

# The Ancient History Bulletin

---

VOLUME THIRTY: 2016

NUMBERS 1-2

---

## **Edited by:**

Edward Anson ✦ Michael Fronda ✦ David Hollander  
Timothy Howe ✦ Joseph Roisman ✦ John Vanderspoel  
Pat Wheatley ✦ Sabine Müller



**ISSN 0835-3638**

# ANCIENT HISTORY BULLETIN

Volume 30 (2016) Numbers 1-2

Edited by:

Edward Anson, Michael Fronda, David Hollander, Sabine Müller, Joseph Roisman, John Vanderspoel, Pat Wheatley

Senior Editor: Timothy Howe

Editorial correspondents

Elizabeth Baynham, Hugh Bowden, Franca Landucci Gattinoni, Alexander Meeus, Kurt Raaflaub, P.J. Rhodes, Robert Rollinger, Victor Alonso Troncoso



## Contents of volume thirty

### Numbers 1-2

- 1 Eric Adler, *Effectiveness and Empire in Tacitus' Agricola*
- 15 Jens Jakobsson, *Dating of Timarchus, the Median Usurper. A Critical Review*
- 27 Salvatore Vacante, *Wetlands and Environment in Hellenistic Sicily: Historical and Ecological Remarks*
- 43 Andrzej Dudziński, *Diodorus' use of Timaeus*

## NOTES TO CONTRIBUTORS AND SUBSCRIBERS

The Ancient History Bulletin was founded in 1987 by Waldemar Heckel, Brian Lavelle, and John Vanderspoel. The board of editorial correspondents consists of Elizabeth Baynham (University of Newcastle), Hugh Bowden (Kings College, London), Franca Landucci Gattinoni (Università Cattolica, Milan), Alexander Meeus (University of Leuven), Kurt Raaflaub (Brown University), P.J. Rhodes (Durham University), Robert Rollinger (Universität Innsbruck), Victor Alonso Troncoso (Universidade da Coruña)

AHB is currently edited by: Timothy Howe (Senior Editor: [howe@stolaf.edu](mailto:howe@stolaf.edu)), Edward Anson, Michael Fronda, David Hollander, Sabine Müller, Joseph Roisman, John Vanderspoel and Pat Wheatley.

AHB promotes scholarly discussion in Ancient History and ancillary fields (such as epigraphy, papyrology, and numismatics) by publishing articles and notes on any aspect of the ancient world from the Near East to Late Antiquity. Submitted articles should normally be in English, but the journal will consider contributions in French, German, Italian or Spanish.

### SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

AHB adheres to the usual North American editorial policies in the submission and acceptance of articles but imposes no House Style. Authors are, however, asked to use the abbreviations of *L'Année philologique* (A<sup>Ph</sup>) for journals, and of the *Thesaurus linguae latinae* (TLL) for Latin authors. Please send submissions to the editor most closely identified with your field of enquiry or, in case of doubt, to Timothy Howe ([howe@stolaf.edu](mailto:howe@stolaf.edu)). Articles must be submitted in electronic format, preferably generated by MS Word. Greek font or other special characters must convert such to Unicode and should be accompanied by a PDF version. Authors will receive PDF offprints of their contributions. Copyright is retained by the author. Books for reviews and enquiries concerning book reviews should be directed to Joseph Roisman ([jsroisma@colby.edu](mailto:jsroisma@colby.edu)).

### SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

The subscription rate for individual and institutional subscribers is USD 25.00. Detailed instructions about subscriptions and access to digital content can be found on the AHB website: <http://ancienthistorybulletin.org>

### PAYMENT

Payment may be made via the subscription portal on the AHB website:  
<http://www.ancienthistorybulletin.org/subscribed-users-area/membership-levels/>

*Cover image courtesy of The Nickle Arts Museum, University of Calgary*

# Dating of Timarchus, the Median Usurper

## A Critical Review\*

*Jens Jakobsson*

### **Abstract**

In this article, a later dating (c. late 161– 160/159 BC) is discussed for the rebellion of Timarchus in Media and Babylonia against the Seleucid king Demetrius I. This later dating is supported by Diodorus Siculus and Appian, while cuneiform evidence shows that Demetrius I was recognised as king in Babylonia as early as 161 BC, and Demetrius' first Babylonian coins celebrate the defeat of Timarchus. The previous Seleucid king, Antiochus V, however, was acknowledged in cuneiform documents but issued very few coins in the Seleucid east. With this parallel, the author suggests that Demetrius may have been recognised as king in Babylonia before Timarchus' brief invasion but only issued coins there after Timarchus' defeat.

