the Ptolemies. However, specimens of Ptolemaic coins from Cyrene mint were inconsistently cataloged with other Cyrenaica coinage instead.

Coin descriptions are concise but to the point. As the introduction points out, legends in the Greek alphabet were quoted in the full version, others were transliterated. An exception to this rule are legends on imitations of Eucratides' coins, which were given in the full form. In this case, the departure is fully justified and accepted owing to the nature of both the inscriptions and the coins themselves.

A further indication of the author's meticulous precision is a virtual lack of errors in the volume. Only coin no. 48 would probably be better attributed to Nerva rather than Domitian. For the Aradian coin no. 63, it would have been useful to add that the Phoenician letters mentioned by the author are mem and aleph. The above remarks do not detract from a high estimation of the work.

The catalog comes complete with useful indices of places, rulers – divided into kings and dynasts, Roman emperors and procurators of Judea – types and symbols, countermarks, and monograms.

The volume under review is a valuable contribution. It will be a tool of scholarly researchers in numismatics and a source of knowledge for collectors, especially in Poland. It should be hoped that more sylloge volumes will appear to cover other Polish collections of Greek coins. They deserve it.

JAROSŁAW BODZEK

Translated by Tadeusz Stanek

Y.MESHORER, SH. QEDAR, Samarian Coinage, (Publications of the Israel Numismatic Society. Numismatic Studies and Researches IX), Jerusalem 1999, pp. 128, pls 31, ISBN-965-222-965.

Nine years since the publication of their pioneering work on Samarian coinage, in the fourth century BC[1], Ya'akov Meshorer and Shraga Qedar decided to tackle the problem once again. A large number of new, heretofore unknown coin types caused what was originally meant as an addendum to expand to

[1] Y. MESHORER, S. QEDAR, *The Coinage of Samaria in the Fourth Century BCE*, Jerusalem 1991.

a whole new work under a new title. Suffice it to say that while the first publication by the Israeli scholars included 106 coin types and variants, the new volume comprises 224 types and variants certainly attributed to Samaria and six coins with uncertain attribution. Apart from the number of monetary types included, a change from the first work is that the authors forwent including once again a full list of the Samaria Hoard in the new publication.

The subject of fourth-century BC Samarian coinage is relatively new to science and is closely connected with the discovery of two monetary deposits: the Nablus hoard (1968)[2] and the already mentioned Samaria Hoard (1990). Supplementary information on Samarian coinage is provided by smaller hoards and stray finds, as well as numismatic matter cropping up on the antiquarian market or kept in public or private collections.

Apart from the omission of a full list of the Samaria Hoard, the new work follows the pattern of the original Meshorer and Qedar publication. It consists of two basic parts: a comprehensive introduction to Samarian coinage and the catalog proper. In the introduction, the authors outlined the historical background, provided the basic bibliography on the topic, explained the organization method they employed, presented the relevant terminology and paleography, and conducted a detailed analysis of the numismatic material in respect to inscriptions, iconography, and the monetary system.

An important problem broached by Meshorer and Qedar is the question of the term to be used for the coinage of Samaria in the fourth century BC. The authors try to decide whether the issues in question are to be ascribed to ethnic Samaritans and thus to be called Samaritan, or whether they should be considered Samarian following their geographic location (MQ, p. 13). The Israeli researchers prefer the latter term as they stress that the term Samaritan refers to a later period in the history of that land. In my opinion, it is a good choice, although the problem is a little more complex. As L. Mildenberg found, coins issued in Samaria belong to provincial coinage[3]. Although it is questionable whether the provincial coinage also includes e.g. coins issued by Pharnabazus (MQ, nos. 1-2), on the whole it is difficult to disagree with that statement. Coins issued in the province by officials of the Achaemenid administration need not be connected with the ethnos inhabiting the pro-

[2] The hoard has so far not been fully published, cf. IGCH no. 1504.

[3] Cf. L. MILDENBERG, „Yĕhud und Šmyrn. Über das Geld der persischen Provinzen Juda und Samaria im 4. Jahrhundert" in: H. CANCIK, H. LICHTENBERG, P. SCHÄFER (eds.) *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*, Bd. I hg., Tübingen, 1996, pp. 119-146

vince. Hence the term Samarian seems more proper in this case, whether or not the majority of the province's population were Samaritan.

