

# Studies

## ANCIENT HISTORY

---

### ONCE MORE ABOUT ANTONIA TRYPHAINA<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** As a king's daughter, a king's wife and the mother of kings, Antonia Tryphaina played a major role in the kinship ties of the ruling circles in the Julio-Claudian period. Although her name did not go unnoticed in scholarly literature, this great-granddaughter of M. Antonius has quite undeservedly been regarded as a historical figure of secondary importance. Besides, her treatments tend to show by numerous inaccuracies and much speculation. The author therefore felt that a new investigation was required, though he unexpectedly found himself involved in a more complex scrutiny than previous studies had let him foresee.

**Keywords:** Julio-Claudian period, Antonia Tryphaina, Kingdoms of Pontus and Bosphorus, Thrace

**Victor Cojocaru**

Institute of Archaeology, Iași  
victorinstarhia@yahoo.com

---

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14795/j.v1i2.54>

ISSN 2360 – 266X

ISSN-L 2360 – 266X

#### Introduction

In a recent paper, I have made a comprehensive attempt to further our understanding of Antonia Tryphaina, based on the literary, epigraphic and numismatic sources, but also by a discussion of modern historiography.<sup>2</sup> In the current paper, I would like to focus on some particular controversies. The constraints of this contribution will of course not allow me to address all hypotheses or unfounded speculations<sup>3</sup> on Antonia Tryphaina, so that I shall have to concentrate on the most important obstacles that have hitherto barred the way to a credible historical reconstruction.

#### 1. Onomastic Remarks

The first name of Antonia Tryphaina reminds us of Antonia Minor Hybrida, the second wife of the triumvir Mark Antony, and his daughter Antonia, the wife of Pythodoros of Tralles and grandmother of Antonia Tryphaina. D.

<sup>1</sup> This work was supported by a grant of the Romanian National Authority for Scientific Research, CNCS – UEFISCDI, project number PN-II-ID-PCE-2011–3–0054.

To my colleagues Dr. Diana Stah (Chișinău), Prof. Dr. Altay Coşkun (Waterloo, Ontario), and Dr. Cristian Găzdac (Cluj-Napoca), I would like to express my deep gratitude for their useful suggestions and for glossing over my English.

<sup>2</sup> COJOCARU 2012. For an earlier electronic version, see URL: <http://www.amicipopuliromani.com> (s.v. *Antonia Tryphaina*). By a discussion of modern historiography see especially VON ROHDEN 1894; PIR I<sup>2</sup> A 900; HANSLIK 1964; SULLIVAN 1980; DNP, Bd. 1, 801 (s.v. *Tryphaena* [7]); SAPRYKIN 1995; LIGHTMAN/LIGHTMAN 2000, 21–22. – s.v. *Antonia Tryphaena*). Among electronic publications I mention only URL: [http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Antonia\\_Tryphaina](http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Antonia_Tryphaina); [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Antonia\\_Tryphaena](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Antonia_Tryphaena)

<sup>3</sup> In order to introduce only one example at this point, I quote from LIGHTMAN/LIGHTMAN 2000, 22: “After her father died, Antonia returned to Pontus and ruled as guardian and regent for her son Polemon II”. The absurdity comes here from the fact that Antonia could be no more than two years old when her father's death.

Braund considered a marriage between Pythodoros and the daughter of the triumvir a modern fantasy, but, effectively, the only strength of his argument is the silence of Strabo.<sup>4</sup>

While the question cannot be answered with certainty without the discovery of new sources, I prefer to agree with the majority of my predecessors, among whom the opinion of R. Hanslik appears to be most authoritative to me: „Zwar hat Dessau (...) mit viel Pathos gegen Mommsens Beweisführung angekämpft,<sup>5</sup> doch mit wenig Überzeugungskraft; seinen Schlüssen ex silentio wird allein schon durch die Tatsache, daß der Enkel oder Urenkel des P (ythodoros) den Namen M. Antonius Polemon, eine Enkelin den Namen Antonia Tryphaena führte, jeglicher Boden entzogen (...)“.<sup>6</sup>

The Greek name Tryphaina means “Sumptuous”<sup>7</sup> and was also encountered as name of some queen of the Ptolemaic dynasty. Her mother Pythodoris bore the epithet Philometor,<sup>8</sup> the same as the Ptolemaic queen Cleopatra II Philometor<sup>9</sup>. The name Tryphaina was also used occasionally in Macedonia<sup>10</sup> and even more frequently in the coastal regions of Asia Minor<sup>11</sup>, which is well documented epigraphically.

