

# Memnon and Mentor of Rhodes in the Troad<sup>1</sup>

ANEURIN ELLIS-EVANS

[PLATES 00-00]

*Abstract.* This article presents a small hoard group from the Troad which appeared on the London market in February 2016. The hoard group can be dated to the mid-350s when Memnon and Mentor of Rhodes were ruling the Troad on behalf of the Persian authorities. It therefore provides a much-needed fixed point in the chronology of Troad coinages which allows us to re-date a number of other 4<sup>th</sup> century silver coinages from the Troad to the 350s/340s, thus producing a new picture of the region's minting activity in this period. The hoard group contains one example of a rare anepigraphic series depicting an archaic cult statue of Athena Ilias on the reverse. This and other numismatic depictions of this cult statue can now be placed in the context of Memnon and Mentor's rule of the Troad and provide an important precedent for the Hellenistic and Imperial-era koinon of Athena Ilias as an expression of regional identity.

## 1. Introduction

It used to be thought that the inhabitants of Asia Minor suffered greatly under the two centuries of Persian rule. Stripped of their political freedom and placed under a crushing burden of taxation, they bore the cruel and autocratic rule of the Achaemenids for the most part patiently until they were finally liberated by Alexander the Great in 334/3. However, over the last forty years the work of Pierre Briant and many others has prompted a wholesale re-evaluation of this picture. One of the most characteristic features of the Achaemenid approach to empire is now seen to be its extensive collaboration with local elites and its choice to delegate even some of the most fundamental of imperial administrative tasks, such as collecting taxes and levying troops, to these local collaborators.<sup>2</sup> Paradoxically, therefore, the power of the Achaemenid empire can seem at once remarkably strong and incredibly weak – strong wherever the king and his satraps were (at a royal or satrapal capital, on campaign with the army), weak wherever they were not (the rest of the empire's vast territorial extent). Put into the terms formulated by the sociologist Michael Mann, the Achaemenid empire was strong in *despotic* power ('the range of actions which the

<sup>1</sup> During the long gestation of this article I have benefited greatly from discussing my arguments with Richard Ashton, Philip Kinns, Jonathan Kagan, Andrew Meadows, François de Callataÿ, Peter van Alfen, and Jack Kroll. I am particularly grateful to Ute Wartenberg for her help with the photos, to Aliye Erol-Özdizbay for providing photos of SNG Turkey 9.825-7, and to Maria Rosa Figueiredo (Calouste Gulbenkian Museum, Lisbon) and Bernhard Weisser (Münzkabinett, Berlin) for help with coins in their collections and permission to illustrate them here.

<sup>2</sup> See above all the synthesis of Briant 2002, the essay collections of Briant 1982 and Briant 2017, and the volumes in the *Achaemenid History Workshop* series (1987-1994).

elite is empowered to undertake without routine, institutionalised negotiation with civil society groups'), but weak in *infrastructural* power ('the capacity of the state to actually penetrate civil society, and to implement logistically political decisions throughout the realm').<sup>3</sup> In other words, the kind of power with which the institutions of the Achaemenid state invested the Great King meant that he found it significantly easier to execute his subjects than to make them pay their taxes (i.e. to impose his will unilaterally on his subjects than to make them cooperate willingly with the demands of the state). Insofar as the Great King had access to infrastructural power, it was in the hands of the relatively autonomous local elites whose collaboration with the imperial centre was thus vital to its continued survival.<sup>4</sup>

Although the evidence of coinage has not received much attention in these debates so far, it deserves to do so. The Achaemenid empire habitually incurred considerable military expenses in the process of expanding its territory, defending its borders, and putting down revolts. When these expenses were incurred in the far western provinces of the empire, the troops who were levied needed to be paid in coinage. Some of these expenses will have been met with royal sigloi (whose production, however, mostly came to an end in the early 4<sup>th</sup> century), others by the occasional so-called 'satrapal' coinages. However, it is relatively clear that these coinages would not have been sufficient on their own to satisfy demand, especially in the 4<sup>th</sup> century when the sigloi were no longer being produced *en masse*.<sup>5</sup> The Achaemenid empire must have met its need for coinage somehow, and given its weakness in infrastructural power and its consequent tendency to delegate key administrative tasks to local elites, there is a *prima facie* case for assuming that cities were periodically co-opted into providing this service (indeed, a request to produce a certain amount of coinage in lieu of tribute would be formally indistinguishable from the many other in-kind tribute arrangements which the Persians established). The process by which the Persian authorities directed local elites to produce the coinage which they needed to fund their military expenditure perfectly illustrates many of the key characteristics of the Achaemenid style of rule – the delegation of key administrative tasks to subject communities and their institutions; the co-option of local experts to navigate unfamiliar cultural codes (in this case, the intricacies of weight standards, coin denominations, and type design which made up the 'language' of Greek coinage and with which ethnic Persians were presumably unfamiliar); and the decision to make such extensive use of coins with civic types rather than taking this opportunity to make Persian rule iconographically visible, in sharp contrast to later Seleukid practice (an example of the Achaemenid empire's 'chameleon imperialism').

Given what we know about how the Achaemenid state operated, it should now be relatively uncontroversial to assert that there existed coinages in Persian-controlled Asia Minor which were produced at civic mints and bore civic types, but either would not have existed or would not have existed in the form that we have them without

<sup>3</sup> Mann 1984, quotations at pp. 188-9.

<sup>4</sup> For a thoroughgoing application of these ideas to the contrasting approaches of the Seleukid and Attalid states to ruling Asia Minor see Thonemann 2013, esp. pp. 46-7.

<sup>5</sup> For overviews see Meadows 2005 and Alram 2012, and for the hoard evidence for the chronology of siglos production Carradice 1987.

the involvement of the Persian authorities. Much more problematic, however, is the task of reliably identifying which these coinages are and the extent of Persian involvement in each case. For example, in a forthcoming paper arguing that much of the minting activity of Pamphylia and Cilicia in the Classical period was directed by the Persian authorities and therefore does not reflect civic spending, François de Callatay has constructed a list of no fewer than fourteen criteria which cumulatively make his case. It is particularly worth noting that a large number of his criteria take on significance only when these coinages are studied at a regional level and a pattern of supra-civic co-ordination over the entire area becomes apparent.<sup>6</sup>

Fortunately, we are now in a position to perform an analysis of just this sort on the coinages of the Troad thanks to the small hoard group which I present in Section 2 and to ongoing research I am conducting into the coinages of Lesbos, Troas, and Mysia which allows us to contextualize this hoard group properly. Sections 2-3 present the hoard group and provide a date for the coins it contains based on what we know about the careers of Memnon and Mentor of Rhodes who intermittently ruled the Troad on behalf of the Persians from the late 360s down to the Battle of the Granicus in May 334. Sections 4-5 then use this chronological fixed point to establish the dating significance of the weight standards and reverse incuse technique of 4<sup>th</sup> century coinages in the Troad. In turn, this allows us to re-date the other silver coinages of the Troad not included in the hoard group, and thus to produce a new picture of the monetary production of this region in the 4<sup>th</sup> century. Section 6 collects the evidence for depictions of the cult statue of Athena Ilias on coinages of the Troad which, based on Sections 3-5, can now be dated to the 350s and thus to the period of Memnon and Mentor's rule. Cumulatively, this provides us with a rich case study on the nature and impact of Persian rule in western Asia Minor in the decades immediately prior to Alexander the Great's conquest of the Persian Empire.

## 2. The Hoard Group

The following hoard group of 13 silver coins (**Plates 00-00**) was recorded on the London market in February 2016. At first sight, the coins appear to be in poor condition because of their corroded state. However, beneath the thick black encrustation which most still display, the types themselves remain sharp and show little sign of wear except in one case (**no. 13**). Despite being partially and rather roughly cleaned, enough of this thick black encrustation remains to indicate that all 13 coins once formed a hoard or part of one. The mints which can be identified in the hoard (Abydos, Assos, Lampsakos under Memnon, and Mytilene) are all located in and around the Troad, suggesting that this is a hoard of coins which had been circulating there, and therefore that the hoard itself may have been discovered in this region.

<sup>6</sup> 'Not civic but pseudo-civic: the abundant silver issues of double sigloi struck by Pamphylian and Cilician cities mainly for the Persians (c.460-333 BC)'. The paper was delivered at the *Coinage in Imperial Space* conference (Krakow, 28 June - 2 July 2017) and will be published in the proceedings. I am very grateful to François for sharing his paper with me in advance of publication.

**Abydos**

*Obv.* Laureate head of Apollo r.

*Rev.* Eagle l.; <LF> ABY (above), circle with four spokes (below); <RF> ΠΡΩΤΑΓΟΡΑΣ.<sup>7</sup>

1. 3.46g, 14mm, 1h

*Rev.* Eagle r.; <LF> ΙΚΕΣΙΟΣ, <RF> ABY.

2. 3.30g, 14mm, 6h

**Assos**

*Obv.* Head of Athena l. in crested Attic helmet decorated with laurel wreath.

*Rev.* Bull's head; around, ΑΣ-ΣΙ-ΟΝ; all within incuse square.

3. 3.38g, 14mm, 12h

4. 3.19g, 15mm, 7h

As last, but *Rev.* Ring through bull's nose, no incuse square.

5. 3.29g, 15mm, 6h

A preliminary die study which I have prepared of this series assigns **nos. 3-4** to O2 and **no. 5** to O6, the penultimate obverse die on what I will be terming the 'reduced Chian' standard (see Section 4) before we see the switch to the Persic standard.

**Anepigraphic Mint**

*Obv.* Head of Athena r. in crested Attic helmet decorated with laurel wreath.

*Rev.* Archaic cult statue of Athena Ilias l. on base, spear with fillets held over shoulder pointing downwards in r. hand, distaff in l., polos on head; <LF> rose.

6. 2.66g, 14mm, 12h (O1/R1)

The possible identity of this mint is discussed in Section 6 and a die study of the series is provided in Appendix 3.

**Lampsakos under Memnon**

*Obv.* Head of Helios l. on radiate solar disk.

*Rev.* Rose, buds on either side of stalk; <LF and RF> E-Y.

7. 3.11g, 14mm, 5h (O2/R9)

As last, but *Rev.* <LF and RF> M-E.