Meshorer and Qedar devote much attention in the introduction to the problem of inscriptions on Samarian coins (MQ, pp. 14 ff.). Coins issued in Samaria bear a variety of monetary legends. On the one hand, there are Aramaic and Hebrew legends, on the other – Greek. A distinct category consists of cuneiform (?) inscriptions. A very useful feature of the volume is its legend index found on p. 17. The authors point to the mixed character of the inscriptions that include letters from paleo-Aramaic, paleo-Hebrew, and Greek writing. The legends convey a host of messages: they present the name of the province, people's names, numerals, and, in one case, part of the alphabet. Commendably, each inscription is provided with a comment by Meshorer and Qedar. They begin discussing the inscriptions with ŠMRYN, or Samaria, which, they claim, serves the twin purpose of also denoting the name of the capital city of the province (MQ, pp. 19 f.). The name is seen in a variety of spellings, which has consequences in coin attribution. Subsequently discussed are Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek personal names. Meshorer and Qedar display impressive erudition as they quote analogies from glyptography, papyrology, and epigraphy. As regards two coins, I am not certain of the reading suggested by the Israeli scholars. One is part of a issue struck on behalf of Pharnabazus (MQ, p. 28, cat. 1), and the other of Bagabatas (MQ, pp. 20, 29). In the earlier case, the authors propose the reading ΦARNABAZC. I am not convinced by the interpretation of the last letter as a „C" (sigma). Insofar as it can be observed on the excellent photograph in the book's catalog section, it seems rather to be a misstruck „O." Behind it, a trace of another letter can be made out. The problem can be definitely settled when a specimen in a better state of preservation is found. A similar uncertainty exists in what the authors read as BAΓABTAC. Here, too, the inscription was largely reconstructed and to make the reading more plausible, a better-preserved specimen is needed. As has been mentioned, two of the coins included bear a date – the year 14, which has implications for the dating of the Nablus hoard and Samarian issues in general.

In the discussion of numismatic material, the greater part is a detailed analysis of monetary types used in Samarian coinage. It is exceptionally rich in iconography. To a large extent, the monetary types were borrowed from the coinage of other regions. Meshorer and Qedar (pp. 32 f.) trace the inspirations of Samarian engravers to the coins of Phoenician cities,

especially Sidon and Tyre, Cilician coins, and, to a lesser degree, Lycian and Carian coins, or satrapic issues. Also, the authors acknowledge a strong influence of Athenian coinage on that of Samaria. A large group of monetary types were inspired by non-numismatic originals, probably such as items of Syrian, Babylonian, and Achaemenid glyptography. Added to the above should definitely be the so-called Greco-Persian gems[4]. It can be stated as a general fact that engravers who made stamps for the striking of Samarian coins drew from the art of the broadly understood Ancient East, expanded to include selected elements of Greek art (such as e.g. Athenian owls).

The authors of the work under discussion made an effort to order monetary types as belonging to groups. Given the wealth of iconographic motives on Samarian coinage, that was no easy task. This is all the more reason to stress Meshorer and Qedar's contribution. In discussing individual representations, they adopted the following model: heads, human figures, animals, miscellaneous, and geometrical patterns. They discerned 91 main monetary types. It seems that the number can be brought down by combining some groups.

An iconographic analysis proper is preceded by a discussion of a frontally pictured Bes (MQ, pp. 33 n, cat. no. 16). The authors point to iconographic analogies with representations preserved on a jar unearthed at Kuntillet 'Ajrud. Also other Samarian monetary types such as the Cow suckling a calf (MQ, p. 34), tree of life (MQ, p. 34), lyre player (MQ, pp. 34 f.), lions (MQ, pp. 35 f.), or „seated figure smelling a flower" appear in the iconography on that jar and on other items found on that site. Taking the Ajrud inscriptions into consideration, Meshorer and Qedar propose a hypothesis that on Samarian coins we are dealing with representations related to the Yahwist cult in Samaria, with such types as the seated person smelling a flower possibly referring to Yahweh of Samaria. However attractive this hypothesis may sound and however likely it may be, it should still be borne in mind that these motives belong to the wide iconographic gamut of Ancient Eastern art which extended far beyond Samaria and even Palestine. The authors

[4] Cf. J. BODZEK, „Zwycięski kawalerzysta z Samarii" [The Victorious Cavalryman of Samaria], *Wiadomości Numizmatyczne* XLIII, 1999, fasc. 1-2 (167-168), pp. 21-30; IDEM., „Cavalier vainquer de Samarie. Remarques sur l'iconographie des monnaies de Samarie dans la période des Achéménides," *The Polish Journal of Biblical Research*, vol. 1, No. 1, September 2000, pp. 109-116 (an abridged version of the earlier essay).

themselves often indicate analogies from other regions.