## 2. Relations to Thrace

Among the literary sources that are important to both direct and indirect relationships of Antonia Tryphaina to Thrace, the two most commonly cited passages are:

1. Strabo 12.3.29: “The Tibareni and Chaldaens as far as Colchis and Pharnacia and Trapezus are ruled by Pythodoris, a woman of discretion and a capacity to manage matters. She is the daughter of Pythodoros of Tralles; she became the wife of Polemo and ruled jointly with him for a period; then she succeeded to power when he died among the so-called Aspurgiani, the barbarians around Sindike. By Polemo she has two sons and a daughter, who was given in marriage to Cotys the Sapaean, but was widowed upon his murder, having borne him children: the eldest now is dynast”.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>4</sup> BRAUND 2005, 260: “But Strabo’s noisy silence surely demonstrates that the notion that Pythodoris reveled in descent from Antony is misguided”. Cf. already DESSAU 1903, 692: “*Eodem modo cum de Pythodoride ageret Strabo et accurate exponerat de stirpe et gente eius (...), tacere non debuit, eam neptem fuisse Antonii triumviri. Non potuit ea res ignota esse Straboni*”. Similar H. H. Schmitt (RE XXIV 592): “Dem steht entgegen, daß eine so enge Verbindung des P. mit dem Triumvirn in dem ausführlichen Bericht des Strabon nicht erwähnt wird und daß von Folgen der Parteinahme des P. nach Actium nichts bekannt ist”.

<sup>5</sup> See MOMMSEN 1872, 271: “*Quae cum egregie conveniant cum titulo Smyrnaeo, nunc demum addiscimus Pythodoridem natam esse ex Antonia et ab hac ipsa Antonia generis splendorem potissimum proficisci. Aliter enim explicari nequit, quod et Antonia illa appellatur εύεργέτις agnomine regio et filia φιλομήτωρ (...)*”.

<sup>6</sup> RE XXIV 591.

<sup>7</sup> From trypháo = “to live luxuriant”; cf. (FRISK 1960, s.v. *thryptō*); (CHANTRAINE 1968, s.v. *thryptō*, with regard to PN *Trýphon*).

<sup>8</sup> IGR IV 144.

<sup>9</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 3433.

<sup>10</sup> LGPN IV 335 (five examples between 145 BC and 134 AD).

<sup>11</sup> LGPN VA 436 (35 examples, almost all from the imperial time).

<sup>12</sup> Τοὺς δὲ Τιβαρηνοὺς καὶ <τοὺς> Χαλδαίους μέχρι Κολχίδος καὶ Φαρνακίας καὶ Τραπεζοῦντος ἔχει Πυθοδώρις, γυνὴ σώφρων καὶ δυνατὴ προίστασθαι πραγμάτων. Ἔστι δὲ θυγάτηρ Πυθοδώρου τοῦ Τραλλιανοῦ, γυνὴ δ’ ἐγένετο Πολέμωνος καὶ συνεβασίλευσεν

2. Tacitus, *An.* 2.67.2: “He was accused in the senate by Cotys’ wife, and condemned to detention at a distance from his kingdom. Thrace was divided between his son Rhoemetaces, who was known to have opposed his father’s designs, and the children of Cotys. As these were not of mature age, they were put under the charge of Trebellenus Rufus, an ex-praetor, who was to manage the kingdom in the interregnum; a parallel from an earlier generation being the despatch of Marcus Lepidus to Egypt as the guardian of Ptolemy’s children”.<sup>13</sup>

The children that remain unnamed by Strabo and Tacitus were Rhoemetaces III, Polemo II, Cotys and Pythodoris Minor. The oldest was – as becomes clear from the enumeration in an honorary inscription of Cyzicus – Rhoemetaces III, which, at his time, already Dittenberger noticed correctly.<sup>14</sup> Therefore, *δυναστεύει* is just to be associated with Rhoemetaces III, who ruled around AD 20, under the supervision of some representatives of the Roman administration. This interpretation has been doubted by R. S. Sullivan, who draws attention to Tacitus phrase “*iisque nondum adultis*”.<sup>15</sup> But this argument carries little weight in light of the important parallel that the historiographer added, and which remained unnoticed by Sullivan. Five-year-old Ptolemy VI Philometor officially ruled from 181 BC as a ward of his mother and of M. Aemilius Lepidus. As for Rhoemetaces III, his elevated position is confirmed, in my opinion, by two dedicatory inscriptions.

1. IGBulg I<sup>2</sup> 399<sup>16</sup> (Apollonia, 19 AD): [Ἀπόλλωνι Ἰητρῶι | ὑπὲρ τῆς Ροιμη|ταλκου] βασιλέ|ως Κοτ]υος κα|ι | βασιλ|έως Ροι|μητα]λκου υἱ|ω|νου κ]αὶ Πυθο[δω]ρίδος β]ασιλέω[ς] | [Ροιμη]ταλκου | [βασιλέ]ως Πολ[έ]μωνος δ]ὲ θυγατ[ρι]δῆς υἱ]ίας καὶ σ[ω]τηρία]ς εὐξάμ[ε]νος Λ]οῦκος | Ἀ[ντῶ]νιος Ζ]ήνων.<sup>17</sup>

