 AR – Alex. III; Dem. Pol.; Perseus; Mac. Pre.; Lys.; Prusias ; Ath. : 197 ; cities of Asia Minor : 727+; Sel. I: 3; Sel. IV: 6; Ant. IV: 25; Ant. V: 16; Dem. I: 143; Alex. I: 110; Dem. II: 66; Ant. VI: 66.

IGCH 1556 (*Syria, northern, 1906; burial: 145-140 BC*)

38 AR – Alex. III: 6 te.; Myrina: 12 te.; Cyme: 14 te.; Magnesia: 3 te. ; Dem. I: 1 te.; Alex. I: 1 te.; Dem. II: 1 te.

CH I 87 = CH II 90 = CH X 310 (*Kirikhan, 1972; burial: 143-142 BC*)

5000 AR – Alex. III; Ath.: 3; Syros;; Prusias; Myrina: 87; Cyme: 261; Aegae: 6; Smyrna: 10; Lebedus: 35; Magnesia: 269; Heracleia: 21; Alabanda: 4; Dem. I: 4; Alex. I: 7; Dem. II: 4; Ant. VI: 11.

IGCH 1557 (*Teffaha, near Tartus, 1954; burial: 140 BC*)

27+ AR – Alex. III: 16 te.; Myrina: 4 te.; Cyme: 5 te.; Alex. I: 1 te.; Dem. II: 1 te.

IGCH 1558 (*Antakya, 1962 ; burial: 140 BC*)

10+ AR – Ant. VI: 10+ te.

IGCH 1559 (*Akkar, near Homs, 1956; burial: 140 BC*)

69 AR – Alex. III: 39 te.; Syros: 1 te.; Aegae: 2 te.; Cyme: 5 te.; Myrina: 12 te.; Heracleia: 2 te.; Magnesia: 5 te.; Smyrna: 2 te.; Alex I: 1 te.

IGCH 1560 (*Ghonsle, near Baniyas, 1955?; burial: 140 BC*)

32 AR – Cyme: 4 te.; Myrina: 7 te.; Aegae, Heracleia, Magnesia: 13 te.; Smyrna: 3 te.; Alex. I: 1 te. and 1 dr.

IGCH 1561 (*Latakia, 1950; burial: 140 BC*)

9 AR – Alex. III: 6 te.; Lys.: 2 te.; Alex. I: 1 te.

IGCH 1593 (Ras-Baalbek, 1957; burial: 140 BC)

43 AR – Athens: 2 te.; Aegae: 1 te.; Cyme: 3 te.; Myrina: 1 te.; Magnesia: 7 te.; Smyrna: 1 te.; Dem. I: 9 te.; Alex. I: 1 te.; Dem. II: 1 te.; Ptol. VI: 17 didr.

IGCH 1594 (Saida, 1863; burial: 140 BC)

70 AR – Alex. I: te.; Dem. II: te.

IGCH 1595 (Palestine, before 1945; burial: 140 BC)

2 AR – Alex. I: 1 te.; Ant. VI: 1 te.

IGCH 1777 (Mesopotamia, 1925; burial: 140 BC)

15+ AR – Ant. II: 2 te.; Sel. II: 1 te.; Sel. III: 2 te.; Ant. III: 4 te.; Ant. V: 1 te.; Dem. I: 1 te.; Alex. I: 3 te.; Dem. II: 1 te.

IGCH 1804 (Susa, 1933-1934; burial: after 140 BC)

97 AR – Alex. III: 22 te.; Phil. III: 1 dr.; Lys.: 4 te.; Aradus: 1 dr.; Ant. II: 1 te.; Sel. III: 1 te.; Ant. III: 3 te.; Sel. IV: 4 te.; Ant. IV: 8 te. and 1 dr.; Ant. V: 4 te.; Dem. I: 10 te. and 1 dr.; Alex. I: 21 te. and 1 dr.; Dem. II: 4 te. and 1 dr.; Kamniskires I: 1 te.; Harithat: 2 te.; Abal: 2 te.; Mithradtes I: 3 dr.; Euthydemes I: 1 te.

IGCH 1805 (Susiana, 1958-1959; burial: 138 BC)

c. 200 AR – Alex. III imit.: 10; Ant. II: 2 te.; Sel. III: 1 te.; Ant. III: 5 te.; Sel. IV: 12 te.; Ant. IV: 22 te.; Ant. V: 5 te.; Dem. I: 43 te.; Alex. I: 17 te.; Dem. II: 2 te.; Kamnaskires I: 1 te.; Euthydemus I: 1 te.; Eucratides I: 2 te.; Heliocles: 1 te.