The first group of monetary representations presented by Meshorer and Qedar is male heads (MQ, p. 38). The authors distinguish several types within this group: „head of warrior" (MQ, p. 38, nos. 73, 80, 81), „head of satrap" (MQ, pp. 38 f.), „head of Heracles" (p. 39), „bearded head wearing crown" (p. 39), „male head with oriental headdress" (pp. 39 f.) „male bust (?) to front" (p. 40), „bearded male head to front (slightly turned to left)" (p. 40), and finally „various male heads" (p. 40). As the Israeli researchers note, some of those types were without a doubt borrowed from the coinage of Cilicia – „head of warrior" (cf. SNG Levante, nos. 69, 71-74, 78-80), „head of Heracles" (cf. SNG Levante, nos. 153, 220, 221, etc.), or „bearded head wearing crown" (cf. SNG Levante, nos. 396-397). No solution can as yet be found to the interpretation of the „male bust (?) to front." For some representations classed as „various male heads," Meshorer and Qedar look for analogies among Philisto-Arabian coinage.

Another group is made up of three other types discerned by the authors: „head of satrap" (nos. 1-2, 20-21, 71-72, 75-76, 185, 188-191), „male head with oriental headdress" (nos. 71-72), and „bearded male head to front (slightly turned to left)" (no. 193). The breakup of the above representations into three separate types does not seem justified; all three could be fitted under one heading. The representation on coin no. 193 („bearded male head to front (slightly turned to left)" only differs from the „head of satrap" in that it is partly, rather than fully turned. Meshorer and Qedar acknowledge it themselves on p. 38. It would have sufficed to mark this representation as a variant within a generalized discussion of one type. It is similar with the „male head with oriental headdress" type (MQ, pp. 39 f.). Although the headgear in this representation is indeed rendered in an unusual way for monetary iconography, we are still dealing with a tiara. It is therefore hardly a new kind of oriental headdress; rather a novel way of showing a tiara. The authors, too, point to a similarity between this headgear featured on Samarian coins and images on Cilician coins (SNG France 2, nos. 396-397), and in the catalog section (p. 96, nos. 71-72) they even speak of a „Persian tiara."

There are other doubts about the group in question. First, the term „head of satrap" used by Meshorer and Qedar does not seem entirely proper. Apart from representations of that satrap bearing an inscription with the name of Pharnabazus (nos. 1-2), it is difficult to be certain if all

representations so designated are really the head of a satrap. While they admit the doubt, the authors still opt for them being representations of a satrap or a local governor (pp. 38 f.). The question is not solved by the headgear worn. Without going into detailed considerations of terminology involved in Achaemenid administration and the tiara itself[5], it would probably be more fitting to use the neutral term „head in tiara." This appellation can be used as the heading for this generalized type. This does not exclude noting in a discussion of this general type that some of its monetary representations picture the head of a satrap (as exemplified by the said coins of Pharnabazus). Secondly, in coin no. 193 - presenting, as has been mentioned, a „head in tiara" in a three-quarter view - Meshorer and Qedar see an original which they define as Cilician (p. 40). In my opinion, the model for this coin is rather to be sought among coins of Kherei issued at Xanthos[6]. Finally, especially remarkable among coins bearing a „head in tiara" are issues with name of Pharnabazus on them (nos. 1-2). Thanks to them, our knowledge of this satrap's coinage, so far associated with Mysia (Cyzicus)[7] and Cilicia[8], was broadened to include Palestine. The coins also have much import for the general dating of Samarian coinage, more on which below.