ἐκείνω χρόνον τινά, εἶτα διεδέξατο τὴν ἀρχήν, τελευτήσαντος ἐν τοῖς Ἀσπουργιανοῖς καλουμένοις τῶν περὶ τὴν Σινδικὴν βαρβάρων-δουεῖν δ’ ἐκ τοῦ Πολέμωνος ὄντων υἱῶν καὶ θυγατρὸς, ἡ μὲν ἐδόθη Κότυϊ τῷ Σαπαίω, δολοφονηθέντος δὲ ἐχίρευσε, παῖδας ἔχουσα ἐξ αὐτοῦ δυναστεύει δ’ ὁ πρεσβύτατος αὐτῶν (Transl. by BRAUND 2005, 256), with exception of παῖδας ἔχουσα ἐξ αὐτοῦ-δυναστεύει δ’ ὁ πρεσβύτατος αὐτῶν, which B. translates as ... having borne him two children: the elder now is dynast. Evidently B. has confused the superlative πρεσβύτατος with the comparative πρεσβύτερος.

<sup>13</sup> *Accusatus in senatu ab uxore Cotyis, damnatur ut procul regno teneretur. Thraecia in Rhoemetalcen, filium, quem paternis consiliis adversatum constabat, inque liberos Cotyis diuiditur; iisque nondum adultis, Trebellenus Rufus, praetura functus, datur, qui regnum interim tractaret, exemplo quo maiores M. Lepidum Ptolemaei liberis tutorem in Aegyptum miserant* (translation after the Loeb Classical Library edition of Tacitus, 1931).

<sup>14</sup> Ad Syll.<sup>3</sup> 798 (= IGR IV 145), n. 8.

<sup>15</sup> SULLIVAN 1979A, 10, n. 14: “WHEN STRABO REMARKS (12.3.29.556) OF THE CHILDREN OF POLEMO’S MOTHER, ANTONIA TRYPHAENA, THAT ... *δυναστεύει* ... ὁ πρεσβύτατος αὐτῶν, the possibility of this being the dynast of Olba immediately springs to mind, since Polemo’s brother Rhoemetaces III is known from Tac. Ann. 2.67 to be too young for kingship in A.D. 19; *iisque [liberis Coty (i)s] nondum adultis (...)*”.

<sup>16</sup> Vgl. SEURE 1904, 214; SAPRYKIN 1993, 33.

<sup>17</sup> My translation: “Lucius Antonius Zenon has vowed to Apollon Ietros for the health and salvation of Rhoemetaces, (son) of King Cotys and grandson

2. IGR I 777 (Βιζύη / Selymbria, 21 n. Chr.): Θεῶι ἀγίωι ὑψίστωι | ὑπὲρ τῆς Ροιμη|τάλκου καὶ Πυθο|δωρίδος ἐκ τῶν κα|τὰ τὸν Κοιλα[λ]ητικὸν | πόλεμον κινδύνου | σωτηρίας εὐξάμενος | καὶ ἐπιτυχῶν Γάιος |<sup>8</sup>Ίούλιος Πρὸκ (λ)ος χαρισ[τ]ήριον.<sup>18</sup>

Before we can draw on these inscriptions for our historical reconstruction, we have to introduce the persons mentioned and explain how they were related. Most of my predecessors – including such authorities as G. Mihailov and R. S. Sullivan – came to the conclusion that this evidence relates to Rhoemetaces II, son of Rhescuporis III, as well as his Spouse Pythodoris. Mihailov and Sullivan are both surprised about the absence of the father's name, which is a plausible way to follow from the perspective of a modern epigraphist: “*Ergo is, qui inscriptionem composuit, duo nomina facinore coniuncta inscribere consulto effugit: Rhascuporis (II) pater Rhoemetalcae (II) occidit Cotyn (III) patrem Pythodoris et ipse paululum post id facinus a Tiberio Alexandriae interfectus est*”.<sup>19</sup> With all due respect to the learned editor of the “*Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgaria repertae*”, I rather agree with the recent opinion of S. Ju. Saprykin – in both cases we are dealing with two of the four children of Cotys VIII and Antonia Tryphaina.<sup>20</sup> According to A. Ceylan and T. Ritti,<sup>21</sup> followed by Saprykin, Lucius Antonius Zenon was the grandson<sup>22</sup> of Antonius Zenon, the less prominent brother of Polemon I. Based on almost the same epigraphic sources, V. P. Yailenko<sup>23</sup> and recently (without knowledge of the work of Yailenko) P. J. Thonemann<sup>24</sup> tried to demonstrate that Lucius Antonius Zenon was a great-grandson of Polemo I. But as the father of Lucius Antonius Zenon – one M. Antonius Polemo – already in the year 5 BC acted as minting official in Laodicea, and as his father was, in the opinion of Thonemann, the third child of Polemon I and Pythodoris, qualified as an *ιδιώτης* by Strabo, the English researcher develops his argument *ad absurdum* with the following conclusion: “(...) the marriage of Polemo I and Pythodoris can hardly be dated any later than 30 B.C. His marriage to Dynamis was hence bigamous”.<sup>25</sup> I will discuss Thonemann's view later in my paper.