### **Background to Timarchus' Rebellion**

In the peace of Apamea in 188 BC, which followed the disastrous defeat of Antiochus III ('the Great') against Rome, the Seleucid Empire was forced to send hostages and pay war indemnities to Rome. When Antiochus III died in 187 BC, he was succeeded by his son Seleucus IV but in 175 BC, Seleucus IV was murdered. This led to a crisis of legitimacy: as Seleucus' oldest son and heir, Demetrius I, was currently hostage in Rome. Seleucus' younger son, a child named Antiochus, was briefly raised to the throne, but this child was soon pushed aside by Seleucus' younger brother Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Antiochus Epiphanes took two brothers from Miletus, Heracleides and Timarchus, into his service. They were used as envoys to Rome, but eventually Heracleides became minister of the treasury, while Timarchus was made satrap (governor) in the east.

Antiochus Epiphanes was a forceful regent, but when he died on campaign in Persia in 164 BC, another crisis followed. His son Antiochus V (Eupator) was only a child, under custody of the steward Lysias, a member of the royal house. Lysias was not only forced to put down a rebellion by the Jewish Maccabees, he was also challenged by other officials and was further weakened by concessions to the Romans, who demanded the destruction of the Seleucid fleet and elephant corps. When Demetrius I escaped from Rome, Lysias lost control over the army.

---

\*Prof Bert van der Spek has provided invaluable help with the cuneiform sources. Many thanks to Arthur Houghton for help with articles, Y.T. Nercessian and the National Armenian Library for Armenian references, and Mark Passehl for interpreting Diodorus Siculus and proofreading. Thanks also to Simon Glenn for useful help, Rudy Dillen and Patrick Pasmans for the seminar in Belgium, and Robert Harry van Gent for his Babylonian Calendar Converter.

He and Antiochus V were killed, and Demetrius I became king in the autumn of 162 BC and in so doing inherited a rather complicated political situation. Apart from the still unsettled Maccabean insurrection, Demetrius was at first neither recognised by the Roman Senate, nor unanimously accepted within the Seleucid Empire. At some point, either before or after the death of Lysias, Timarchus declared himself king in Media, and then invaded Babylonia. He was eventually defeated, however, and killed by Demetrius, who temporarily managed to subdue the Maccabees and was grudgingly recognised by the Senate.

## Chronology for Timarchus' Rebellion

This article reviews the chronology of Timarchus' revolt. The Greco-Roman sources are brief and contradictory and the dating consequently depends on cuneiform documents (see Appendix I) and numismatic evidence. The date suggested in *Seleucid Coins Part II*<sup>1</sup> (henceforth SC II), which is the most updated work on this subject to include a full numismatic analysis, is c. 164-161 BC, possibly only 162-161 BC. A more traditional dating would be 162/161-160 BC.<sup>2</sup> I suggest that the Greco-Roman sources support a later date, and that the numismatic evidence for this period is in fact quite ambiguous. Therefore, a possible alternative dating would be c. late 161-160/159 BC; the idea that Timarchus was king before 161 cannot be maintained.

Other modern scholars often suggest a later inauguration: Capdetrey gives 162 BC; while Ehling suggests that Timarchus had a short reign from the late summer of 161 BC, and was defeated in a campaign that begun that same winter; Demetrius I being again recognised as king in the east during the spring of 160 BC. Monerie by and large supports this timespan.<sup>3</sup> However, these analyses usually focus more on Greco-Roman and cuneiform evidence than numismatic details. This paper will be an attempt to reconcile these different sources of information.

### a) Greco-Roman Sources

Timarchus is mentioned by three ancient historians.

1. Pompeius Trogus (Justin, *Prologus*, 34) briefly states that Demetrius I became king, and then made war with Timarchus, 'king of the Medes', and with Ariarathes, king of Cappadocia.

2. Appian mentions Timarchus twice (Syr. 45 and 47). Firstly, he says that Timarchus and Heracleides were appointed by Antiochus Epiphanes, Timarchus as governor of Babylonia and his brother as treasurer. Appian then relates how Demetrius I became king and removed Heracleides from his office; he then killed Timarchus, who had rebelled and mistreated the government of Babylonia. Demetrius was given the epicleris Soter (Saviour) by the grateful Babylonians.