A much larger group of monetary types discussed by Meshorer and Qedar involves female heads (cf. MQ, pp. 40 f.). The most numerous among these are likenesses of Athena's head. Also popular in the coinage of Gaza, Ashdod, Askalon, Yehud, and in that of the satraps, this type was probably borrowed directly from Athenian issues and in some cases from coins struck in Cilician, Cypriot, or Lycian mints. Included in this group is the type known as the „head of Athena to front" (MQ, nos. 102-103). Meshorer and Qedar rightly look for its prototype among Cilician

[5] The complex problem of the meaning of the tiara on Achaemenid-period coins will be the topic of my intended article.

[6] Cf. J.BODZEK, „A Lycian Prototype for the Coin from Samaria?" in: K.M. CIAŁOWICZ, J.A. OSTROWSKI, eds., *Les civilizations du bassin méditerranéen. Hommages à Joachim Śliwa*, Kraków 2000, pp. 331-340.

[7] Cf. J. BODZEK, „Pharnabazos in Kyzikos. Der Seesig in Kunst und Numismatik zu Beginn des 4. Jhs. v. Chr," in: B. KLUGE, B. WEISER (eds.), *XII. Internationaler Numismatischer Kongress, Berlin 1997. Akten – Proceedings – Actes*, Vol. I, Berlin 2000, pp. 170-178.

[8] Cf. R.A. MOYSEY, „The Silver Statter Issues of Pharnabazus and Datames from the Mint of Tarsus in Cilicia", *American Numismaic Society Monographs and Notes* 31, 1986, p. 7-61.

coinage (cf. SNG Switzerland, nos. 69-70, 78-80, 89-98), although other likely candidates are the issues of Cypriot Lapethus[9]. Without a doubt, the characteristic likeness of the „Female head to front" can be traced to Cilicia (MQ, p. 41). A large group of representations were described as „head of Aphrodite" (MQ, p. 41). On the whole, this designation should be considered conventional. Notwithstanding likenesses of Aphrodite being found on the Cilician coins mentioned by the Israeli scholars, the inspiration for Samarian engravers need not have come from that land.

The list of head representations in the volume concludes with what the authors call „other heads" (MQ, pp. 41 ff.). These include renditions of grotesque faces, Gorgon head, janiform heads, etc. In part, analogies to the above representations are found on Philisto-Arabian coins, some others on Cilician coins, and yet some on examples of Phoenician glyptography.

Another group of monetary types isolated by the authors are representations of human figures. Prominent among them is a set of figures of the King. Meshorer and Qedar subdivide this group into several (MQ, pp. 43 ff.) types of representations: „King with animal" with several subtypes and a variant named „King with animals" (MQ, p. 45), and „two kings with sitting lion" (MQ, p. 45). In the king figures they also include the „king seated on throne smelling flower" (MQ, p. 46), „Persian king holding dagger" (MQ, pp. 50 f.), „Persian king standing with sceptre" (MQ, p. 51), „archer" (MQ, p. 53), „Persian king raising his arms" (MQ, p. 53), and finally „Persian king with chariot" (MQ, pp. 53 f.). Some comments are due at this point. First, I do not think it justified to use interchangeably the terms „king" and „Persian king." I can see no way of substantial distinction between representations and of determining which shows a Persian king and which a different ruler. The term „king" seems more neutral and allows for more interpretational leeway. Something of an inconsistency is observable in the arrangement of this section of the work. Types containing a likeness of a king are interspersed with others, which upsets an analysis of the contents. In coin no. 32, I would look for a precedent of the archer figure in a Cilician coin of Mallus (SNG France, no. 399), and not a Phoenician piece of Sidon. The design on coin no. 197 was borrowed from a prototype in the great king / mounted satrap issue (SNG Copenhagen,

[9] Cf. C.M. KRAAY, *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins*, Berkeley – Los Angeles, 1976, pl. 63, no. 1093.

nos. 290-291), which the authors recognize as they discuss the Persian cavalry type. Nor am I certain whether in the reverse of coin no. 171 we are dealing with a king. The figure's headgear rather resembles a tiara worn with Median dress. Similar doubts arise for the chariot passenger on coin no. 15. By contrast, the authors' identification of a similar figure on coin no. 74 as a king is almost certain.

Related to king figures are representations of a winged deity resembling Ahuramazda (MQ, pp. 51 f.). However, as Meshorer and Qedar point out, identification of the deity still poses a problem.