For now I would like to briefly focus on the dedicatory inscriptions of Apollonia and Βιζύη / Selymbria. Probably Zenon is a close relative and quite possible the tutor of Antonia Tryphaina's children. βασιλέως Κοτυος I see as a reference to Rhoemetaces' father Cotys VIII<sup>26</sup> and not to his grandfather Cotys VII<sup>27</sup>. By βασιλέως Ροιμηταλκου the famous grandfather Rhoemetaces I is meant. And since the inscription of Βιζύη was composed by a proud member of the

of King Rhoemetaces, and of Pythodoris, granddaughter of king Rhoemetaces and of king Polemon”.

<sup>18</sup> My translation: “Gaius Julius Proclus has vowed to the Highest God, the holy one, for the rescue of Rhoemetaces and Pythodoris from danger during the war against the Koilaleti”.

<sup>19</sup> Ad IGBulg I<sup>2</sup>, p. 367.

<sup>20</sup> SAPRYKIN 1993, 32–33. Similarly, expressed earlier, KALINKA/BORMANN/DOBRUSKÝ 1906, 142–143.

<sup>21</sup> CEYLAN/RITTI 1987, with Stemma on page 93.

<sup>22</sup> At SAPRYKIN 1993, with Stemma on page 28, the great-grandson.

<sup>23</sup> YAILENKO 1981.

<sup>24</sup> THONEMANN 2004.

<sup>25</sup> THONEMANN 2004, 148.

<sup>26</sup> As earlier SEURE 1904, 214 and SAPRYKIN 1993, 33.

<sup>27</sup> As Mihailov, ad IGBulg I<sup>2</sup>, S. 367 and SULLIVAN 1979b, 197.

Zenonids,<sup>28</sup> it would be quite reasonable that also the likewise famous grandfather of Rhoemetaces III and Pythodoris II, Polemo I, is mentioned. Whether Gaius Julius Proclus was another tutor of the children of Tryphaena has to remain no more than a hypothesis until new sources confirm or contradict it. More importantly, Rhoemetaces reappears without dynastic title which, in my opinion, weakens even more the traditional reconstruction of Mommsen, Dessau, Mihailov, Sullivan, and many others. If Strabo, who was a friend of Pythodoris Maior, claims that Rhoemetaces III governed in 20 AD (δυναστεύει δ' ὁ πρεσβύτατος αὐτῶν), the two representatives of the Roman administration, namely Lucius Antonius Zenon and Gaius Julius Proclus, are simply pragmatic in their dedications not mentioning Rhoemetaces as dynast.

### 3. Relations to the Kingdoms of Pontus and Bosporus

The relationships of Antonia Tryphaina with the kingdoms of Pontus and Bosporus turn to be an aspect of even greater complexity. However, one thing is certain – thanks to Strabo and especially thanks to some honorary inscriptions from Cyzicus<sup>29</sup> –, she is the daughter of the King Polemo I and Queen Pythodoris Maior, and herself mother of king Polemo II. The numismatic evidence confirms – as U. Kahrstedt rightly remarked previously – her position as a custodian of her son Polemo II before AD 38,<sup>30</sup> when Polemo received “the paternal kingdom” from Gaius Caligula. The succession of Antonia after the death of her mother remains a controversial issue.

If we accept the argumentation of H. R. Baldus, the coinage of Pythodoris is dated around AD 30 to 33 (her early 60s), thus her death being dated around the year AD 33.<sup>31</sup> Apparently, Thonemann overlooked this detail, as he dates Pythodoris' marriage to Polemo I no later than 30 BC. In addition, I would like to remark the fact that Strabo would hardly have used the phrase χρόνον τινά to refer to a possible marriage lasting for more than 20 years.

A passage from the Roman History Cassius Dio (59.12.2) aroused even more controversy among modern exegetes: “Meanwhile, he (Caligula) granted to Sohaemus the land of the Ituraean Arabians, to Cotys Lesser Armenia and later also parts of Arabia, to Rhoemetaces the possessions of Cotys, and to Polemo the son of Polemo his ancestral domain, all on the vote of the Senate”.<sup>32</sup>

It remains controversial, whether πατρώαν ἀρχήν meant Pontos, Pontos and Bosporus or even Lycaonia and Cilicia Tracheia.<sup>33</sup> Not controversial, however, has until recently

<sup>28</sup> Cf. IGR 1436, l. 1: [e.g. τὸν ἀπὸ προγόνων βασιλ]έων, τετραρχῶ[v --]. See also SAPRYKIN 1993, 26; THONEMANN 2004, 146.

<sup>29</sup> IGR IV 144–146.