---

<sup>1</sup> SC II vol I, p. 141.

<sup>2</sup> Cf Houghton (1979) pp. 213-217.

<sup>3</sup> Capdetrey (2007), pp. 270-271. Ehling, (2008), pp. 122-124. Monerie (2014), p.171.

### 3. Diodorus Siculus (*Hist.*, 31.27):<sup>4</sup>

When it became known that the Romans were ill disposed towards Demetrius, not only the other kings but even some of the satraps subject to him regarded his kingship with scant respect. Of these satraps the most outstanding was a certain Timarchus. A Milesian by birth, and a friend of the previous king, Antiochus, he had, in the course of a series of missions to Rome, worked serious detriment to the Senate. Providing himself with large sums of money, he offered the senators bribes, seeking especially to overwhelm and lure with his gifts any Senators who were in a weak financial position. By gaining in this way a large number of adherents and supplying them with proposals contrary to the public policy of Rome, he debauched the senate; in this he was seconded by Heracleides, his brother, a man supremely endowed by nature for such service.

Following the same tactics he repaired to Rome on the present occasion, being now satrap of Media,<sup>5</sup> and by launching many accusations against Demetrius persuaded the Senate to enact the following decree concerning him: 'To Timarchus, because of . . . to be their king.'

Emboldened by this decree he raised an army of considerable size in Media; he also entered into an alliance against Demetrius with Artaxias, the king of Armenia. Having, moreover, intimidated the neighbouring peoples by an impressive display of force, and brought many of them under his sway, he marched against Zeugma, and eventually gained control of the kingdom.

## Coins of Timarchus

Timarchus issued coins with the legend ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ ΤΙΜΑΡΧΟΥ of Timarchus, the Great King). The main mint of Timarchus was Ecbatana, which produced several rare issues of silver, and three series of bronzes. Two of his bronze series were withdrawn and countermarked, which indicates a numismatic reform. Timarchus also used several temporary mints for small issues. The only other identified mint is Seleucia on the Tigris. A single tetradrachm, imitating the coinage of the Bactrian king Eucratides I, is known from this mint (see Ill 1). However, nine tetradrachms have been found overstruck by coins of Demetrius I in Seleucia. It is natural to assume that most of these belong to the Babylonian mint, but as the undertypes have at least four different die adjustments, some of them may belong to Timarchus' other output.<sup>6</sup> None of the coins of Timarchus are dated. The dating of coins according to the Seleucid era became common only during the later part of Demetrius' reign, when Timarchus was certainly dead.

Numbers of coins do not per se indicate a long reign, but the changes made to Timarchus' bronze coinage is an indication of some amount of stability and long-term planning within his

---

<sup>4</sup>Translation by F.R. Walton for Loeb Classical Library.

<sup>5</sup>The phrase 'repair to' is ambiguous, as it does not reveal whether Timarchus personally went to Rome. See below for a critical translation of this sentence.

<sup>6</sup>Houghton (1979), note 11.

administration. SC II<sup>7</sup> also interprets the rare (sometimes unique) coins of five or six unattributed issues as remnants of ‘a far more extensive coinage, struck at occasional mints to buy loyalty or to meet campaign expenses’. To the author, this suggests that Timarchus' rebellion lasted for longer than only months.

## Contemporary Cuneiform Documents

The cuneiform documents are listed in Tables 1 and 2, including relevant dated references for Antiochus V and Demetrius I. No documents refer to Timarchus' kingship with any certainty. The Babylonian king list (see Table 1) is incomplete for this period. A tablet of the Astronomical diaries from 163/162 BC mentions a violent conflict in Babylonia, which included a reference to Medians. These Medians could possibly have been troops under Timarchus' command, but whether he was at that time a king or still an official, who participated in the general vying for control over Antiochus V, is not stated.

The *Demetrius and Arabia fragment* mentions Demetrius I and troops in Arabia. This tablet contains a partially destroyed line with the latter half of what is possibly a name ending with *ma]r-ku-us* (see Table 2 for cuneiform symbols), which might correspond to the Greek ending “RCHOS” as in TIMARCHOS, but even if this line refers to how Demetrius defeated Timarchus, the date has been destroyed.