8. 3.28g, 14mm, 6h (O2/R12c)

9. 3.16g, 14mm, 12h (O17/R28)

10. 3.21g, 14mm, 5h (O12/R24d)

11. 2.89g, 14mm, 1h (O15/R27b)

<sup>7</sup> **No. 1** is the second known example of a coin issued by Protagoras with the types Apollo r./eagle l., circle with four spokes (the other is Peus 401 [3/11/2010] 358 = *SNG* von Aulock 7536 (3.44g, 6h, same dies). The two other combinations are (i) Apollo r./eagle r.; circle with four spokes (Chian standard; 4 known), and (ii) Apollo l./eagle l.; trident below in left field (Persic standard; 36 known). **No. 1** and the other coin with these types share an obverse die with two of the Chian-standard coins with the Apollo r./eagle r. types (Lucien de Hirsch 1466, 15mm, 1h, 3.63g, ex W.T. Ready, 1885; *CNG* EA 293 [19/12/2012] 94, 14mm, 11h, 3.51g). As will be argued in Section 4, the Chian-weight coins were probably minted in the 350s while the Persic-weight coins were produced in the 340s/330s, and so we may be dealing with two homonymous individuals. If these two magistrates are distinct, then the individual in *LGPN* VA s.v. no. 18 is the later of the two (*BMC* Troas, p. 4, nos. 31-2 referenced there are both of Persic weight).

As last, but *Rev.* <LF and RF> E-M (retrograde).

12. 3.40g, 15mm, 5h (O13/R26c)

A revised die study of this series is provided in Appendix 1.

### Mytilene

*Obv.* Head of Apollo r.

*Rev.* Female head r. in round incuse; <RF> MYT; <LF> uncertain symbol.

13. 1.33g, 11mm, 6h

### 3. The Date of the Hoard Group

The great benefit of this hoard group is that it combines a datable series (the drachms of Memnon) with a number of series which have hitherto been difficult to date precisely. The drachms of Memnon in the hoard show little wear, suggesting that they had not been in circulation for very long. Therefore, whatever we determine the date of this series to be will also not be long before the date at which the hoard was buried. In turn, because, with the exception of the somewhat worn coin of Mytilene (**no. 13**), the other coins in the hoard have the same limited amount of wear as the Memnon drachms, then the date at which these series were minted will be close to the date at which the Memnon drachms were produced.

In 2002 Richard Ashton identified the drachms with the Helios/rose types and the letters M-E, E-Y, and N-I as having been minted by the Rhodian brothers Memnon and Mentor who ruled the Troad on behalf of the Persian satrap Artabazos in the middle decades of the 4<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>8</sup> Previously, the Rhodian-like types of these coins had encouraged scholars to look for an origin in the territories controlled by Rhodes. However, among other arguments, Ashton noted that the known proveniences of the bronzes in this series, which we would not expect to travel far from the territory of their issuing authority, cluster in the Troad.<sup>9</sup> Since no plausible minting authorities can be found in the Troad whose names fit the letters M-E, E-Y, and N-I, Ashton has instead suggested that M-E stood for Memnon and/or Mentor, thus explaining the appearance of Rhodian types on a coinage minted in the Troad. Although E-Y and N-I remain unexplained, these letter combinations could easily begin personal names and presumably refer to subordinates of Memnon (whereas M-E is associated with 25 obverse dies, E-Y and N-I are associated, respectively, with only two obverse dies, of which one is shared with M-E, and one obverse die). The appearance of the present hoard group, which attests these drachms circulating with coinages of Lesbos and the Troad, further confirms the attribution of these coins to a mint in the region.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>8</sup> See Ashton 1990 for the initial die study and Ashton 2002 for the attribution to the Troad and further additions to the corpus. An updated die study is provided in Appendix 1. I am very grateful to Richard Ashton for generously lending me his index cards from the original study to help with this task.

<sup>9</sup> Ashton 2002, pp. 12-13.

<sup>10</sup> It is also worth noting the three examples in *SNG Turkey* 9.825-7 which come from a collection assembled only from coin dealers in the town of Burhaniye, a short distance south of ancient Adramyttion, and will therefore all have local proveniences.

Ashton has noted that Memnon and Mentor were active in the Troad from the 360s to the 340s/330s, but we can be more precise than this.<sup>11</sup> Memnon and Mentor had a sister (never named in the sources) who was married to the Persian nobleman Artabazos. As a result, when Artabazos was appointed satrap of Hellenistic Phrygia in 363/2, he brought the young brothers with him as part of his entourage and soon afterwards set them up in charge of the Troad.<sup>12</sup> Their period of rule began somewhat disastrously: after another Persian nobleman, Autophradates, arrested Artabazos in 360, they hired the mercenary forces of Charidemus of Oreos to defend the Troad only for Charidemus to turn on them and occupy the towns of Ilion, Kebren, and Skepsis. However, Artabazos was soon freed, and once he had regained access to the resources of the neighbouring satrapies he was quickly able to corner Charidemus in Ilion where he besieged him until Memnon and Mentor negotiated the mercenary commander's departure from the Troad.<sup>13</sup> We learn no more about what Memnon and Mentor were doing until 353/2, although as will become apparent we can make some educated guesses.<sup>14</sup>

At some point between the death of Artaxerxes II in winter 359/8 and 356, Artabazos went into revolt against the new king Artaxerxes III. In 356 he hired the forces of the Athenian general Chares, who happened to be close at hand while fighting the Social War, in order to defend himself against the satrapal armies massing to put down his revolt. With the help of Chares, Artabazos was able to defeat the first of the armies which came against him.<sup>15</sup> At about the time when the Social War came to an end in 355, ambassadors from Artaxerxes III warned the Athenians against offering Artabazos any further support.<sup>16</sup> Once Athenian support had dried up, Artabazos turned to Thebes, which sent a force of 5,000 Boeotian troops under

<sup>11</sup> Ashton 2002, pp. 14-15. The chronology of the north Aegean in the mid-4<sup>th</sup> c. is controversial and frequently uncertain. In what follows I have primarily followed Weiskopf 1989, pp. 54-64 and Debord 1999, pp. 393-6. However, Heskell 1997, pp. 54-60, 118-22, 149-51 has argued for a 'high' chronology which would put many of the key events discussed here (e.g. the arrival of Artabazos in the Troad, the point at which Memnon and Mentor summon Charidemus, and the date of Pammenes' expedition) in the 360s. This has not been generally accepted, but if it were then the two main consequences for my argument would be: (i) to date the burial of the hoard to the late 360s, and (ii) to suggest that these coinages were minted not in the context of Artabazos revolting but rather of Artabazos suppressing revolts.

<sup>12</sup> Dem. 23.157: ὁ Μέμνων καὶ ὁ Μέντωρ, οἱ κηδεσται τοῦ Ἀρταβάζου, ἄνθρωποι νέοι καὶ κεχηρημένοι ἀπροδοκίῳ εὐτυχίᾳ τῆ τοῦ Ἀρταβάζου κηδεῖα, βουλόμενοι τῆς χώρας ἄρχειν εὐθὺς ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ τιμᾷσθαι καὶ μὴ πολεμεῖν μηδὲ κινδυνεύειν ('Memnon and Mentor, the sons-in-law of Artabazos, were young men who were enjoying unexpected good fortune by their marriage connection to Artabazos. What they wanted was to govern the country peaceably without delay, and to win distinction without warfare and peril'). See Weiskopf 1989, pp. 54-6, for the early career of Artabazos and p. 63 for the suggestion that, initially, the brothers were just members of the satrapal family and only subsequently became mercenary commanders by force of circumstance.

<sup>13</sup> Dem. 23.154-157; cf. Aen. Tact. 24.3-14, Ps-Arist. *Oec.* 2.1351b20-35, Polyaeus 3.14 (for Artabazos' commander Athenodoros mentioned here see also *I. Kios* 2, ca. 360), Plut. *Sert.* 1.3. It is speculated that Ilion's honours for a certain Menelaos son of Arrabaios of Athens which were granted for securing their freedom (*I. Ilion* 23, ca. 359?) are related to the negotiated departure of Charidemus.

<sup>14</sup> On the whole episode see Weiskopf (1989) 61-3.

<sup>15</sup> Diod. 16.22.1 with Debord (1999), pp. 394-5 for further details on these battles.

<sup>16</sup> Diod. 16.22.2.

Pammenes to support him. Pammenes appears to have marched his troops overland via Aegean Thrace, reaching Maroneia in November 355 and thus probably arriving in Hellespontine Phrygia early in 354.<sup>17</sup> With the help of Pammenes, Artabazos was able to defeat two further satrapal armies in the subsequent campaigning season.<sup>18</sup> However, following these two victories, Artabazos apparently came to suspect that Pammenes was secretly communicating with the enemy, and so lured him into a trap in order to arrest him, after which we hear no more of Pammenes.<sup>19</sup> We do not know what happened next in the revolt, but in 353/2 Memnon and Artabazos fled to the court of Philip II.<sup>20</sup> Presumably, once the Boeotian troops had returned home at the end of the 354 season Artabazos would have been short of troops once again, and, given the fate of Pammenes, he may have had difficulty hiring new forces.<sup>21</sup>

At some point between 360 and 345, Mentor had secured employment with the pharaoh Nectanebo II. He reappears in the sources when he re-enters the service of the Persians having betrayed Sidon to them in 345.<sup>22</sup> He then participated in Artaxerxes' successful invasion of Egypt in 343/2 and by his actions gained royal preferment. Following the campaign's end with the capture of Memphis in summer 342, Artaxerxes ordered him to go to Hellespontine Phrygia in order to deal with rebellious dynasts in the area, chief among them being the tyrant Hermias who ruled over Assos in the Troad and Atarneus in Aeolis. At this point, Mentor leveraged his favour with Artaxerxes to intercede on behalf of Memnon and Artabazos and secure their pardon from the king. Diodorus quite clearly implies that Memnon and Artabazos, but not Mentor, had been the ones in revolt from the king.<sup>23</sup> If this is correct, it would explain why Mentor did not also go to the court of Philip II in 353/2 and why he was able to enter Persian service without fear of reprisal and then quickly progress to the highest ranks. Mentor may therefore have played little or no role in Artabazos' revolt, and perhaps left the Troad several years before he would have been forced to flee in any case in 353/2.<sup>24</sup>

On reaching the Troad, Mentor tricked Hermias into a meeting where he arrested and then executed the tyrant and used his signet ring to send forged letters to the cities under Hermias ordering them to come over to Mentor's side. Diodorus then says that Mentor was able to deal with all the other commanders who were at odds

<sup>17</sup> Buckler 1989, pp. 50-3, 176-81.