<sup>30</sup> KAHRSTEDT 1903, 302.

<sup>31</sup> BALDUS 1983, 542.

<sup>32</sup> “Ἐν δὲ τούτῳ Σοσίμῳ μὲν τὴν τῶν Ἰτουραίων τῶν Ἀράβων, Κότυι δὲ τὴν τε Ἀρμενίαν τὴν μικροτέραν καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο καὶ τῆς Ἀραβίας τινά, τῷ τε Ῥυμητάλκῳ τὰ τοῦ Κότυος καὶ Πολέμωνι τῷ τοῦ Πολέμωνος υἱεὶ τὴν πατρώαν ἀρχήν, ψηφισαμένης δὴ τῆς βουλῆς, ἐχαρίσατο (Transl. by THONEMANN 2004, 144).

<sup>33</sup> For this discussion on this aspect see BARRETT 1977; cf. recently VINOGRADOV 1997; YAILENKO 2010, 264–266.

been that Cassius Dio is incorrect in regard to the family relations: Polemo II was the grandson and not the son of Polemo I. But P. J. Thonemann has now chosen to defend the historiographer. In his opinion it is not a mistake of Dio, but his perspicacity – so Dio wanted to distinguish the Polemo, son of Polemo I. (ιδιώτης by Strabo) from Polemo II.<sup>34</sup> When trying to reconstruct the genealogy of Lucius Antonius Zenon based only on four inscriptions, Thonemann does not seem to be aware, among other important aspects, of a well-known honorary degree of Cyzicus.

Syll.<sup>3</sup> 798<sub>3-7</sub> = IGR IV 145, Z. 3–7: [- - -] ὁ νέος Ἥλιος Γάιος Καῖσαρ Σεβαστὸς Γερμανικὸς [- - -] τοὺς Κότυος δὲ παῖδας Ῥομητάλικην καὶ Πολέμωνα καὶ Κότυν [- - -] εἰς τὰς ἑκ πα[τέρ]ων καὶ προγόνων αὐτοῖς ὀφειλομένης ἀποκαθέστακεν βασιλείας.<sup>35</sup>

For me, as it was for many of my predecessors,<sup>36</sup> the two Polemones (...) are undoubtedly names referring to the same person. Both sources refer to the grandson and not the son of Polemo I. Yet if we mean by πατρῶν ἀρχὴν Pontus and Bosphorus, we have another problem. Given that coins were issued continuously under the successors of Aspurgos – Gepaiyris and Mithridates III. – from 37 to 42 AD, Polemo II could not be ruler of the Bosphorus during the same period.<sup>37</sup> Starting with V. V. Latyshev and A. V. Oreshnikov particularly Russian researchers were eagerly looking for a solution to this apparent contradiction between the literary and numismatic evidence. For reasons of space, I confine myself to the one remarkable argument of Ju. G. Vinogradov<sup>38</sup> for the presence of Polemon II in the Bosphorus: the Chersonesians sent an auxiliary unit to King Polemon and to the commander of Moesia, most probably in the reign of Caligula rather than that of Nero<sup>39</sup>, and to the Bosphoran area rather than to Armenia.

While I agree so far with Vinogradov, I see no reason to consider the Bosphoran regent Gepaiyris as a sister of Polemo II,<sup>40</sup> an idea first formulated by M. I. Rostovtzeff.<sup>41</sup> Based on the seeming similarity between the portraits of Antonia Tryphaina and Gepaiyris on the coins, the Russian scholar argued that Gepaiyris was Antonia's daughter. Thanks to the authority of Rostovtzeff, the idea has been widely accepted and is now the *opinio communis*. The only exception, as far as I know, is S. Ju. Saprykin, who regards Gepaiyris as sister, not daughter, of Cotys VIII.<sup>42</sup> Although ultimate prove is likewise missing for the latter view, I find it much more plausible. If she were a daughter of Antonia Tryphaina, then Gepaiyris could not have been born earlier

<sup>34</sup> THONEMANN 2004, 149.

<sup>35</sup> My translation: "The New Helios Gaius Caesar Augustus Germanicus provided the sons of Cotys – Rhoimetalces, Polemon and Cotys – to the government of kingdoms that were rightfully their fathers and ancestors".

<sup>36</sup> See for example VINOGRADOV 1997, 566.

<sup>37</sup> On the subject, see recently FROLOVA/IRELAND 2002, 70–74; cf. MACDONALD 2005, 62–64.

<sup>38</sup> VINOGRADOV 1997.

<sup>39</sup> SAPRYKIN 1993, 34–42; cf. SAPRYKIN 2002, 239–240.

<sup>40</sup> VINOGRADOV 1997, 569. Similar at MACDONALD 2005, 62: "Polemo II took control of Pontus but never ruled in Bosphorus, where Gepaiyris, Aspurgus' queen and Polemo II's sister, ruled directly for a short period".

<sup>41</sup> ROSTOVZEFF 1919.