## The Chronology of Seleucid Coins II

According to SC II, Timarchus made himself king when he was governor of Media (not Babylonia, as Appian claims), as shown by the large number of coins from Ecbatana. This was perhaps as early as 164 BC, during the reign of Antiochus V, as there are no coins of this boy-king from the Ecbatana mint.<sup>8</sup> In 162 or 161 BC, Timarchus' kingship was confirmed by the Senate, according to Diodorus Siculus; this is seen as the *terminus ante quem* for when Timarchus became king. Possibly, the last document that recognises Antiochus V as king at Babylon on 11 January 161 BC, while Demetrius I's kingship is first mentioned on 14 May the same year (though these datings are uncertain as the documents are lost—see Table 2). SC II places Timarchus' occupation of Babylonia in the lacuna between January and May 161 BC, as Demetrius' first coinage in Seleucia on the Tigris was issued after the Timarchus' defeat, because: 1) Demetrius' epiclesis *Soter* appears on all coins from Seleucia, which supports Appian's account of how this title was given to Demetrius by the Babylonians. The use of this cult title is quite variable in other mints: in Antioch, where Demetrius ruled from the outset of his reign, all of the early coins were issued without epiclesis; and 2) the coins that Demetrius overstruck (see above) in Seleucia feature him and his queen Laodice. They may represent the marriage of the couple, which could have been celebrated in Seleucia after Timarchus was defeated.

---

<sup>7</sup> SC II, vol I, p.149.

<sup>8</sup> SC II, vol I, p.139.



Thus, SC II suggests, following Appian, that Timarchus was killed in 161 BC, during the war with Demetrius.

### Evidence for a Later Dating

However, this dating does not agree with the literary sources. Firstly, Appian says that Demetrius demoted Heracleides, Timarchus' brother. This indicates that Timarchus had not yet taken the diadem when Demetrius arrived in Syria in late 162 BC. The author finds it unlikely that Lysias would have trusted Heracleides to control the Seleucid royal finances after his brother's rebellion. More importantly, Diodorus Siculus explicitly states that Timarchus was a satrap when Demetrius I became king. Diodorus does even imply that Timarchus then left Media and travelled to Rome *in person*, even though Walton's translation does not give this impression (see note 4). The sentence reads:

KATA TON ENEΣTΩTA KAIPON ΣΑΤΡΑΠΗΣ <ΩΝ> ΜΗΔΙΑΣ ΚΑΤΗΝΘΗΣΕΝ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΡΩΜΗΝ<sup>9</sup>

The word ΚΑΤΗΝΘΗΣΕΝ here is significant, as the verb ΚΑΤΑΝΤΑΩ means to 'come down to', to 'arrive at'. Cf. ΚΑΤΑΝΘΗΣ—downhill. Media, on the Iranian plateau, belonged to the upper satrapies (Upper Asia),<sup>10</sup> from which one could travel *down* to the Mediterranean basin. A better translation is: 'during the opportune time that had arisen, he [Timarchus] went, as satrap of Media, down to Rome.' However, this detail may be a conflation with an earlier embassy in which Timarchus himself participated. Even so, if Diodorus is correct that Timarchus awaited the Senate's recognition, he could not have begun his rule as a king in Media before 161 BC. Ehling<sup>11</sup> interprets Diodorus and Trogus thus: '*Nach Ekbatana in Medien zurückgekehrt, ließ sich Timarchos zum Medorum rex (Iust. prol. 34) ausrufen (nach Mai 161).*' Ehling is correct to place the return no earlier than May: taking into account the length of the journey and the period spent for the Senate to issue the decree, the embassy may not have returned until late in 161 BC, especially as they may have had to avoid travelling openly through Demetrius' territories.

The idea that Timarchus should have proclaimed himself king of Media while he was still a Seleucid satrap seems unprecedented<sup>12</sup>—and further, Diodorus Siculus states that it was only

---

<sup>9</sup> The 'ΩΝ' admitted into the Loeb text is Herwerden's supplement.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Polybius, *Hist.* 5.40.6.

<sup>11</sup> Ehling (2008), p.126.