<sup>18</sup> Diod. 16.34.1-2.

<sup>19</sup> Polyæn. 7.33.2.

<sup>20</sup> Diod. 16.52.3, Curt. 5.9.1, 6.5.2.

<sup>21</sup> On the fate of Pammenes and the end of Artabazos' revolt see Buckler 1989, p. 53 with n. 35.

<sup>22</sup> Diod. 16.42.4, 47.4. On the revolt of Sidon (348-345 BC) see most recently Wiesehöfer 2016.

<sup>23</sup> Diod. 16.52.3: ὁ δὲ Μέντωρ ἔχων οἰκειότητα πρὸς Ἀρτάβαζον καὶ Μέμνονα τοὺς διαπεπολεμηκότας μὲν πρὸς Πέρσας ἐν τοῖς ἐπάνω χρόνοις, τότε δὲ πεφευγότας ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ διατρίβοντας παρὰ Φιλίππῳ, δεηθεὶς τοῦ βασιλέως ἔπεισεν αὐτὸν ἀπολῦσαι τοὺς ἄνδρας τῶν ἐγκλημάτων ('And since Mentor was related to Artabazos and Memnon, both of whom had warred against the Persians in the preceding period and, at the time now under consideration, were fugitives from Asia residing at the court of Philip, he made a request of the King and prevailed upon him to dismiss the charges against them').

<sup>24</sup> If Mentor had not seen Memnon, Artabazos, and his sister since the mid- to early 350s, this gives important context to the emotional reunion in late 342 when he was perhaps meeting his many nephews and nieces, some of whom would now be teenaged, for the very first time: Diod. 16.52.3-4.

with the Persians through the use of either force or stratagem. The implication is that, through his cunning, Mentor was able to minimize the amount of military force needed to subdue the rebels.<sup>25</sup> From this point onwards, he and Memnon will have once again been in charge of the Troad, now under the watchful eye of the new satrap Arsites who had replaced Artabazos following his flight in 353/2. Mentor is not heard of again after the events of 342, and perhaps died soon afterwards, but Memnon continued in this role right down to the Battle of the Granicus in May 334 when, following Alexander's defeat of the Persian forces, he fled the Troad for the last time. As this account of the careers of Memnon and Mentor shows, the coins with the M-E legend can only date to either 363/2-353/2 or 342-334, since in the intervening decade Memnon, and for that matter Mentor, were not in the Troad.

The latter period can be shortened considerably because an example of the series with the legend E-Y (the same type as **no. 7** in this hoard group) appeared in a hoard dated *c.*340 from Muğla (ancient Mobolla) in Karia.<sup>26</sup> The period 342-340 is a rather unlikely context for the minting of this reasonably sized and intensively minted coinage (27 obverse dies, little stylistic variation, and a good amount of die-linking) since, as we have seen, Mentor did not have to engage in major military operations to subdue the troublemakers in Hellespontine Phrygia.<sup>27</sup> By contrast, in the period 363/2-353/2 Memnon and Mentor hired the forces of Charidemos in 360, and Memnon was involved in the revolt of Artabazos and thus most probably in hiring the forces of Chares and Pammenes in 356-354. It is therefore much more attractive to attribute these coins to the earlier period, and perhaps specifically to 356-354 when we know that Artabazos was repeatedly hiring mercenary forces to fend off the attempts of at least three separate satrapal armies to put down his revolt. This dating is consistent with Ashton's observation that, in comparing the types of these drachms to those of Rhodes which were their model, the stylistic affinity is strongest with a series dating to the 350s or 340s.<sup>28</sup> This conclusion also suggests that the coins with the M-E legend refer to Memnon specifically and not to his brother since, as argued above, Mentor's career in Persian service in the 340s suggests that he had not been involved in the revolt of Artabazos.

This may also be the context for the three undated anecdotes about Memnon in Ps-Aristotle's *Oeconomica*. In the first two of the anecdotes Memnon finds himself in need of funds and so tricks the citizens of Lampsakos into paying him more than they had intended to. In both anecdotes he promises to pay them back at a later date, and in the second anecdote even on favourable terms, suggesting an emergency need for

<sup>25</sup> Diod. 16.52.5-8, and see also Mentor's stratagem in Ps-Arist. *Oec.* 2.1351a.

<sup>26</sup> *IGCH* 1215 (Muğla, 1950). The *c.*340 burial date is inferred from the fact that the hoard contains coins of Mausolus (377-353) and Hidrieus (351-344), but not Pixodaros (340-335) or Alexander (after 334).

<sup>27</sup> For a sense of the scale of this coinage, François de Callataÿ suggests to me that it could have paid the wages of 3,700 soldiers for a year (assuming a rather low salary of 200 drachms per annum, a generous average production of 20,000 coins per obverse die, and an original number of 37 obverse dies based on Esty's formula). This calculation should be treated as purely *exempli gratia*, and the figure of 3,700 soldiers almost certainly represents the upper limit of the available possibilities. Nevertheless, this comparatively low upper limit usefully calibrates our expectations as to the size of the military forces involved.

<sup>28</sup> Ashton 2002, p. 14. For discussion of the Rhodian series in question see Ashton 2001, p. 82.

cash.<sup>29</sup> The third anecdote involves him trying to find ways to withhold pay and rations from his mercenaries, a different type of response to the kind of cash shortage which might well arise during prolonged campaigning.<sup>30</sup> One possible scenario, therefore, is that these coins were minted with the silver Memnon deceptively extracted from the citizens of Lampsakos. This speculation gains some support from the fact that, around this time, Lampsakos minted an issue of its series of gold staters with a head of Helios as the obverse type (*Figure 1*).<sup>31</sup> Ashton has noted that the style of the type is very close to that of obverse dies 15-18 of the M-E drachms in his corpus (obverse dies 19-22 in the updated corpus), and is probably the work of the same engraver.<sup>32</sup>



*Figure 1: AV stater of Lampsakos (SNG France 1147 – 16mm, 8.43g)(1.5x).*

© Bibliothèque nationale de France.

In sum, the contextual information which we have for the careers of Memnon and Mentor strongly suggests that Memnon minted these coins at Lampsakos at some point during the decade 363/2-353/2. Within that period, the years 356-354 represent the most attractive context given the need to hire troops in support of

<sup>29</sup>Ps-Arist. *Oec.* 2.1351b1-11: **(1)** Μέμνων Ῥόδιος κυριεύσας Λαμψάκου δεηθείς χρημάτων ἐπέγραψε τοῖς πλουσιωτάτοις αὐτῶν πλῆθος τι ἀργυρίου, τούτοις δὲ τὴν κομιδὴν ἔσεσθαι παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων πολιτῶν ἔφησεν· ἐπεὶ δὲ οἱ ἄλλοι πολῖται εἰσήνεγκαν, ἐκέλευσε καὶ ταῦτα αὐτῷ δανεῖσθαι χρόνον διεπάμενος ἐν ᾧ πάλιν αὐτοῖς ἀποδώσει. **(2)** πάλιν τε δεηθείς χρημάτων ἤξιώσεν αὐτοὺς εἰσενέγκαι, κομίσασθαι δὲ ἐκ τῶν προσόδων· οἱ δ' εἰσήνεγκαν, ὡς διὰ ταχέων αὐτοῖς ἔσομένης τῆς κομιδῆς· ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ αἱ καταβολαὶ τῶν προσόδων παρήσαν, ἔφησεν ἐπ' αὐτῷ χρεῖαν εἶναι καὶ τούτων, ἐκείνοις δὲ ὕστερον ἀποδώσειν σὺν τόκῳ ('**(1)** Memnon of Rhodes, after making himself master of Lampsakos, was in need of money. He therefore exacted a heavy tribute from the richest citizens, telling them that they could collect it from the rest of the citizens. But when the latter had contributed, he ordered them to lend him this sum as well, fixing a period within which he would pay them back. **(2)** On another occasion when he was in need of money, he demanded contributions from them, saying that they should be repaid out of the revenues. They therefore contributed, thinking that they would soon receive their money back. But when the time came for the payment of the revenues, he told them that he needed these revenues as well, but would repay them later with interest').

<sup>30</sup>Ps-Arist. *Oec.* 2.1351b12-19: **(3)** τῶν τε στρατευομένων παρ' αὐτῷ παρητεῖτο τὰς σιταρχίας καὶ τοὺς μισθοὺς ἕξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ, φάσκων ταύταις ταῖς ἡμέραις οὔτε φυλακὴν αὐτοὺς οὐδεμίαν οὔτε πορείαν οὔτε δαπάνην ποιεῖσθαι, τὰς ἐξαιρεσίμους λέγων. τὸν τε πρὸ τοῦ χρόνον διδοὺς στρατιώταις τῇ δευτέρᾳ τῆς νομηνίας τὴν σιταρχίαν, τῷ μὲν πρώτῳ μηνὶ παρέβη τρεῖς ἡμέρας, τῷ δ' ἐχομένῳ πέντε· τοῦτον δὲ τὸν τρόπον προῆγεν, ἕως εἰς τὴν τριακάδα ἦλθεν. **(3)** 'He also excused himself from paying the rations and wages of those who were serving under him for six days in the year, declaring that on these days they had no watch to keep, no marching, and no expenses, meaning the 'omitted' days. As he was already giving the soldiers their rations on the second day of the new month, he thus passed over three days in the first month and five by the following month, and so he gradually gained on them till he reached a total of thirty days'. For an explanation of Memnon's scheme here see Forster 1920, p. 1351, nn. 3-4 and Zoepffel 2006, p. 624.

<sup>31</sup>Baldwin 1924, p. 26, no. 23. Baldwin's no. 23a (Jameson 1 [1913] 1435) is now Gulbenkian 690. A third example is now known: Alpha Bank 5982 (19.5mm, 9h, 8.39g).

<sup>32</sup>Ashton 2002, p. 13.