<sup>42</sup> SAPRYKIN 2002, 242. Cf. SAPRYKIN 1993, 46, with Stemma.

than AD 13. But many scholars believe that she married the Bosphoran king Aspurgos around the same year. Apparently, the two views are incompatible. Further to be considered is that, when Aspurgos died by AD 37, his wife remained behind with two grown-up sons – Mithridates and Cotys –, who were about the same age as Polemo II.

Towards on the relationship of Antonia Tryphaena to the Bosphorus, I would like to call the attention to another *malum discordiae*. There are, in my opinion, no serious arguments against dating the marriage of Polemo I. and Pythodoris to 13/2 BC, when the groom was king of Pontus and the Bosphorus. Not much later, he was killed by the so-called Aspurgianoi in or around 9/8 BC, as we know from Strabo. Thus, the birth of Antonia is to be expected during this period and not in the year 15 BC.<sup>43</sup> In addition to this, Dio Cassius (54, 24, 4–6) reports not only a victory of Polemon over the Bosphorani for the year 14 BC, but also that Dynamis was his wife with the approval of Augustus.

Neither literary nor numismatic data shed light on the further fate of the Dynamis. Therefore, following the conclusion of scholars such as N. A. Frolova and S. Ju. Saprykin, Dynamis could have died soon after 14 BC when Polemon was still alive.<sup>44</sup> However, this opinion is not supported by other experts of the Bosphorus, such as V. A. Anokhin or V. P. Yailenko, who prefer to follow a much earlier hypothesis of M. I. Rostovtzeff. According to this hypothesis, Dynamis has fought against Polemon I after her separation from him. Then she reigned again from 8 BC to AD 7/8.<sup>45</sup> The only problem is that the coinage of this period – with the possible exception of a monogram (ΔM)<sup>46</sup> – can hardly be ascribed to Dynamis. In their book on the coinage of the Bosphoran Kingdom from 1<sup>st</sup> century BC to the middle of the 1<sup>st</sup> century AD, Frolova and Ireland call the period from 9/8 BC to 13 AD "the period of 'uncertain rulers', with a coinage characterised by monograms and the imperial head". At the same time, these authors rightly remark, "However, the question of the date when Panticapaeum and Phanagoria were renamed remains to be resolved".<sup>47</sup>

Against this problematic background, a more recent hypothesis on the Ara Pacis, put forward by the American researcher Ch. B. Rose<sup>48</sup> and developed further by the Russian colleague V. N. Parfenov<sup>49</sup> is of a particular importance. Rose suggested that the woman with the child on the South Frieze of the Ara Pacis must be the Bosphoran ruler Dynamis with her son,<sup>50</sup> along with Agrippa who arrived in 13 BC in

<sup>43</sup> For a discussion, with the literature, see recent COJOCARU 2012, 127.

<sup>44</sup> FROLOVA/IRELAND 2002, 7: "(...) the alternative scenario of the queen's death shortly after the accession of Polemo in 15/14 BC, followed by Polemo's marriage to Pythodoris in 12 BC becomes a far more satisfactory interpretation of events". Cf. SAPRYKIN 2002, 98–124, with a much more detailed, but also much more speculative discussion. For reasons of space I cannot go into details at this point.

<sup>45</sup> See a recent discussion, with previous literature YAILENKO 2010, especially 234–240.

<sup>46</sup> YAILENKO 2010, 232–234, with literature. Cf. earlier ANOCHIN 1999, 131 for identification with Dynamis; FROLOVA/IRELAND 2002, 62–63, against an identification with Dynamis. SAPRYKIN 2002, 99–101 transcribed the monograms as ΔYM and talks about a dynast who could be in kinship with Dynamis.

<sup>47</sup> FROLOVA/IRELAND 2002, 7.

<sup>48</sup> ROSE 1990, here 455–459, The Barbarian on the South Frieze.

<sup>49</sup> PARFENOV 1996.

<sup>50</sup> Aspurgos at Rose; an unknown son of Scribonius at Parfenov.

Rome. „Ganz offenkundig“ – Parfenov writes – „darf man als starkes Indiz für den Aufenthalt der Dynamis in Rom die von ihr in Pantikapaion, Phanagoreia und Hermonassa errichteten Augustus- und Liviastatuen ansehen (CIRB 38, 978, 1046)“.<sup>51</sup> I am aware of the fact that most Russian colleagues might consider this hypothesis a heresy. It is not my task to bring at this point new arguments supporting or disagreeing with the suggestion of Rose and Parfenov. I would just like to underline that the remarkable iconographic analysis by Rose, in conjunction with other observations by Parfenov, would certainly be worth a broader discussion also in Russian historiography.<sup>52</sup>