IGCH 1806 (Susiana, 1965?; burial: after 138 BC)

2 AV, 485 AR and 5+ AE – Alex. III: 18 te.; Lys.: 1 te.; Myrina: 4 te.; Alabanda: 1 te.; Side: 1 te.; Ant. II: 3 te.; Interregnum: 1 te.; Ant. Hie.: 1 te.; Ant. III: 12 te., 2 dr. and 1 AE; Sel. IV: 17 te., 1 dr. and 1 AE; Ant. the Young: 2 te.; Ant. IV: 45 te., 5 dr.; Ant. V: 17 te. and 1 dr.; Timarchus: 1 AE; Dem. I: 54 te., 16 dr., 2 AV and 1 AE; Alex. I: 38 te. and 7 dr.; Dem. II: 41 te. and 9 dr.; Ant. VI: 1 dr.; Kamnaskires: 2 te.; Mithradates I: 3 te. and 1 AE; Euthydemus I: 2 te.; Eucratides I and II: 10 te.; Heliocles: 9 te.

IGCH 1808 (Susa, 1934-1939; burial: 150–100 BC [soon after 138 BC])

42 AR – Alex. III: 13 te. and 1 dr.; Lys.: 1 te.; Ant. I: 1 te.; Sel. III: 1 te.; Ant. III: 16 te.; Sel. IV: 4 te.; Dem. I: 5 te.

IGCH 1809 (Susa, 1951-1952; burial: 145–100 BC [soon after 138 BC])

19 AR – Alex. III: 8 te. and 3 dr.; Ant. III: 1 te. and 1 dr.; Sel. IV: 1 te.; Ant. IV: 1 dr.; Dem. I: 1 dr.; Alex. I: 1 te.; Mithradates I: 1 dr.; Euthydemus I: 1 te.

IGCH 1597 (Khan el-Abde, near Tripolis, 1938; burial: soon after 138 BC)

118+ AR – Tryphon: 33 te.; Ant. VII: 4 te.; Ptol. II: 66 te.; Ptol. III: 1 te.; Ptol. IV: 14 te.

IGCH 1778 (Baghdad, 1954; burial: 136 BC)

212 AR – Aradus: 71 dr.; Ant. IV: 30 te.; Ant. V: 10 te.; Dem. I: 85 te.; Alex. I: 13 te.; Ant. VII: 3 te.

CH X 313 (Saida or environs, 1993 ; burial: 136–135 BC)

5+ AR : **Ant. VII:** 5+ te.

CH X 311 (unknown findspot, c. 1997; burial: 130s BC)

Dem I: 73 te; Ant. VII: 53 te.

CH X 314 (Syria, 1997; burial: 130 BC)

173+ AR – Dem. II: 1 te.; Ant. VII: 171 te.; Ant. VIII: 1 te.

CH X 312 (Hama, Syria, 2001?; burial: 138–111 BC?)

Dem I: te. 20; Dem. II: 9 te.

CH X 315 (Beth Ummar, Israel, 2001; burial: 127–126 BC)

50+ AR: Ant. VII: 21 te.; Dem. II: 29 te.

IGCH 1598 (Sur, 1966; burial: 126-125 BC)

14 AR – Alex. I: 1 te.; Ant. VII: 2 te.; Dem. II: 6 te. and 5 didr.

IGCH 1599 (Phoenicia, 1966; burial: 126–125 BC)

c. 30 AR – **Dem. II:** 30 te.

IGCH 1563 (Latakia, 1948; burial: 125 BC)

10 AR – Ant. VII: 2 te.; Dem. II: 8 te.

IGCH 1600 (Golan, 1932; burial: 125 BC)

7 AR – Ant. VII: 4 te.; Dem. II: 3 te.

IGCH 1601 (Nablus, 1891?; burial: 125 BC)

400 AR – Ant. VII: 14 te. and 1 didr.; dem. III: 11+ te. and 4 didr.; Sidon: 3 octadr.; Tyre: 1 te. and 1 didr.; Ptol. II: 1 te.

IGCH 1602 (Capernaum, 1957; burial: 125 BC)

78 AR – Dem. II: 45 te. and 3 didr.; Ant. VII: 25 te. and 5 didr.

IGCH 1603 (Bethlem, 1971; burial: 125 BC)

51+ AR – Ant. VII: 20 te.; Dem. II: 31 te.

CH X 318 (Syria or northern Lebanon, 2000; burial: 123–122 BC)

9 AR: **Alex. II:** 9 te.

IGCH 1604 (Thalalaia, 1952; burial: 120 BC)

24+ AR – Ant. VII: 8 te.; Dem. II: 6 te.; Tyre: 10 te.

CH VIII 471 = CH X 322 (Tartous, Syria, 1987; burial: 120 BC)

200 AR – Alex. III; Ath.; Byz.; Mytilene; Clazomene; Smyrna; Diodotus of Bactria; Alex. I: 5; Dem. II: 15; Tryphon: 8; Ant. VII: 8; Alex. II: 4; Ant. VIII: 1.

IGCH 1786 = CH X 323 (Basra, Iraq, 1955; burial: 120 BC)

537+ AR – Alex. III: 159 te.; Aht.: 1 te.; Atta.: 1 te.; lion stater: 11; Sel. I: 1 te.; Ant. I: 4 te.; Ant. II: 28 te.; Sel. II: 1 te.; Sel. III: 1 te.; Ant. III: 15 te.