Artabazos' rebellion and the evidence for Artabazos engaging the services of Chares and Pammenes at this time. As a result, we can conclude that the hoard was most probably buried in the late 350s or, at the latest, the early 340s. This not only provides a firm *terminus ante quem* of c.350 for the other series represented in the hoard, but also, given the relatively fresh condition of all the other coins except for **no. 13** (the Mytilene hemidrachm), suggests that the coins of Abydos and Assos and the anepigraphic issue were minted contemporaneously with those of Memnon in the mid-350s.

#### 4. Weight Standards

Now that we have fairly precise dates for these four series from the Troad and know that they are contemporary with one another, we can treat them as a fixed point in the chronology of the 4<sup>th</sup> century coinages of the Troad. As a result, developments which we see in these coinages can be used to date other coinages from the Troad which have not yet appeared in dateable hoards. In particular, attention to the weight standards on which these series were minted and the incuse technique they used for their reverse types yield dating criteria which potentially allow us to date most of the silver coinages from the 4<sup>th</sup> century Troad with some precision. In turn, this gives us for the first time a region-wide perspective on the minting that was going on in the Troad under Memnon and Mentor.

At some point in the last decade of the 5<sup>th</sup> century, mints across western Asia Minor rapidly adopted the Chian weight standard (3.8g drachm), and Andrew Meadows has made a case for 405 specifically which I have accepted and built upon in a previous publication.<sup>33</sup> As Georges Le Rider argued in *Deux trésors de monnaies grecques de la Propontide* (1963), this was followed half a century later in the Troad, Mysia, and the Propontis by a shift from the Chian to the Persic standard (2.78g half siglos) between the 350s and 330s.<sup>34</sup> Scholarship also refers to these Persic-standard coins as a drachm-denominated coinage (i.e. terming coins minted to the theoretical standard of 2.78g hemidrachms instead of half sigloi), but to avoid confusion with the drachm-denominated Chian standard coins I will be referring to them as a siglos-denominated coinage in the discussion which follows.

If it is correct to date the present hoard group to the late 350s, then identifying the weight standard(s) on which the coins in the hoard were minted should allow us to confirm and further refine Le Rider's chronology. This would, in turn, allow us to use the weight standards of the other coinages from this region as a way to date them. However, while the coins of Abydos represented in this hoard were clearly minted on the Chian standard (thus providing a *terminus post quem* of c.350 for the shift to the Persic standard at that particular mint), the other series which are represented in the hoard appear to have been minted on a weight standard which falls halfway between

<sup>33</sup>Meadows 2011, Ellis-Evans 2016b.

<sup>34</sup>Le Rider 1963, Le Rider 1971, pp. 144-51.

the Chian and Persic standards (here referred to, somewhat unsatisfactorily, as the ‘reduced Chian’ standard) and thus requires more detailed investigation.<sup>35</sup>

#### 4.1 Abydos (nos. 1-2)

Abydos minted silver coins with the Apollo/eagle types (**nos. 1-2** in the hoard group) on both the Chian standard and the Persic standard. Although the theoretical weight of a Chian drachm was originally 3.8g, over the course of the first half of the 4<sup>th</sup> century it diminished to around 3.5g. As Table 1 demonstrates, the weights of the tetradrachms and drachms of the Chian weight coins are precisely what we would therefore expect of the Chian standard by the 350s. The double sigloi and half sigloi on the Persic standard have the same types, style, and diameter as these coins, all of which suggests that there was little if any gap in production between the coins Abydos minted on the two weight standards. However, the Persic-weight coins are easily distinguishable from the Chian-weight coins by being just under a gram lighter.

*Table 1.* Weight tables for Chian-weight tetradrachms and drachms (C) and Persic-weight double sigloi and half sigloi (P) of Abydos.

Tetradrachms (C) n = 10	Drachms (C) n = 77	Double Sigloi (P) n = 3	Half Sigloi (P) n = 378
X>15.00-9 = 1	3.60-9 = 1	10.60-9 = 1	2.80-9 = 3
15.00-9 = 1	3.50-9 = 9	10.50-9 = 2	2.70-9 = 12
<u>14.90-9 = 4</u>	<u>3.40-9 = 28</u>		2.60-9 = 97
14.80-9 = 1	<u>3.30-9 = 22</u>		<u>2.50-9 = 135</u>
14.70-9 = 1	3.20-9 = 11		2.40-9 = 55
X<14.70-9 = 2	3.10-9 = 2		2.30-9 = 46
	3.00-9 = 3		2.20-9 = 18
	2.90-9 = 1		X<2.20-9 = 12

#### 4.2 Assos (Nos. 3-5) and Memnon at Lampsakos (Nos. 7-12)

Table 2 gives the weights for the other series represented in the hoard. The Chian-weight drachms of Assos (**nos. 3-5** in the hoard) and of Memnon (**nos. 7-12** in the hoard) are appreciably lighter – by about 0.3-0.4g – than the Chian-weight drachms of Abydos. However, in the case of Assos we have half sigloi on the Persic standard to compare them with and can see that these lighter Chian-weight coins are nevertheless significantly heavier (by about 0.5g) than coins from the same mint on the Persic standard, with almost three-quarters of the recorded weights coming in above the theoretical weight of a Persic half siglos (2.78g). Moreover, just as in the case of Abydos, the Assos coins on the two standards have the same types, style, and diameter, again suggesting little if any break in production.

<sup>35</sup> The data in what follows comes from a study I have made of these coinages for a future publication.

*Table 2.* Weight tables for the Chian-weight drachms of Memnon at Lampsakos (C), the Chian-weight drachms (C) and Persic-weight half sigloi (P) of Assos, the anepigraphic Athena/cult statue and rose drachms (C?), and the Chian-weight hemidrachms (C) of Mytilene.

<b>Memnon</b> Drachms (C) n = 100	<b>Assos</b> Drachms (C) n = 45	<b>Assos</b> Half Sigloi (P) n = 10	<b>Anepigraphic</b> Drachms (C?) n = 6	<b>Mytilene</b> Hemidrachms (C) n = 109
3.40-9 = 3	3.30-9 = 1	2.60-9 = 1	2.90-9 = 1	1.40-9 = 5
3.30-9 = 7	3.20-9 = 2	2.50-9 = 1	2.80-9 = 1	<u>1.30-9 = 47</u>
3.20-9 = 17	3.10-9 = 7	<u>2.40-9 = 3</u>	2.70-9 = 0	1.20-9 = 41
<u>3.10-9 = 28</u>	<u>3.00-9 = 11</u>	2.30-9 = 2	<u>2.60-9 = 3</u>	1.10-9 = 10
3.00-9 = 22	2.90-9 = 8	2.20-9 = 2	2.50-9 = 1	1.00-9 = 2
2.90-9 = 12	2.80-9 = 6			0.90-9 = 3
2.80-9 = 8	2.70-9 = 6			0.80-9 = 1
2.70-9 = 3	X < 2.70-9 = 4			
2.60-9 = 1				

#### 4.3 *The Anepigraphic Coin (No. 6)*

The weight standard of the anepigraphic coins with the Athena/cult statue and rose types is difficult to determine with such a small sample. Several auction catalogues have suggested that they are tetrobols, but this assumes a drachm of 4g which is too heavy at any period for the Chian standard, never mind by the 350s when Chian weight drachms were typically minted to a theoretical standard of 3.5g, as we have seen at Abydos. The weights currently known appear to favour interpreting these coins as Persic half sigloi rather than ‘reduced weight’ Chian drachms, since the median weight range is 2.60-2.69g and four of the six coins fall below the theoretical weight of 2.78g for a Persic half siglos. If we interpret the weights in this way, it would make **no. 6** the latest coin in the hoard.

However, there are reasons to be sceptical. Firstly, our sample is extremely small and may thus be misleading: examples as light as 2.6-2.7g appear in some of the other series from the Troad minted to this ‘reduced Chian’ standard (see *Table 3*). Secondly, despite having such a small sample, we nevertheless have two examples above the theoretical weight of the Persic standard: this is exceedingly rare even in much better known series (compare e.g. Abydos in *Table 1*, Assos in *Table 2*, and Antandros in *Table 3*). Finally, the presence of the Rhodian-style rose in left field on the reverse strongly suggests that these coins were produced while the unidentified mint in question was under the control of Memnon and/or Mentor, and thus before Memnon’s exile in 353/2, since Rhodian-style roses are almost entirely absent from the iconographic repertoire of coinages from Lesbos and the Troad in

antiquity.<sup>36</sup> On balance, therefore, it seems more likely that these coins belong to the ‘reduced Chian’ weight phase of the 350s rather than the Persic weight phase which immediately followed, but we will have to await new examples of the series to confirm this hypothesis.

#### 4.4 Mytilene (No. 13) and Other Relevant Mints in the Troad

As Table 3 illustrates, the ‘reduced Chian’ standard we have observed in the drachms minted at Assos and by Memnon at Lampsakos is also found at two further cities along the southern littoral of the Troad: Gargara, a close neighbour of Assos, and Antandros, located a short distance further east along the coast. Much like the hemidrachms of Mytilene (see Table 2), the hemidrachms of Antandros are somewhat light for the Chian standard. However, given that the drachms of Antandros are also light to standard, this is to be expected, and so neither series should be considered Persic. Finally, it is worth noting that whereas Abydos and Assos have unchanging types across the Chian- and Persic-weight issues (thus making the switch to the Persic standard undetectable except for the weight), Antandros and Gargara both make changes to their reverse types, with Antandros introducing a pine tree and Gargara losing the square which framed the bull. However, whereas at Antandros this change of type coincides with the switch to the Persic standard, at Gargara it marks no such change.

Table 3. Weight table for the Chian weight drachms (C) of Gargara and Antandros, the Persic weight half sigloi (P) of Antandros, and the Chian weight hemidrachms (C) of Antandros.