## Concluding Remarks

As the daughter of Polemon I and through him granddaughter of the rhetorician Zenon from Laodicea,<sup>53</sup> Antonia Tryphaena represented the outgoing Hellenistic tradition in Asia Minor. At the same time, as a relative of the Roman imperial family through maternal line, she was ideally suited to serve as an *amica populi Romani* for an increasingly aggressive border policy of the Emperor in the Eastern Anatolian and Pontic areas. Even her father, whom Antony had made king of Pontus in 37/6 BC, was acknowledged as an *amicus et socius populi Romani* by Augustus in 26 BC.<sup>54</sup> In 14 BC he was still king of the Bosphorus. In 12 BC he married Pythodoris, daughter of Pythodoros of Tralles and granddaughter of M. Antonius. When Polemon died, Pythodoris became ruler in the Pontic kingdom.<sup>55</sup> Her second husband was Archelaus, king of Cappadocia, whom she married in AD 2/3 without the consent of Rome. The same must be assumed for the marriage of Antonia with the Thracian king Cotys VIII in AD 12/3. Thanks to her maternal descent from Rome, Antonia Tryphaena could place her children in the house of Livia Drusilla after the assassination of Cotys VIII, where they were brought up together with the young Caligula. Later, as a widow, she settled down in Cyzicus. This was not out of sentimental reasons, such as S. Ju. Saprykin thinks without paying attention to the former relations with the Thracian royal family,<sup>56</sup> but rather because of the location of this city, from which Rome, Thrace and Pontus were in easy reach. By 38/9 AD, she was honoured by the citizens of Cyzicus as a king's daughter, Queen and Mother of Kings due to her *pietas* towards the imperial house.<sup>57</sup> After the *consecratio* of Iulia Drusilla on 23 September (?) 38,<sup>58</sup> Tryphaena is attested in Cyzicus as her priestess.<sup>59</sup> The year of her own death is entirely obscure. The date of AD 49<sup>60</sup> is based on the assumption that the coinage of Polemon II as sole ruler from 49/50

presupposes his mother's death.<sup>61</sup> Later, a "Tryphaena of Cyzicus" was venerated as a Christian saint. Whether this legendary Christian aspect is linked to the memory of Tryphaena and her benefactions to the citizens of Cyzicus or is an allusion to her son's Polemon conversion to Judaism, remains an open ground for speculations.

## References:

- ANOCHIN 1999  
Anochin, V. A., *Istoriya Bospora Kimmeriiskogo* (Kiev: Odigitriya Numizmatika).
- BALDUS 1983  
Baldus, H. R., Die Daten von Münzprägung und Tod der Königin Pythodoris von Pontus, *Chiron* 13, 537–543.
- BARRETT 1977  
Barrett, A. A., Gaius' Policy in the Bosphorus, *TAPhA* 107, 1–9.
- BRAUND 2005  
Braund, D., Polemo, Pythodoris and Strabo. Friends of Rome in the Black Sea Region. In A. Coşkun, [et al.] (eds.), *Roms auswärtige Freunde in der späten Republik und im frühen Prinzipat* (Göttingen: Duehrkohp & Radicke), 253–270.
- CEYLAN/RITTI 1987  
Ceylan, A./ Ritti, T., L. Antonius Zenon, *Epigraphica* 49, 77–98.
- CHANTRAINE 1968  
CHANTRAINE, P., *DICTIONNAIRE ÉTYMOLOGIQUE DE LA LANGUE GRECQUE: HISTOIRE DES MOTS*, vol. I (Paris: Klincksieck).
- COJOCARU 2012  
Cojocaru, V., Antonia Tryphaina, *Pontica* 45, 119–134.
- DESSAU 1903  
Dessau, H., Mischellanea Epigraphica, I. De Regina Pythodoride et de Pythodoride Iuniore, *Ephemeris Epigraphica* 9, 691–696.
- FRISK 1960  
Frisk, H., *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. vol. I (Heidelberg: C. Winter).
- FROLOVA/IRELAND 2002  
Frolova, N. A./ Ireland, S., *The coinage of the Bosporan kingdom from the first century B.C. to the middle of the first century A.D.* [BAR international series, 1102] (Oxford: Archaeopress).
- HANSLIK 1964  
Hanslik, R., A (ntonia) Tryphaena. In *Der Kleine Pauly*, vol. 1 (Stuttgart: Druckemüller).
- KALINKA/BORMANN/DOBRUSKÝ 1906  
Kalinka, E./ Bormann, E./ Dobruský, V., *Antike Denkmäler in Bulgarien* (Wien: A. Hölder).
- KAHRSTEDT 1903  
Kahrstedt, U., Frauen auf antiken Münzen, *Klio* 10, 261–314.
- KIENAST 1996  
Kienast, D., *Römische Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*<sup>2</sup> (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft).
- LIGHTMAN/LIGHTMAN 2000  
Lightman, M./ Lightman, B., *Biographical Dictionary of Greek and Roman Women: Notable Women from Sappho to Helena* (New York: Facts On File).
- MACDONALD 2005  
MacDonald, D. J., *An Introduction to the History and Coinage of the Kingdom of the Bosphorus: Including the Coinage of Panticapaeum (with "Apollonia" and "Myrmecium"), Phanagoria, Gorgippia, Sindicus Limen or the Sindoi, Nymphaeum, Theodosia, and the Kings of the Cimmerian Bosphorus* (Lancaster: Classical Numismatics Group).