CH X 326 (Bassit, Syria, 1978; burial: 118 BC)

10 AR: Alex. III: 9 te.; Ant. VII : 1 te.

IGCH 1605 (Haifa, 1969; burial: after 112 BC)

24 AR – Ant. VIII: 20 te.; Ant. IX: 4 te.

IGCH 1567 (Baarin, near Massyaf, 1955; 110 BC)

21 AR – Myrina: 1 te.; Cyme: 5 te.; Smyrna: 2 te.; Dem. I: 9 te.; Ant. IX: 1 te.; Eucratides: 1 te.

IGCH 1568 (Kessab, near Seleucia Pieria, 1952; burial: c. 110 BC)

388+ AR – Athens: 40 te.; Seleucia Pieria: 12 te.; Dem. I: 1 te.; Dem. II: 31 te.; Ant. VII: 113 te.; Alex. II: 66 te.; Cleo.: 1 te.; Ant. VIII and Cleo.: 17 te.; Ant. VIII: 102 te.; Ant. IX: 4 te.; Phraates II: 1 te.

CH IX 545 (Homs, 1987; burial: 110 BC)

19 AR: Ant. VII: 2 te.; Alex. II: 1 te.; Ant. VIII et Cleo.: 2 te.; Ant. VIII : 2 te. ; Ant. IX : 2 te.

CH X 329 (unknown findspot, « posthumous Antiochus VII » hoard, 2005; burial: 101 BC)

2068 AR – Ath.; Ant. IV: 1 te.; Dem. I: 4 te.; Alex. I: 1 te.; Ant. VII: 1185 te.; Dem. II: 2 te.

IGCH 1607 (Jericho, 1965-1966; burial: 100 BC)

200+ AR – Ant. VII: 44+ te. and 3+ didr.; Dem. II: 52+ te. and 1 didr.; Cleo. and Ant. VIII: 1+ te.; Ant. VIII: 3 te.; Tyre: 5+ te.

----- (99 BC-64 BC)

CH IX 550 (Rafah, Gaza strip, 1968; burial: early 1st c.)

c. 52 AR – Ascalon: 3 te.; Alex. II: 1 te.; Ant. VII and Cleo.: 5 te.; Ant. VIII : 41 te. ; Ant. IX : 2 te.

IGCH 1570 (Antakya, before 1960; burial: 95 BC)

8 AR – *Ant. VIII*: 8 te.

IGCH 1609 (Gaza, 1969; burial: 95 BC)

52+ AR – Cleo. and Ant. VIII; 2 te. and 3 didr.; Ant. VIII: 39 te. and 3 didr.; Ant. IX: 2 te.; Ascalon: 2 te.

IGCH 1619 (Tripolis, 1884-1885; burial: 100–50 BC)

520 AR – Dem. II: 5 te.; Alex. II: 36 te.; Ant. VIII: 20 te.; Ant. VIII and Cleo.: 1 te.; Ant. IX: 1 te.; Aradus: 27 te.; Tripolis: 20 te.

- CH X 338 (Tarsus?, Turkey, 1997; burial: 95 BC)
24 AR – Tarsus: 1; Dem. II: 1 dr.; Ant. VI: 1 dr.; Ant. VII: 9 dr.; Alex. II: 9 dr.; Ant. VIII:
1 dr.; Ant. IX: 2 dr.
- CH X 339 (Eastern Anatolia, eastern Syria or northern Mesopotamia, 1990; burial: 95 BC)
101? AR – Ant. VII: 5 dr.; imitations of Ant. VII: 108 te.; Ant. IX: 1 dr.
- CH X 340 (“*Seleucia on the Calycadnus*” hoard, 2002; burial: 94 BC)
10-11 AR – Ant. VIII: 5 te.; Sel. VI: 5 te.
- IGCH 1610 (Palestine, before 1941; burial: after 86 BC)
34+ AR – Ant. VII: 1 te.; Ant. VIII: 1 te.; Aradus: 32 te.
- IGCH 1575 (Aleppo, 1939; burial: after 80 BC)
20 AR – *Phil. I*: 20 te.
- CH X 344 (unknown findspot; burial: 78 BC)
46 AR – imitations of Ant. VII: 46
- CH X 345 (Syria, early 1980; burial: 76–75 BC)
53+ AR – *Phil. I*: 53 te.
- CH X 346 (unknown findspot, 1991; burial: 76–75 BC)
16 AR – *Phil. I*: 16 te.
- CH X 347 (unknown findspot, 2003; burial: 76–75 BC)
10 AR – *Phil. I*: 10 te.
- IGCH 1583 = CH X 348 (Akkar, Lebanon, 1951; burial: 76–75 BC)
16 AR – *Phil. I*: 16 te.
- CH X 350 (unknown findspot, “Philip I” hoard, 2007; burial: 64 BC)
127 AR – *Phil. I*: 126 te.; Ant. XIII: 1 te.