<sup>12</sup> Diodotos I of Bactria has often been regarded as a 'semi-autonomous' Seleucid satrap during his early reign (from c.250 BC), as it was assumed that he issued his first coins in the name of king Antiochos II, but with his own portrait. However, these coins were likely later than the royal Bactrian coins issued in the name of Diodotus—and are better attributed to a separate Bactrian king called Antiochus (Nicator), perhaps Diodotus I's younger son, who ruled between Diodotus II and Euthydemus I. Consequently, Diodotus issued his first coins with his own name and royal title. See Jakobsson (2010).

But regardless of whether this thesis is correct or not, we do not know the exact attitude of the Seleucid kings towards the first rulers in Bactria. However, Bactria was a very remote province, and difficult to control. Otherwise, the Seleucids acted with force against appointed satraps or relatives who made themselves kings, such



after the Senate had granted him kingship of Media did Timarchus begin to *act* like a king: he gathered a great army and allied himself to the king of Armenia. Presumably his first coins were struck then. Thus, two sources imply that Timarchus became king *after* 162 BC, and with such a late inception, his coinage is too comprehensive to allow a reign of only a few months in 161 BC, a fraction of the timespan suggested in Seleucid Coins II. However, it is possible to reinterpret the numismatic evidence to fit a later inception date.

## Reinterpreting the Numismatic Evidence

According to SC II, Antiochus Epiphanes used approximately thirty identified mints, while his young son Antiochus V used about eight. The number of mints is not relevant per se: it can only be expected that Antiochus Epiphanes, who ruled longer and campaigned vigorously, struck coins in many places<sup>13</sup>—Epiphanes' older brother Seleucus IV, whose reign was more sedentary, relied on many fewer mints. But what is relevant here is the geographic distribution of these mints: both brothers used the well-established mints of the eastern regional capitals: Seleucia on the Tigris, Ecbatana and Susa.

By contrast, the major mints of Antiochus V were all Syrian or Phoenician,<sup>14</sup> which matches the historical accounts well. The steward Lysias had resided at the court of Antioch when Antiochus Epiphanes died; Lysias' authority was not generally recognised east of Syria, and the general Philip was allegedly put in charge of the government by Antiochus Epiphanes on his deathbed. In any case, Philip commanded the eastern army after the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, eventually marched from Persia to Syria to bury Epiphanes, but then fled in fear of Lysias—an official named Philip (perhaps the same man) rebelled in Antioch, forcing Lysias to abandon the expedition against the Maccabees to defeat him.<sup>15</sup>

---

as Molon in Media, c.221 BC, and Achaïos the Younger in Asia Minor, c.219 BC. The emergence of local kings of non-Greek ethnicity, for instance in Armenia and Cappadocia, was a lesser threat to the Seleucids' own position. Such kings could sometimes be accepted as Seleucid vassals, and offered dynastic marriages.

For the earliest Diadochid royal period (around the time of the death of the last nominal Argead ruler Alexander IV in 309 BC) it would be possible to present numerous examples of inconsistent titles, with people being referred to as kings and officials at the same time. For instance Menelaus, brother of Ptolemy I (at the time still a satrap under Alexander IV), served under his brother as *strategos* on Cyprus c.310 BC. However, Menelaus also seems to have acted as a local king, as he issued coins with the title BA (short for *basileus*). See Diodorus Siculus, *Hist.* 20.47; coin from Hill (1904), pl XXIV. However, examples from this chaotic and experimental period are less relevant for the mid-2nd century BC, when Hellenistic kingship was a better-established institution.

<sup>13</sup> SC II vol I, pp.107-126, describes several series of Epiphanes coins attributed to the upper satrapies, some of which may be imitations or posthumous.

<sup>14</sup> From the Seleucid east, there were coins from Antioch on the Persian Gulf, an unattributed western Median mint, and some uncertain single coins, according to SC II, vol. I, pp. 137-139. Antiochus V could also be compared to another weak child-king, Antiochus the son of Seleucus IV, whose mother Laodice issued coins for him during a few months in 175 BC. These coins were mostly struck in territories under immediate control of the court in Antioch: the city itself and Cilicia, the only province west of Syria. The exception was a curious issue attributed to Antioch in Persis, on the opposite side of the empire. See SC II vol. I, pp. 37-39.

<sup>15</sup> 1 Macc. 6.55-65, Josephus, *AJ* 12.360-361; 12.379-81.