<b>Gargara</b> Drachms (C) n = 56	<b>Antandros</b> Drachms (C) n = 32	<b>Antandros</b> Half Sigloi (P) n = 29	<b>Antandros</b> Hemidrachm (C) n = 78	<b>Tenedos</b> Drachm (C) n = 186
3.20-9 = 1	X>3.10-9 = 2	2.80-9 = 1	1.50-9 = 2	X>3.60-9 = 6
3.10-9 = 8	3.10-9 = 7	2.70-9 = 3	1.40-9 = 6	3.60-9 = 34
3.00-9 = 14	<u>3.00-9 = 10</u>	2.60-9 = 7	<u>1.30-9 = 28</u>	3.50-9 = 43
<u>2.90-9 = 15</u>	2.90-9 = 5	<u>2.50-9 = 14</u>	1.20-9 = 26	<u>3.40-9 = 50</u>
2.80-9 = 10	2.80-9 = 4	2.40-9 = 5	1.10-9 = 13	3.30-9 = 24
2.70-9 = 5	2.70-9 = 2		1.00-9 = 3	3.20-9 = 14
X<2.70-9 = 3	X<2.70-9 = 2			3.10-9 = 8
				X<3.10-9 = 7

<sup>36</sup> Examples: **1**) countermark on a Dardanos bronze probably dating to 4<sup>th</sup> century (ANS 1944.100.43860); **2**) common countermark on late 3<sup>rd</sup>/early 2<sup>nd</sup> century bronzes of Antissa on Lesbos (Tselekas 2010, pp. 128, 140), thought to reflect Rhodian influence on the island following the collapse of the Ptolemaic Empire in the Aegean after 205/4; cf. treaty between Rhodes and the cities of Lesbos (*JG* XII Suppl. 120, c.200?); **3**) control mark on an issue of wreathed tetradrachms of Abydos c.100-70 (Callataÿ 1996, p. 85: issue of Demetrios, D16/R1-2). Roses appear on Persic-weight half sigloi of Abydos (Hephaistoleos and Noumenios, 340s?), but lack the buds on either side. Mannsperger and Mannsperger 2002, pp. 1092-3, assume that the rose on the anepigraphic issue reflects the Rhodian state’s involvement in the region, but are unaware of Memnon’s decades-long association with the Troad beyond his brief stint as a Persian admiral in 333 (p. 1093 n. 79).

The Classical coinage of Tenedos has traditionally been dated to the second half of the 5<sup>th</sup> century or to the 4<sup>th</sup> century without further specification.<sup>37</sup> However, a date in the first half of the 4<sup>th</sup> century, and perhaps specifically in the 360s/350s, seems likely for two reasons. Firstly, the weights of the Tenedian drachms (*Table 3*) are similar to those of the Chian-weight drachms of Abydos (*Table 1*). Moreover, the tetradrachms and didrachms in the series, although rare, also have weights which suggest they were being minted to the slightly lighter Chian standard which prevailed by the mid-4<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>38</sup> Secondly, the tetradrachms and drachms include coins with both a square incuse technique and a round incuse technique, a shift which, as we shall see in Section 5, can be dated to the 350s in the Troad.<sup>39</sup> Except for this change in reverse incuse technique, the coins show relatively little stylistic development, so their production does not necessarily need to be stretched out over several decades.

Elsewhere in the Troad we find the following less well-attested series whose weights are therefore not worth tabulating: **1**) Neandrea produced drachms (n = 6; median weight range 3.60-79g), hemidrachms, obols, and hemiobols on the Chian standard; **2**) a unique didrachm on the Chian standard is attested for Kebren;<sup>40</sup> **3**) Skepsis minted didrachms, drachms (n = 18; median weight range 3.50-9g), hemidrachms, and diobols on the Chian standard and drachms (n = 6; median weight range 3.00-39g) on what looks to be what I have been terming the ‘reduced Chian’ standard;<sup>41</sup> **4**) Sigeion produced one issue of drachms on the ‘reduced Chian’ standard and a second on the Persic standard (see *Figure 2* and *Figure 3* respectively and Appendix 2 for a die study); **5**) Ophryneion minted coins which look to be Persic standard half sigloi (n = 4; 2.84g, 2.73g, 2.72g, 2.61g) and quarter sigloi (n = 2; 1.34g, 1.21g); **6**) Dardanos minted Persic half sigloi (n = 17; median weight range 2.30-2.59g).

#### 4.5 Mysia

Finally, it is worth noting that a clear shift from the Chian to the Persic standard at this time is also seen in the silver coinages of Lampsakos, Kyzikos, and Prokonnesos in neighbouring Mysia.<sup>42</sup> In the case of Kyzikos, hoard evidence allows us to date this shift to the 350s/340s, thus making it contemporary with our evidence from the Troad.<sup>43</sup> Moreover, the drachms in the Kyzikene series have an average weight

<sup>37</sup> See (e.g.) *BMC Troas* pp. 92-3, nos. 9-21 (ca. 450-387), Babelon, *Traité* 2.2:1305-6, 1309-10 (c.387 – ‘vers la fin du IV<sup>e</sup> siècle’), and *SNG Ashmolean* 1235 (5<sup>th</sup> c.) and 1236-1237 (4<sup>th</sup> c.).

<sup>38</sup> Tetradrachms (n = 10): 14.75; 14.60, 14.64, 14.67; 14.56; 14.10; 14.09; 13.72 (worn); 12.97 (worn). Didrachms (n = 2): 6.23; 5.92 (worn).

<sup>39</sup> The tetradrachms with a bee control mark have a round incuse. The drachms with a kantharos control mark include both square and round incuse reverses. The drachms with Athena Promachos, Nike, thyrsus, and thymiaterion control marks only have round incuses.

<sup>40</sup> BNF Fonds Général 590 (7.56g, implies a drachm of around 3.7g).

<sup>41</sup> I know of 4 didrachms, 24 drachms, 8 hemidrachms, and 6 diobols. The drachms and hemidrachms are split over two series, and the drachms display types in three quite distinct styles. Completing a die study of the series has only raised more questions than it has answered regarding the overall arrangement. Without a larger sample and, ideally, some hoard evidence, the series will remain intractable.

<sup>42</sup> Lampsakos: Gaebler 1923, pp. 15-30 (Groups 3-4), Baldwin 1924, pp. 62-5 (Group B). Kyzikos: the arrangements of Fritze 1914 and Sandstrom 1993 and 1995 have been superseded by that of Meadows in Ashton *et al.* 2002, pp. 167-71. Prokonnesos: Thompson 1965, Robert 1967, pp. 15-22.

<sup>43</sup> Meadows in Ashton *et al.* 2002, pp. 167-71.

of 3.1-3.3g.<sup>44</sup> Although this looks very much like the ‘reduced Chian’ standard we have seen in the Troad, it could equally be an example of the phenomenon whereby drachms were struck underweight when produced in parallel with high volumes of tetradrachms, as is the case for Kyzikos but not for any of the coinages from the Troad which we have been looking at.<sup>45</sup> While it is therefore clear that these series need to be studied in conjunction with those we have surveyed from the Troad, the size and complexity of the Lampsakene and Kyzikene material in particular is such that it is not possible to do so here.

#### 4.6 Conclusions

We may summarize the findings from this section as follows. Firstly, the evidence of this hoard group confirms Le Rider’s conclusion that the switch from the Chian to the Persic standard happened soon after *c.* 350. At least within the Troad, therefore, it seems increasingly likely that Chian weight coinages ought to be dated before *c.* 350 and Persic weight coinages after this point. Secondly, the use of what I have been terming the ‘reduced Chian’ standard (for convenience rather than out of conviction) emerges as an important monetary phenomenon in the satrapy of Hellespontine Phrygia in the 350s, with at least six mints (Antandros, Assos, Gargara, Memnon at Lampsakos, Sigeion, and Skepsis; perhaps also Kyzikos and the mint responsible for the anepigraphic issue) simultaneously producing silver coinage of a similar weight and in the same denominations as one another. Just on its own this would be a noteworthy development, but it is revealed to be even more exceptional when we place this phenomenon in the broader context of the minting activities of these cities in the rest of antiquity. For some of these mints this was the only occasion on which they ever produced silver coinage (Sigeion; cf. Ophryneion), for others it represented, together with the Persic standard coinage, a volume of minting several times greater than the rest of their silver output in antiquity put together (Antandros, Assos, Gargara), and even for established mints this was a significant episode in their minting history (Memnon at Lampsakos, Kyzikos).

The simultaneous appearance of coins with the same idiosyncratic weights and in the same denominations at six or more mints within a single region implies a degree of collective or supra-civic co-ordination. If we are looking for someone who might have been responsible for this co-ordination, then the obvious candidate is Memnon: he was responsible for at least one of these coinages (the solar disk drachms minted at Lampsakos) and all but one of these mints (Kyzikos) were located within his sub-satrapy of the Troad. Given the likelihood of Memnon’s involvement, the relatively high value of the coins, and the uncharacteristically large volume of production, it seems more likely that these coins reflect Memnon’s spending on hiring mercenaries to support the rebellion of Artabazos than it does the spending of the cities themselves. If this is correct, then we may also want to question the authentically civic character of other coinages from this region which are instead on the normal Chian standard,

<sup>44</sup> Sandstrom 1993, p. 244 reports this as the average weight based on a sample of 130+ drachms.

<sup>45</sup> I thank Philip Kinns for suggesting this alternative explanation to me. He cites as an example the Ephesian ‘cross-band’ drachms of *c.* 340-325 (Kinns in Ashton *et al.* 2002, pp. 196-200) and suggests that the rationale was to save silver.

for example the large series of Abydos (included in the hoard) and Tenedos, and perhaps also less well-attested series such as those of Neandrea and Kebren.