Another group worth a mention comprises likenesses of a figure wearing a Median cavalry dress described by the authors as a „satrap." Some of those representations show a „satrap sitting on throne" (MQ, pp. 46 f.). As the authors correctly point out, this type was inspired by prototypes in Cilician satrap's issues. Another type in this group is a „satrap on galloping horse taking aim with sword or short spear" (MQ, p. 54). It may be good to point out that the Persian cavalryman type on Samarian coins can be generally divided into two subtypes:

a. Horseman in a long gallop with a spear raised to strike (nos. 40, 123, 124, 125, and also no. 197). The authors rightly associate this variant with a prototype of the great king / mounted satrap coins (cf. above);
b. Variant represented by coin no. 15, showing a cavalryman in an extended gallop but holding upright a spear (?), a short scepter (?), or a sword (?). This type has no analogy in Achaemenid coinage but its prototype should be sought in a broadly understood Achaemenid art tradition. An identically pictured horseman is known from a gold plate from the Oxus treasure (cf. Dalton, The Treasure of Oxus, p. 15, no. 36).

Coins nos. 123 and 197 deserve highlighting for their uniqueness. They portray, respectively, a Persian horseman jumping over a fallen animal (?) and a similar cavalryman in a pose as referred to in variant a. above, over the body of a fallen enemy. I wrote of coin no. 197 elsewhere[10]; it may be nevertheless worth observing here that analogies to this representation can be found in Achaemenid or so-called Greco-Persian

[10] Cf. J. BODZEK, „Zwycięski kawalerzysta z Samarii" [The Victorious Cavalryman of Samaria], *Wiadomości Numizmatyczne* XLIII, fasc. 1-2 (167-168), 1999, pp. 21 ff.

glyptography, which, in turn, has its roots in broadly understood Achaemenid iconographic tradition. Inspiration for the reverse design on coin no. 124 can also be traced to the same tradition.

Related to the type under discussion are images of a horseman on coin no. 178, a rider on a bull (no. 41), and a soldier taming a horse (nos. 65-68).

The next group are standing figures. Besides renditions of kings, these include „two soldiers" (MQ, p. 46), „two female (?) figures in shrine" (MQ, p. 47), „two confronted, standing figures" (MQ, p. 48), and a „standing male figure (Poseidon?), holding dolphin (?)" (MQ, p. 55). All the above types stem from Cilician prototypes but include the broad iconographic traditions of Achaemenid art. Still, suggested identification of the shrine on coin no. 45 with the sanctuary built on Mt. Gerizim should be treated with a grain of salt.

Types picturing human figures are supplemented by images of persons seated (MQ, pp. 49, 50), kneeling (MQ, pp. 49 f.), and fantastic creatures like a „Scorpio man" (MQ, p. 56), „Sphinx with Persian king's head" (MQ, pp. 56 ff.), and „Sphinx with facing head of Bes" (MQ, p. 57).

A large group set apart by Meshorer and Qedar are likenesses of animals, either real or fantastic. A sizeable proportion of those are lions (MQ, pp. 61 ff.), and different kinds of imaginary creatures (MQ, pp. 60 f.). Generally speaking, all animalistic types are based in the broad iconography of Achaemenid art. We are dealing here with borrowings from Cilician, Cypriot, Lycian, Greek, Philisto-Arabic, or Phoenician coins, as well as from the glyptography and handicraft of various parts of the empire. As before, this group suggests some comments. The type „forepart of the running horse" (MQ, p. 58), not only has a prototype in the Gaza coins the authors quote, but similar iconographic motives are seen on coins of Spithrydates[11]. This is especially true of coins nos. 75-76, which faithfully repeat an identical reverse and obverse type of the satrap's issue mentioned above. The resemblance must be more than accidental. As has been mentioned, a cow suckling a calf also appears on Lycian coins. The type described by Meshorer and Qedar as „animal lowering head towards calf" (MQ, p. 59) certainly shows a mare with a foal, and not an antelope.

What attracts attention among items classed as miscellaneous is a representation described as „heap of Athenian coins" (MQ, p. 65). A tempting

[11] Cf. H.A. CAHN, „Le monnayage des satrapes: iconographie et signification", *Revue des Etudes Anciennes* XCI, 1989, 1-2, pl. I, No. 13.

hypothetical interpretation may be of the type as a solar symbol.