Thus we can see that after Antiochus Epiphanes died, many officials challenged Lysias' weak rule. The omission of issues of Antiochus V from the important eastern cities should not be 'blamed' on Timarchus alone—his actions during this time are in fact unknown. The suggestion that Timarchus had at some point become the supreme commander of the entire Seleucid east has been raised,<sup>16</sup> though the numismatic evidence does not suggest that Timarchus ever controlled other upper satrapies such as Susiana. In fact, the first issue of Demetrius I from Susa's mint was based on a portrait of Antiochus Epiphanes (SC II, coin 1710). There is no evidence that Timarchus became king while Antiochus V was still alive; this would as mentioned contradict two sources, and would also likely have gone against Timarchus' allegiance to his benefactor Antiochus Epiphanes.

Generally, then, there was a generous output of Epiphanes' coins from most eastern mints, including several unattributed issues. So those eastern mints that had not become exhausted from financing Epiphanes' last campaign in Iran, could well have issued posthumous coins of Epiphanes during the unstable reign of Antiochus V.<sup>17</sup> Nevertheless, Antiochus V was recognised in cuneiform documents—and this detail could be the key to prove that the early dating of Timarchus may be based on a misinterpretation. For we cannot assume that the first coins of Demetrius I from Seleucia on the Tigris were as early as 161 BC just because he was recognised in Babylonian documents of that year. Demetrius' position was *also* weak when he first became king, and while those who were in charge at Babylonia at this turbulent time<sup>18</sup> did not outright refuse to recognise him, (he was after all the only living Seleucid pretender), they may not have made the more serious commitment to issue coins in his name. Hence, while Demetrius' regnal years may have been used in dating formulas in the Babylonian society from 161 BC, the mints of Seleucia (and Susa) may have been silent, or issued more posthumous coins. Such a hesitant policy would fit Diodorus Siculus' account; the officials were uncertain if there would be a war with Rome, or with Timarchus. Only after Timarchus was dead did Demetrius assume full control and issue his own coins.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Bengtson (1952), vol. 2, p.87.

<sup>17</sup> Posthumous coins of Antiochus Epiphanes were issued in Syria 151/0 BC and 146/5 BC (SC II, vol I, p. 257), during the unstable periods before Demetrius I, respectively Alexander Balas, were dethroned. So it seems likely that posthumous coins were also struck during the crisis after Antiochus Epiphanes' death in 164 BC, though these coins would have been undated and thus difficult to separate from Epiphanes' lifetime issues.

<sup>18</sup> The classical sources (see above) provide no information about who was in control. The *strategos* of Babylonia fled his residence in Seleucia according to cuneiform evidence from Babylon in April/May 162, BC; murders and killings are reported from the city in August/September the same year. See Boiy (2004), p.163, for an overview of the situation.

<sup>19</sup> A cuneiform document from Uruk, 23 March 160 BC (see Table 2), mentions how 36.5 shekels of silver coins in good condition, in Demetrius' name, were used for a payment in the city. Such silver may, under more peaceful circumstances, have been assumed to come from Seleucia's mint, but it is fully possible that Demetrius I transferred coins from his Antioch mint (which he controlled from 161 BC) in an attempt to buy support from Babylonian officials and troops.

## Conclusions: an Alternative Beginning and End for Timarchus

Timarchus' hold of Babylonia probably lasted less than a year, perhaps only a few months. His only undisputedly Babylonian coinage was a prestige issue of tetradrachms, which could have been struck within weeks of his conquest of Seleucia on the Tigris. We cannot be sure how the Babylonian officials reacted. Even if the scribes had recognised Timarchus during his invasion, they may have discarded some of the archived documents referring to him after his death.<sup>20</sup> An additional uncertainty comes from the fact that Uruk, another city that produced cuneiform documents, was far south of Seleucia and Babylon (c. 100 and 140 miles, respectively). Timarchus entered Babylonia from the north, and perhaps there were pockets in the south loyal to Demetrius. With all this in mind, cuneiform documents giving Demetrius I as king provide only weak negative evidence to establish when Timarchus was active in Babylonia. Hopefully, there may appear new documents—such are discovered all of the time.