Why mint coins which were appreciably below the Chian standard? The answer must in part be to do with the broader question of the shift from the Chian to the Persic standard which lies beyond the scope of this paper.<sup>46</sup> In addition to this wider context, however, it is also worth considering the possibility that Memnon was reducing the weight of these coins during the rebellion of Artabazos as a means of making his stretched financial resources go further. As we have seen in the passages of Ps-Aristotle's *Oeconomica* discussed above, Memnon devised a variety of stratagems aimed at limiting or withholding pay from his mercenaries.<sup>47</sup> In such a context, an obvious step to take would be to reduce the metal content of the coins with which he was paying the mercenaries by 10-15% so as to save silver. The other two anecdotes in Ps-Aristotle show Memnon devising ways of extracting more silver from unwilling communities such as Lampsakos.<sup>48</sup> We could therefore imagine a situation in which Memnon levied an emergency tax on the Troad to pay for the rebellion of Artabazos and asked the cities to pay this tax in coins of a particular denomination and weight standard which could then be immediately handed out to the troops.<sup>49</sup>

Finally, the foregoing argument also has consequences for the vexed question of the status of the islands off the coast of Asia Minor between the King's Peace of 387 and the Macedonian conquest of 334-332. If the large issue of Tenedian coinage on the Chian standard does indeed belong in the 350s and the Mytilenaian hemidrachms really are on the 'reduced Chian' standard, then both series fit very well with the pattern of minting I have been able to reconstruct for the Troad in this period. If these issues do indeed belong in this context, then the implication is that Memnon was in some sense able to direct the production of these mints just as he was the production of mints on the mainland. However, this conclusion would seem to be at odds with what we know of the political histories of Lesbos and Tenedos in the 4<sup>th</sup> century. The King's Peace had placed the two islands in the Greek sphere of influence, both Mytilene and Tenedos were amongst the earliest states to become members of the Second Athenian Confederacy in 378, and a fairly continuous narrative of adherence to Athens can be constructed for both cities down to the 340s. In short, neither Memnon nor any other Persian official should have been in a position to direct the production of these two mints.

Pierre Debord has emphasized that, although in general the offshore islands belonged to the Greek sphere of influence, in periods when Athenian naval power was in abatement (for example, in the immediate aftermath of the Social War's

<sup>46</sup>I will return to this question in a joint paper with Jonathan Kagan to be published in the proceedings of the *Coinage in Imperial Space* conference (Krakow, 28 June - 2 July 2017).

<sup>47</sup>See n. 30.

<sup>48</sup>See n. 29.

<sup>49</sup>The drachms of Abydos, which instead kept to the normal Chian standard, remain an exception in search of an explanation. Following the argument here, we might hypothesize that they were minted slightly earlier than the other series at a time when Memnon's silver supplies were not yet under pressure. However, the issue should not be prejudged before a die study has been completed.

conclusion in 355) these islands could slip into the Persian sphere or carve out a role for themselves which did not involve absolute adherence to Athens.<sup>50</sup> In the case of Tenedos, we have evidence for adherence to Athens in 360 and again in the 340s, but know nothing about its status in the 350s: it is possible that during this period the island briefly came within Memnon's sphere of influence.<sup>51</sup> Likewise, while Mytilene does not appear to have been openly anti-Athenian until the tyrant Kammys came to power in 348, it gave refuge to enemies of Athens in the late 360s, switched from a democratic to an oligarchic constitution at some point in the 350s, and was reluctant to pay its *syntaxeis* to Athens in the late 350s/early 340s.<sup>52</sup> While it is unlikely that Mytilene ever wholly belonged to the Persian sphere, it is therefore clear that the city would not have scrupled to collaborate with a Persian official.

### 5. Square and Round Incuse Reverses

In the course of the first half of the 4<sup>th</sup> c. there was a shift from mints using a square incuse technique on the reverse of their coins to using a round or flat incuse technique (the edge of a round incuse is often off flan, thus making the reverse appear flat – see *Figure 2* and *Figure 3* below for examples of the two styles).<sup>53</sup> Although in theory this switch should be a useful dating criterion, in practice it is highly problematic because there is no general rule for the adoption of this practice – some mints switch to round incuses as early as c.405 (e.g. Kyzikos), others as late as c.350-345 (e.g. Kos), others switch back and forth between round and square (e.g. Rhodes). This variation means that we usually cannot presume a coinage's date on the basis of the incuse technique alone – we first need to establish its date on other grounds (e.g. hoard evidence) in order for the dating significance of the incuse technique to become apparent, at which point it has of course become superfluous as a dating criterion because we already know the date of the coinage on much more reliable evidence.

However, if it can be shown that there is a regional pattern for the switch from square to round incuse reverses, then it becomes reasonable to use the incuse technique as a dating criterion for mints within the region even when other more reliable dating criteria are absent. Usually, however, our evidence falls far short of allowing us to establish the existence of a regional pattern, since this requires: (i) the switch to be attested at a fair number of neighbouring mints (at least three); (ii) the mints in question to have firm chronologies; (iii) the switch to have occurred within a fairly tight timeframe (less than a decade). Fortunately, this is precisely what the

<sup>50</sup> Debord 1999, pp. 380-3, 407-12, esp. p. 411: 'On comprend donc que, dans toute la mesure du possible, Athènes ait cherché à la maintenir dans sa mouvance. Cela ne signifie pas pour autant qu'il n'y ait pas eu des accrocs conjoncturels à des moments d'affaiblissement de la puissance navale athénienne'.

<sup>51</sup> Debord 1999, p. 411. Athenian naval detachment at Tenedos (360 BC): Ps-Dem. 50.53-6. Athenian proposes honours for Tenedians (345-342 BC): Ps-Dem. 58.35.

<sup>52</sup> Debord 1999, pp. 408-9.

<sup>53</sup> I am unaware of a systematic study of this phenomenon. Villenoisy and Frémont 1909 and Naster 1975 discuss incuse technique on Archaic and Classical Greek coinage in general without noting this particular issue.

hoard group studied here provides. Table 4 summarizes the evidence for the weight standards attested at each mint and the incuse technique used at that mint for coins on each of the weight standards it used.<sup>54</sup>

*Table 4.* 4<sup>th</sup> century mints in the Troad and the correlation between weight standard and incuse technique.

Mint	Weight Standard	Incuse Technique
Abydos (Athena Ilias)	Chian	Square [Figure 5]
Abydos (hoard group)	Chian	Rounded square (earlier) Round/flat (later)
Abydos	Persic	Round/flat
Memnon at Lampsakos (hoard group)	‘Reduced Chian’	Square (O1-O16/O17) Round (O17/O18-O25) <b>NB</b> – Hoard coins are O2, O12, O13, O15, O17
Assos (Athena Ilias)	Chian	Square [Figure 4]
Assos (hoard group)	‘Reduced Chian’	Square (O1-O2) Rounded square (O3-O4) Round/flat (O5-O8) <b>NB</b> – Hoard coins are O2 and O6
Assos	Persic	Round/flat (O9-O10)
Anepigraphic (hoard group)	‘Reduced Chian’ (?)	Round/flat [Figure 7]
Antandros	‘Reduced Chian’	Deep square
Antandros	Persic	Flatter square (earlier) Round/flat (later)
Dardanos	Persic	Round/flat
Gargara	‘Reduced Chian’	Incuse square (earlier) Round/flat (later)
Kebren	Chian	Round/flat
Neandreaia	Chian	Square
Ophryneion	Persic	Round/flat
Sigeion	‘Reduced Chian’	Square [Figure 2]
Sigeion	Persic	Round/flat [Figure 3]
Skepsis	‘Reduced Chian’	Deep square
Skepsis	Chian	Deep square (earlier) Flatter square (later)
Tenedos	Chian	Square (all denominations) Round/flat (details in n. 39)

The switch from a square to a round incuse technique seems to happen during broadly the same time period that these mints switch from the Chian or ‘reduced Chian’ standard to the Persic standard. The point here is not to suggest that there is a causative relationship between these two phenomena – apart from anything else, most of the mints change their incuse technique *before* switching to the Persic

<sup>54</sup> On the principle that cities in other regions will have their own regional patterns, I have excluded neighbouring mints in Mysia and on Lesbos (including the Mytilene coin from the hoard group).

standard. However, the broad correlation between the switch in weight standard (which is dateable) and the switch in incuse technique (which has hitherto been undateable) allows us to conclude that, at least within the Troad, the switch to a round incuse technique happened in the course of the 350s. In the two cases where we have completed die studies (for Memnon at Lampsakos and for Assos) we can see that the shift not only occurred mid-series, but also close to the time when this hoard group was buried.



*Figure 2:* AR Drachm of Sigeion – Chian Standard, Square Incuse Reverse  
(CNG 100 [7/10/2015] 1422 – 16mm, 12h, 3.09g)(1.5x).  
© Classical Numismatic Group, Inc.



*Figure 3:* AR Half Siglos of Sigeion – Persic Standard, Round Incuse Reverse  
(Bank Leu 33 [3/5/1983] 366 – 15mm, 9h, 2.78g)(1.5x).  
© Bank Leu AG.

If we adopt the two dating criteria for coinages of the Troad which I have argued for in this and the previous section (i.e. that Persic weight coinages probably post-date *c.*350, and that the switch from square to incuse reverses happens in the course of the 350s.), then this has a dramatic effect on our picture of the region's monetary history between the end of the Peloponnesian War and the conquests of Alexander. Traditionally, the silver coinages of the Troad have been evenly spread out across this period. However, if we apply these two dating criteria to the evidence, then, with the exception of some fractional silver coinages minted soon after *c.*400, the overwhelming majority of the Troad's minting of silver coinage becomes concentrated in the 350s and 340s. Since it seems rather unlikely that so many mints across the Troad should choose to produce higher-value silver coinages at precisely the same time, this finding only further strengthens the impression, first discussed in the conclusion to the previous section, that these coins may have been minted to meet Persian rather than civic needs.

## 6. Athena Ilias

I have referred so far to coin **no. 6** in the hoard as the anepigraphic issue. This coin belongs to a small series of silver and bronze coins which have been variously attributed to either Assos or Ilion, but always with a degree of uncertainty because

of the lack of an ethnic. The anepigraphic coins have been attributed to Assos under the influence of a unique tetradrachm in the Bibliothèque nationale de France which likewise depicts a helmeted head of Athena as the obverse type and an archaic cult statue of Athena Ilias as the reverse type alongside the ethnic ΑΣΣΙΟΝ (*Figure 4*). The attribution to Ilion, or a mint based at Ilion such as the koinon of Athena Ilias, instead stems from noticing several things: firstly, that the cult statue's attributes indicate that it is not Athena Polias of Assos, but rather Athena Ilias of Ilion; secondly, that the earliest bronzes of Ilion depict the cult statue of Athena Ilias in much the same way (*Figure 9*); thirdly, that whereas on the tetradrachm of Assos the helmet of Athena features a griffin design (the civic badge of Assos), on the anepigraphic coins it does not.<sup>55</sup>



*Figure 4*: AR Tetradrachm of Assos (BNF Fonds Général 498 - 23mm, 15.01g)(1.5x).  
© Bibliothèque nationale de France.