<sup>51</sup> PARFENOV 1996, 102.

<sup>52</sup> SAPRYKIN 2002, 98–99 argues against the view expressed by Rose and Parfenov hypothesis unfortunately scarce and unconvincing.

<sup>53</sup> See Strabo (11, 8, 16). Cf. a recent discussion at COJOCARU 2012, with Stemma.

<sup>54</sup> See Cassus Dio (53, 25, 1).

<sup>55</sup> Strabo (11, 2, 18); cf. MAREK 1993, 52, with the literature.

<sup>56</sup> SAPRYKIN 1995, 201.

<sup>57</sup> Syll.<sup>3</sup> 798; IGR IV 147.

<sup>58</sup> KIENAST 1996, 87.

<sup>59</sup> Syll.<sup>3</sup> 798, l. 12–13.

<sup>60</sup> SAPRYKIN 1993, 38); cf. SAPRYKIN 1995, 202; cf. also [http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Antonia\\_Tryphaina](http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Antonia_Tryphaina)

<sup>61</sup> The year 55 has been suggested with no serious arguments: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Antonia\\_Tryphaena](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Antonia_Tryphaena)

- MAREK 1993  
Marek, Chr., *Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia* (Tübingen: E. Wasmuth).
- MOMMSEN 1872  
Mommsen, Th., *Observationes Epigraphicae XIII. De titulo reginae Pythodoridis Smyrnaeo*, *Ephemeris Epigraphica* 1, 270–276.
- PARFENOV 1996  
Parfenov, V. N., *Dynamis, Agripa und der Friedensaltar. Zur militärischen und politischen Geschichte des Bosporianischen Reiches nach Asandros*, *Historia* 45, 95–103.
- ROSE 1990  
Rose, Ch. B., “Princes” and Barbarians on the Ara Pacis, *AJA* 94, 453–467.
- ROSTOVZEFF 1919  
Rostovtzeff, M., *Queen Dynamis of Bosphorus*, *JHS* 39, 88–109.
- SAPRYKIN 1993  
Saprykin, S. Ju., *Iz istorii pontijskogo carstva Polemonidov (po dannym epigrafiki)*, *VDI* (2), 25–49.
- SAPRYKIN 1995  
Saprykin, S. Ju., *Zhenshchiny-pravitel'nicy Pontiiskogo i Bosporskogo tsarstva (Dinamia, Piphodorida, Antoniya Trifena)*. In Marinovič, L. P. / Saprykin, S. Ju. (eds.), *Zhenshchina v antichnom mire: Zhenshchina v antichnom mire: sbornik statei* (Moscow: Nauka), 181–203.
- SAPRYKIN 2002  
Saprykin, S. Ju., *Bosporskoe tsarstvo na rubezhe dvukh epokh* (Moscow: nauka).
- SEURE 1904  
Seure, G., *Les derniers souverains thraces: Rhoemetalcès et Pythodoris*, *REA* 6, 212–218.
- SULLIVAN 1979A  
SULLIVAN, R. D., *KING MARCUS ANTONIUS POLEMO*, *NC* 7/19, 6–20.
- SULLIVAN 1979B  
Sullivan, R. D., *Thrace in the Eastern Dynastic Network*. In *ANRW* II 7.1, 186–211.
- SULLIVAN 1980  
Sullivan, R.D., *Dynasts in Pontus*, *ANRW* II 7.2, 913–930.
- THONEMANN 2004  
Thonemann, P.J., *Polemo, Son of Polemo*, *EA* 37, 144–149.
- YAILENKO 1981  
Yailenko, V. P., *Polemon, tsar' Armenii*, *Istoriko-filologicheskij zhurnal* 1, 168–178.
- YAILENKO 2010  
Yailenko, V. P., *Dinasticheskaya istoriya Bospora ot Mitridata Evpatora do Kotisa I*. In Yailenko, V. P. (ed.), *Tsyacheletnii Bosporskii Reich. Istoriya i epigrafika Bospora VI v. do n.e. – V v. n. e.* (Moscow: Nauka), 232–266.
- VINOGRADOV 1997  
Vinogradov, Ju. G., *Polemon, Chersones und Rom*. In Vinogradov, Ju. G./ Heinen, H. (eds.), *Pontische Studien: kleine Schriften zur Geschichte und Epigraphik des Schwarzmeerraumes* (Mainz: von Zabern), 563–576.
- VON ROHDEN 1894  
von Rohden, P., *s.v. Antonia Tryphaena* [130], *RE* 1.2, 2641–2642.