If Diodorus Siculus' account of Timarchus' embassy to Rome was correct, Timarchus probably declared himself king in Media late in 161 or possibly early in 160 BC.<sup>21</sup> (The importance of Roman recognition could have been exaggerated by Diodorus; Roman troops could after all not intervene directly in Media.) There seems to be a relatively long period without known dated documents from Babylon after January 18, 160 BC, and from Uruk after March 23 in the same year. So, unless new evidence appears, it is best to suggest that Timarchus invaded Babylonia in 160 BC, and was driven out either the same year or in 159 BC. According to Trogus, Timarchus was defeated before Demetrius dethroned Ariarathes V of Cappadocia, but after or at least not long before Demetrius' marriage to his queen Laodice. Unfortunately, none of these dates are known with certainty.

It is also not entirely certain that Timarchus was killed in Babylonia—even if a literal reading of Appian implies this. However, Appian's account is very brief, and omits to mention that Timarchus' main base was Media. So possibly, Timarchus may have maintained himself in Media until 159 BC (or even later?), after being defeated in Babylonia: he may have taken the step to withdraw and reissue his own bronzes during this last period.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> There had been only one non-dynastic usurper in Babylonia during the entire Seleucid period, Molon in c.221 BC, and he is not mentioned in cuneiform documents—he could well have been omitted on purpose from the Babylonian King List (see Table 1), for it is well known that Molon proclaimed himself king and took control over Babylonia. Polybius, *Hist.* 5.48, relates how Molon became master over Mesopotamia and Babylonia, including the cities of Seleucia on the Tigris and Babylon, as well as the satrapy close to Persian Gulf (Characene) and Susiana, but not the city of Susa. Polybius does not, however, recognise that Molon became king; this is known only from coins. See Sachs and Hunger (1996).

<sup>21</sup> Timarchus' influence in Armenia, as suggested by Diodorus Siculus, may have been indirect. Little is known about Armenian rulers from this period, but Nercessian (1995), p. 55, dates the succession of Artavasdes I to his father Artaxias I to c.160 BC. Nercessian (personal correspondence) does not know of any coin findings of Timarchus in the territory of ancient Armenia.

<sup>22</sup> The coinage of Demetrius I from Ecbatana is relatively large, but as it is undated, its first year cannot be ascertained.

Demetrius was finally half-heartedly recognised by the Senate perhaps c.160 -159 BC<sup>23</sup>, but even this does not necessarily mean that Timarchus was dead at that time. Timarchus could have fallen out of favour with the Senate, or the Senate's recognition did not include Demetrius' right to Media: by acknowledging Timarchus as King of the Medes, they had already once separated Media from the rest of the Seleucid Empire.

JENS JAKOBSSON

INDEPENDENT SCHOLAR

<https://independent.academia.edu/JensJakobsson>



*Ill 1. A tetradrachm of Timarchus from Seleucia (left), copied from tetradrachms of Eucratides I of Bactria, who ruled c.165-142 BC. Tetradrachms of Timarchus from Seleucia (left) and Ecbatana (right). On the reverse, the Dioscuroi on horseback, the gods of brotherly love. The author's view is that for Timarchus the Dioscuroi signified him and his brother Heracleides, who presumably was supporting Timarchus' case from the family's base in Miletus. Courtesy of the authors of Seleucid Coins II.*

---

<sup>23</sup> Polybius, *Hist.*, 32.3. The exact date is not given, and the recognition was vague: the Senate gave Demetrius the message that as long as his conduct was satisfactory to the Senate, they would look kindly upon him. In addition, Demetrius had sent Leptines and Isocrates as prisoners to Rome. These two men had been instrumental in killing the Roman legate who saw to the destruction of the Seleucid navy and elephants in Lysias' time. Demetrius delivered the perpetrators to show his good intentions, but the Senate left them unpunished, preferring instead to keep the matter unsettled if they needed a reason to attack the Seleucid Empire.

**Table 1.** Cuneiform texts with information about political events.

Document	Reference
Astronomical diaries from 163/2 BC, with fragmentary references about unrest in Babylonia (Timarchus is not mentioned, but ‘from the Medes’ appear.)	Sachs and Hunger, ‘Astronomical Diaries’ p 27, n.162 C. Rev 11-17 and 161 A. Rev 28-29.
Demetrius and Arabia fragment (undated, but from the reign of Demetrius I). Contains the damaged line 7' ..... <sup>m</sup> Ti-ma]r-ku MU <sup>?</sup> -šú SA <sub>4</sub> MU [BI <sup>?</sup> ....., possibly reconstructed as “[Tima]rchus he was called. [That <sup>?</sup> ] year <sup>?</sup> [ .....”,	BM 34433. See van der Spek and Finkel (web project).
Babylonian king list of the Hellenistic period. This list is damaged for the period in question. Timarchus is not mentioned.	The Babylonian King List, or King List 6, in the British Museum BM 35603 = Sp. III 113. This analysis is based on the online presentation by van der Spek, on <a href="http://www.livius.org">www.livius.org</a> . The tablet was originally presented by Sachs and Wiseman (1954), pp. 202-212.