In their treatment of monetary types, Meshorer and Qedar devote much attention to coins based on Athenian prototypes dividing them into two main groups: coins fashioned after an Athenian prototype and those bearing an imitation of an Athenian type only on one side (MQ, pp. 66 f.). The authors consider the question of attribution of those coins to the Samaria mint.

Following an analysis of iconography, Meshorer and Qedar go on to discuss the monetary system and minting techniques in use in ancient Samaria (MQ, pp. 69 ff.). Based on the numismatic material included in their publication, they conclude that Samarian coinage of the period certainly included such denominations as the drachma, obol, hemiobol, and quarterobol. Besides, they admit the possible existence of the didrachm, hemidrachm, and denominations used at the time in Gaza and Askalon. According to the Israeli scholars, the primary monetary unit in Samaria was the obol which simultaneously acted as a kind of link between the Phoenician and Attic standards. Meshorer and Qedar suggest identifying the obol with the gera mentioned in the Bible. They also note the importance in Samaria of Phoenician coins, especially those of Tyre and Sidon. At the same time, they emphasize the scant percentage of Judean and Philisto-Arabian coins in the area in question. The link between these areas could be Athenian owl imitations, the monetary system being identical in both places. These remarks are accompanied by a table of denominations from Philisto-Arabia, Judea, Samaria, Tyre, and Sidon.

The chronology of Samarian coins as proposed by Meshorer and Qedar spans the period from approximately 372 BC (the time boundary being the coins struck in the name of Pharnabazus) to approximately 333/332 BC.

The introduction concludes with a list of abbreviations and some useful tables: an arrangement of catalog items according to denominations; a helpful concordance between the work cited and the earlier Meshorer and Qedar publication (Samarian Coinage, 1991), and lists of Phoenician alphabetic symbols on Samarian coins along with relevant catalog references. The volume also comes with a general index.

The remaining part of the volume is the catalog itself (MQ, pp. 83 ff.). Most of the pieces listed are identified as Samarian (nos. 1-224), while some are described as incerti (nos. IC 1-6). Importantly, in addition to descriptions, catalog entries contain notes on coin origin and drawings of coins. On the whole, the drawings are a highly useful addition. Neverthe-

less, in some instances graphic reconstructions go too far, failing to match precisely the photographic material. Such is the case in Pharnabazus' (no. 1) and Bagabates' (cat. no. 4) coins. This may occasionally lead to misunderstandings: e.g. coin no. 8 is rightly described as bearing a head of Athena, while the respective drawing suggests a bearded warrior's head instead. On the reverse of coin no. 44, one of the figures is described as „probably nude" and yet on the drawing both appear dressed. Similarly, the graphic rendition of coin no. 113 obverse (a woman's bare head) is at odds with the illustration and photograph (showing Athena's helmeted head). The graphic reconstruction of the obverse of coin no. 60 seems uncertain. Nor are descriptions free from error. In the note on coin no. 185, the reverse representation is not a woman's head but rather a „head in tiara". In some places, the obverse and reverse were confused such is in coins nos. 30, 31, 61-70, 115-119, 145-146, 157, 193, and IC 3-4. The sequence of obverse and reverse in the description of coin no. 152 does not match the relevant drawing and photograph.

These slight flaws are made up for by excellent photographic documentation. As was also true of the first publication, Meshorer and Qedar made sure they used the best quality images of all the types, arranged in 31 tables. Each coin is shown photographed life-size and magnified. In some cases the authors provided two different magnifications (e.g. nos. 16-18: magnification ratios of 3:1 and 6:1).

To sum up, the work under review deserves the highest mark, regardless of its minor imperfections. The amount of work by Ya'akov Meshorer and Shraga Qedar that went into the making of this book is truly impressive. Most issues and problems involved in their subject matter called for a vast knowledge, and both authors demonstrated superb scholarship. Equally remarkable is the book's editorial quality. All of this makes the volume an indispensable tool for specialists dealing with Palestinian archeology but in a equal measure for any researcher studying the archeology and numismatics of the Achaemenid period.

JAROSŁAW BODZEK

Translated by Tadeusz Stanek