This uncertainty regarding the minting authority of the anepigraphic coins has only been compounded by confusion over their intended weight standard and denominations, and as a result the correct historical context in which to place this series. Traditionally, scholars attempting to date these coins on stylistic grounds alone have gone for dates which are too high (*c.*450-400).<sup>56</sup> More recently, Lorenzo Lazzarini attempted to place the series in the 330s.<sup>57</sup> While this is now ruled out given the *c.*350 *terminus ante quem* which the hoard group provides, he nevertheless makes a number of useful observations about the character of this coinage. Emphasizing the anepigraphic character of these coins, Lazzarini has argued that the lack of a city ethnic rules out Ilion as the minting authority and instead points to the koinon of Athena Ilias. He is here influenced by Louis Robert's argument that coinages which were minted in the name of a god but lack a city ethnic were produced by religious koina and not by cities, and thus that the coins in the name of Athena Ilias (late 180s/early 170s – 60s/50s) were minted by the koinon of Athena Ilias and not Ilion.<sup>58</sup> Lazzarini thus dated the anepigraphic coinage to 334 and after on the assumption that the koinon was founded when Alexander visited Ilion prior to the Battle of the Granicus. There are several problems here. Firstly, most scholars would

<sup>55</sup> Lazzarini 1984, p. 5 (koinon of Athena Ilias), Mannsperger and Mannsperger 2002, pp. 1092-3 (Ilion).

<sup>56</sup> See Babelon *Traité* 2.2:1269-70 for the stylistic dating of the Assos tetradrachm which is then used to date the anepigraphic coins in subsequent scholarship and auction catalogues.

<sup>57</sup> Lazzarini 1984, followed by Mannsperger and Mannsperger 2002, pp. 1091-3 and Mannsperger 2006, p. 270.

<sup>58</sup> Robert 1966, pp. 36-46. For this dating of the series see Ellis-Evans 2016a, pp. 127-32.

instead date the foundation of the koinon to shortly before *c.*306.<sup>59</sup> Secondly, while Robert was correct to attribute the Athena Ilias coinage to the koinon, the particular argument which he makes and which Lazzarini has here adopted has not proved to be a sound way of identifying minting authorities.<sup>60</sup> More importantly, though, Robert's argument is not precisely relevant here: we are not dealing with the city ethnic being replaced by the name of a god, but rather with there being no legend at all and a symbol (the Rhodian-style rose) appearing where the ethnic normally does.

The logic behind these coin types has been obscure to scholars because an important piece of information has been missing from the debate. In addition to the Assos tetradrachm at the BnF, there is also an Abydos tetradrachm which depicts a head of Apollo on the obverse and the cult statue of Athena Ilias alongside the ethnic ΑΒΥΔΗΝΟΝ on the reverse (*Figure 5*). This coin first appeared in volume 4 of Robert Jameson's collection (published in 1932) and later passed into the collection of Calouste Gulbenkian (published in 1989). Jameson's catalogue reports the coin as having been found near Çanakkale and thus a short distance from the ancient site of Abydos. Since the coin does not appear in volume 3 of Jameson's collection, he presumably purchased it after 1924 when that volume was published. This perhaps explains its absence from the debate: by the time it had appeared in print, all the major handbooks of Greek numismatics had been published, and as a result the coin was only ever likely to become known to those making a special study of the Troad. With the addition of this coin, we now have the following dossier of series from the Troad which depict an archaic cult statue of Athena Ilias as their reverse type: **1)** Abydos and Assos – Chian standard tetradrachms (360s/350s?);<sup>61</sup> **2)** Ilion – bronzes (360s/350s?); **3)** anepigraphic mint – 'reduced Chian' standard drachms and hemidrachms; bronzes which are the same module as the Ilion bronzes (late 350s?). These series are catalogued in Appendix 3.

<sup>59</sup> The key document is *I. Ilion* 1. Low date shortly before *c.*306: J. and L. Robert, *BE* 1964, no. 424, Robert 1966, pp. 20-1. Frisch 1975, p. 6 criticized this reconstruction of the document and, building on this, Verkinderen 1987 argued for a high date *c.*334, most recently followed by Pillot 2016, p. 147. For criticisms of the arguments of Frisch and Verkinderen see, respectively, J. and L. Robert, *BE* 1976, no. 66, and Ph. Gauthier, *BE* 1988, no. 419.

<sup>60</sup> Ellis-Evans 2016a, pp. 135-7.

<sup>61</sup> The highly unusual reverse and similar style of these two tetradrachms suggest they were minted simultaneously. When incuse technique (in both cases) and weight standard (in the case of Assos) are considered, it is clear they precede the drachms of the mid-350s from their respective mints (see *Table 4*). However, where we can compare like with like (the Abydos tetradrachm with Athena Ilias reverse with the rest of the Abydos tetradrachms, e.g. Gulbenkian 596), we see that the style is very close, suggesting that the tetradrachms with Athena Ilias reverse were minted only shortly before (i.e. late 360s/early 350s).



Figure 5: AR Tetradrachm of Abydos (Gulbenkian 595 – 23mm, 11h, 15.15g)(1.5x).  
© Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, Lisbon. Photo: Catarina Gomes Ferreira.

The tetradrachm of Abydos is key because it establishes the principle at work in these types: each mint depicts its *own* local deity on the obverse, but the *same* archaic cult statue of Athena Ilias on the reverse along with its *own* identifying ethnic (ΑΒΥΔΗΝΟΝ, ΑΣΣΙΟΝ, ΙΑΙ) or distinguishing mark (Rhodian-style rose). Since the mints other than Abydos all chose Athena for their obverse type, there has hitherto been a tendency to assume that the same deity was being depicted on *both* the obverse and the reverse, a hypothesis which the Abydos coin immediately invalidates. Thus, Babelon and the Mannspergers, rightly noting that the griffin on Athena's helmet is a badge of Assos, assumed that the cult statue on the reverse of the anepigraphic coins must therefore *also* be the Athena Polias of Assos, with the Mannspergers even claiming (erroneously) that the statue is not holding a spindle and therefore cannot be Athena Ilias.<sup>62</sup>

An obvious point of comparison for the form these coinages take are the ΣΥΝ coinages from half a century earlier. These were produced by a number of mints in western Asia Minor in 405/4 under the influence of the Spartan commander Lysander. They combined a shared obverse type (baby Herakles strangling two snakes, sometimes accompanied by the legend ΣΥΝ) with a distinctively local reverse type which often included the city's ethnic.<sup>63</sup> It should be noted that our Athena Ilias cult statue coins differ in important respects from the ΣΥΝ coinages: there is no shared legend similar to ΣΥΝ, the ethnic is displayed with the shared type rather than with the city type, and lower denomination silver coins and bronzes are also produced. This is therefore not a case of direct emulation, but rather of structural similarities in the two cases reflecting similar political priorities which have thus produced a similar outcome.

Firstly, the use of a shared type suggests co-ordination at a supra-civic level. For the ΣΥΝ coinages, this came from Lysander, whereas for the Athena Ilias cult statue

<sup>62</sup>Babelon *Traité* 2.2:1269-70, Mannsperger and Mannsperger 2002, p. 1093.

<sup>63</sup>Catalogue of the ΣΥΝ coinage: Delrieux 2000. Arguments for dating it to 405/4 rather than the 390s: Karwiese 1980, Meadows 2011, and Ellis-Evans 2016b.

coinages it probably came from Memnon and/or Mentor.<sup>64</sup> Secondly, in the case of the ΣΥΝ coinages the two important choices which are made regarding the types – what to use as a shared type and legend; the decision to combine the shared type with local types – are interpreted as elements of Lysander’s anti-Athenian propaganda: the message is that he is helping the cities throw off the Athenian yoke just as the baby Herakles fights off the two snakes, and he is promising a more consensual style of rule in which the allied cities are equal partners (the ΣΥΝ legend) whose civic identities (the local types used for the reverse) will not be subordinated to and effaced by that of the imperial power.<sup>65</sup> In the same way, we may presume that the shared type of the Athena Ilias cult statue represents a collective identity for the participating mints, and that if Memnon really was the guiding hand behind these coins, then the decision to combine shared with local types reveals a concern to present this as an authentically civic expression of shared identity. We could speculate that Memnon found it useful to foster a regional identity which could be used to unify cities from all parts of the Troad in contrast to pre-existing regional definitions based on ethnicity, geography, and administrative boundaries which split the Troad between Hellespont and Aegean, coast and interior, and north and south of Ida.<sup>66</sup>

It is significant that these mints have converged on a quite specific representation of the cult statue of Athena Ilias. Most importantly, Athena Ilias is depicted *as* a cult statue, with a large base prominent in all the depictions, and specifically as an archaic *xoanon* of self-evident antiquity. There is one more issue of bronzes at Ilion featuring the statue base, but with the statue in a slightly more naturalistic pose and the clothing beginning to show some signs of drapery (*Figure 10*).<sup>67</sup> These probably follow on immediately from the first issue of Ilian bronzes with the archaic cult statue. From this point onwards, however, Athena Ilias is not represented again as a

<sup>64</sup> The Abydos and Assos tetradrachms with Athena Ilias reverse could feasibly be dated pre-363/2, since the key dating criterion is the rather flexible consideration of the stylistic similarity of the Abydos example to subsequent Abydos tetradrachms: see n. 61. If these coins pre-date 363/2, they would reflect an initiative under the previous satrap, Ariobarzanes (a statue of whom was set up in the precinct of Athena Ilias: Diod. 17.17.6).

<sup>65</sup> See Karwiese 1980, esp. pp. 12-15 for discussion of the Herakliskos Draknognigon iconography and Gartland 2013 for its re-use later in the 4<sup>th</sup> century on a Theban series of electrum coins. The idea that freeing the Greeks from Athens is a collective enterprise (the point underscored by emphasizing the ΣΥΝ in *συνμαχία* on the coins) is also found in an Eretrian proxeny decree from summer 411 which honours Hegelochos of Taras *ὡς συνελευθέρωσαντι τὴν πόλιν | ἀπ’ Ἀθηναίων* (*IG XII (9) 187A.8-10*; cf. Knoepfler 2001, pp. 77-87, Hornblower 1991-2008, 3:1017-18). The verb *συνελευθέρω* first appears in Herodotus and Thucydides (it is rare thereafter until the Imperial period) and is used to describe contexts in which tyrants (e.g. the Peisistratids: Thuc. 6.56.2; Peithagoras of Selinus: Hdt. 5.46.2) or tyrannical states (Athens: Thuc. 2.72.1, 3.13.1, 3.62.5; Persia: Hdt. 7.51.2, 7.157.2; Carthage: Hdt. 7.158.2) are being overthrown by collective action. It is particularly associated with Sparta, either as their preferred way of representing their own actions or as how their allies liked to represent proposed courses of action to them in the hope of stirring Sparta into action.