**Table 2.** Selected datings from the period 162-158 BC<sup>24</sup>

	Reference
<b>BABYLON</b>	
August 162, BC, Antiochus V king	Sachs and Hunger, 'Astronomical Diaries III', p 41. (Diary no. -161A1+A2: 11'-12'(month Ululu SEB 150)
(11 Jan 161, BC, Antiochus V king, perhaps Babylon) <sup>25</sup>	Seleucid Coins pt II, p. 143, quoting Bellinger (1945), p. 43.
(14 May 161, BC, Demetrius I king, perhaps Babylon)	Ibid.
October/November 161 BC Offerings were brought " <i>for the life of king Demetrius</i> "	Sachs and Hunger, 'Astronomical Diaries III', p 41. (Diary no. -160A: 2'(month VII SEB 151)
18 Jan 160, BC Demetrius I king	Kennedy (1968) Ref: CT 49, 138
Day 4, month name lost, year 153 SE. Thus: April 159 BC - March, 158 BC. Demetrius I king.	Ibid. Ref: CT 49, 140
<b>URUK</b>	
16 Oct 162, BC Antiochus V king	Rutten (1935). Ref: BRM II 40
23 March 160, BC Demetrius I king	Ibid. Ref: BRM II 42
Day 30, month name lost, SE 153. Thus: May, 159 BC -March, 158 BC. Demetrius I king.	Ibid. Ref: BRM II 41
9 July 159 B.C., Demetrius I king.	McEwan, (1982) Ref: OECT 9:60
8 December 159, BC. Demetrius I king.	Ibid. Ref: BRM II 43

<sup>24</sup> The city of Uruk produced several documents dated to Demetrius I for most years SEB 151 – 161, according to prof. van der Spek (personal correspondence), who supplied most dates below but emphasised that other documents from Uruk are still unpublished.

<sup>25</sup> The current location of these documents, referred to by Bellinger, seems to be unknown. Boiy (2004), p.163, n.139.

## Bibliography

- A. Bellinger, *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes*, (New York, 1945).
- H. Bengtson, *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit*, (Munich, 1952).
- T. Boiy, *Late Achaemenid and Hellenistic Babylon*, (Leuven, 2004).
- L. Capdetrey, *Le pouvoir séleucide*, (Rennes, 2007).
- K. Ehling, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der späten Seleukiden*, (Stuttgart, 2008).
- G.F. Hill, *BMCGreek* 24, (London, 1904).
- A. Houghton, 'Timarchus as King in Babylonia', *Revue Numismatique* (1979), pp. 213-217.
- A. Houghton, C. Lorber and O. Hoover, *Seleucid Coins Part II*, (New York, 2008).
- J. Jakobsson, 'Antiochus Nicator, the Third King of Bactria?', *Numismatic Chronicle* (2010), pp.17-33.
- D.A. Kennedy, *Late Babylonian Economic Texts, Cuneiform Texts in the British Museum* 49, (London, 1968).
- G. McEwan, *Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts* 9, (Oxford, 1982).
- J. Monerie, *D'Alexandre à Zoilos*, (Stuttgart, 2014).
- Y.T. Nercessian, *Armenian Coins and Their Values*, (Los Angeles, 1995).
- M. Rutten, *Contrats de l'époque séleucide conservés au musée du Louvre*, (Paris, 1935).
- A.J. Sachs and H. Hunger, *Astronomical Diaries and Related Texts from Babylonia, Vol III 164 BC-61 BCE*, (Vienna, 1996).
- A. J. Sachs and J. Wiseman, 'A Babylonian King List from the Hellenistic Period', *Iraq* 16 (1954) .
- R. van der Spek and I.L. Finkel, 'Babylonian Chronicles of the Hellenistic Period', online on [www.livius.org/cg-cm/chronicles/chron00.html](http://www.livius.org/cg-cm/chronicles/chron00.html).