<sup>66</sup> See Strabo 13.1.4 for the enormously varied definitions of the Troad produced both by inhabitants of the region itself and by those of neighbouring regions.

<sup>67</sup> Previous arrangements of the earliest bronzes of Ilion have assumed that they post-date either Alexander’s visit in 334 (Fritze 1902, pp. 502 and 511 with Beilage 61, nos. 1-4) or Lysimachos taking the area over in 301 (Bellinger 1957 and 1961, pp. 14-16 and T 1-5).

stiff, upright cult statue on a base until the second half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD.<sup>68</sup> The participating mints therefore wanted to emphasize that this was one cult statue in particular and a cult statue of considerable antiquity. In the case of Athena Ilias, this must therefore be the Palladion, whose appearance and origins we learn about from Pseudo-Apollodoros: “And having prayed to Zeus that a sign might be shown to him, [Ilios, founder of Ilion] beheld by day the Palladion, fallen from heaven, lying before his tent. It was three cubits in height [= c. 1.5m], its feet joined together; in its right hand it held a spear aloft, and in the other hand a distaff and spindle”.<sup>69</sup>



Figure 6: AR Hemidrachm of Anepigraphic Mint (Naumann 62 [4/2/2018] 146 – 12mm, 1.19g)(1.5x). © Numismatik Naumann GmbH.



Figure 7: AE of Anepigraphic Mint (Berlin 18262108 – 12mm, 1h, 1.48g)(1.5x). © Münzkabinett, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Photo: Bernhard Weisser.



Figure 8: AE of Ilion (Berlin 18262109 – 12x14mm, 3h, 1.67g)(1.5x). © Münzkabinett, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Photo: Bernhard Weisser.

The choice of this particular cult object as the shared type for these coinages suggests that the satrapal authorities and/or the cities of the Troad were tapping into the region’s Homeric heritage to create a shared regional identity centred on the worship of Athena Ilias. Given that the cities which minted these coins (Abydos, Assos, and Ilion) are later attested as members of the koinon of Athena Ilias, it is tempting to conclude that these coins are in fact evidence for the koinon already existing in the mid-4<sup>th</sup> century almost fifty years earlier than the traditional foundation date of shortly before c.306. In a modification of Lazzarini’s argument, this coinage would thus represent the koinon’s first attempt at producing a common coinage, an

<sup>68</sup> Athena Ilias is depicted with some frequency as a cult statue on a base from the reign of Caligula onwards, but not as a stiff and upright archaic cult statue until the reign of Marcus Aurelius (*RPC* 4.83, 92, 95, 102-103, 106, 108 – all temporary numbers). Once introduced, this remains popular for the next century until the reign of Decius (*RPC* 9.396).

<sup>69</sup> Ps-Apoll. 3.12.3: τῷ δὲ Διὶ σημειῶν εὐξάμενος αὐτῷ τι φανῆναι, μεθ’ ἡμέραν τὸ διυπετές παλλάδιον πρὸ τῆς σκηνῆς κείμενον ἐθεάσατο. ἦν δὲ τῷ μεγέθει τρίπηχον, τοῖς δὲ ποσὶ συμβεβηκός, καὶ τῇ μὲν δεξιᾷ δόρυ διηρμένον ἔχον τῇ δὲ ἑτέρᾳ ἡλακάτην καὶ ἄτρακτον.

effort later perfected with the long-running coinage in the name of Athena Ilias of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 1<sup>st</sup> century. This possibility cannot be discounted, although it is worth emphasizing that all the epigraphic and archaeological evidence for Ilion being transformed into a space fit to host the Panathenaia only starts to appear *c.*300 and thus coincides with the traditional foundation date of shortly before *c.*306.<sup>70</sup> However, whatever the precise institutional arrangements we are dealing with, it is clear that these coinages of the mid-350s and the regional identity and shared purpose which they imply represent an important precedent for the later Hellenistic *koinon* of Athena Ilias.

Memnon's interest in the cult of Athena Ilias was not unusual for a representative of the Persian authorities. Famously, Xerxes had sacrificed at the sanctuary before crossing from Asia to Europe in 480.<sup>71</sup> Much closer to our time period, Diodorus informs us that when Alexander visited the sanctuary in 334, the Ilian sacrificant, 'Noticed in front of the temple a statue of Ariobarzanes, a former satrap of Phrygia, lying fallen on the ground, together with some other favourable omens that occurred'.<sup>72</sup> Ariobarzanes had been the satrap of Hellespontine Phrygia until he revolted and was replaced by Artabazos: either his statue was toppled in 363/2 and left where it fell for the next three decades, or, more probably, the Ilians toppled it in advance of Alexander's arrival in 334.<sup>73</sup> Whatever the circumstances of the statue's destruction, the fact that it was erected in the first place attests to the value which high-ranking Persian representatives attached to the sanctuary and to its special status within the satrapy as a whole in the years immediately prior to Memnon and Mentor's arrival in the Troad. It may also be significant that recent excavations at Ilion have discovered a ritual deposit associated with the sanctuary and dating to *c.*375-325 which suggests that, after an extended period of neglect, the sanctuary began to attract a broader range of wealthier dedicators in this period. In particular, the excavators have drawn attention to the fact that the deposit mostly consists of tableware of either an Attic or atticizing style or of an Achaemenid style which can be paralleled with finds from the satrapal capital of Hellespontine Phrygia, Daskyleion.<sup>74</sup> While the excavators prefer to associate this uptick in dedicatory activity with the activities of Charidemus and Chares in the region, it seems rather more likely in the context of the foregoing argument that this instead reflects the patronage of figures like Ariobarzanes and Memnon and, more generally, the increased importance attached to the sanctuary by the cities of the Troad as reflected in the Athena Ilias cult statue coinages.

Finally, we may speculate briefly on the identity of the anepigraphic mint. The case of Assos, where the griffin decoration on the helmet identifies whose Athena this is, suggests that the helmet decoration on the anepigraphic mint's Athena may be the key to identifying the minting authority. As can be seen from **Plate 00, 6**, this

<sup>70</sup> For the debate over this date see n. 59.

<sup>71</sup> Hdt. 7.43.

<sup>72</sup> Diod. 17.17.6: τοῦ δὲ βασιλέως ἀναζεύξαντος ἐκ τῆς Τρωάδος καὶ καταντήσαντος πρὸς τὸ τέμενος τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ὁ μὲν θύτης Ἀλέξανδρος κατανοήσας πρὸ τοῦ νεῦο κειμένην εἰκόνα χαμαὶ τοῦ Φρυγίας ποτὲ σατραπεύσαντος Ἀριοβαρζάνου καὶ τινῶν οἰωνῶν αἰσίων ἄλλων ἐπιγενομένων.

<sup>73</sup> Pillot 2016, pp. 140-2.

<sup>74</sup> Berlin 2002, pp. 133-40.

decoration consists of a palmette where the central ‘stalk’ is flanked by two pairs of ‘fronds’, the top pair curling round to protrude at right angles, the bottom pair curling round entirely to form spirals. This is much less distinctive than the griffin of Assos, as is to be expected on a coin with a smaller diameter (in the same way, Athena’s helmet on the Assos drachms likewise features a figurative pattern rather than the more complex and distinctive griffin). Nevertheless, within the wider region of Lesbos, Mysia, and the Troad this pattern is only paralleled on issues of bronze coinage from Ilion and Sigeion (*Figure 9* and *Figure 10*).<sup>75</sup>



*Figure 9*: AE of Sigeion (Roma Numismatics 4 [30/9/2012] 1557 – 18mm, 9h, 1.61g)(1.5x). © Roma Numismatics Ltd.



*Figure 10*: AE of Ilion (Roma Numismatics 4 [30/9/2012] 259 – 18mm, 11h, 5.92g)(1.5x). © Roma Numismatics Ltd.

The issues of Ilion probably follow on immediately from the Ilian bronzes with the archaic cult statue (*Figure 9*) and thus date to the 350s/340s, while the issues of Sigeion probably date to the 360s/350s.<sup>76</sup> It is difficult to choose between these options, although Ilion is perhaps the stronger possibility (the comparison of the types is more exact and Ilion does not already have a silver coinage attributed to it at this time). If this is correct, then the anepigraphic issue was the first silver coinage produced at Ilion. This does not necessarily mean, however, that it was the first silver coinage belonging to the *city* of Ilion: the Rhodian-style rose in the left field suggests Memnon’s involvement, while the lack of a city ethnic might also point in this direction.<sup>77</sup>

## 7. Conclusions

In the course of analysing the hoard group presented in Section 2 I have come to the following conclusions. The coins in the hoard group date to the 350s, and perhaps specifically to the mid-350s and to the context of Artabazos’ rebellion (Section 3).

<sup>75</sup> Ilion: Bellinger 1961, pp. 14-15, T 1 and 4. Sigeion: Babelon, *Traité* 2.2:1311-12, no. 2416 (this coin: BNF Fonds Général 910).

<sup>76</sup> The issues of Sigeion have Athena’s head in profile facing right, not the three-quarter facing head of Athena which we find on both the silver coinage (see Appendix 3 and *Figure 2* and *Figure 3*) and the rest of the bronze coinage which the city produced until its abandonment soon after c.300 (see Babelon, *Traité* 2.2:1311-12, nos. 2413-15). The Sigeion bronzes with Athena’s head in profile thus probably pre-date the silver coinage, which began in the 350s (see Section 4.4 for the date).

<sup>77</sup> Compare the coinage of Pharnabazos minted at Kyzikos: Maffre 2004.

The dating of the hoard group provides a fixed chronological point which we can then use to determine the dating significance of two further criteria: the choice of weight standards and the choice of reverse incuse technique (Sections 4-5). Taken together, this evidence indicates that the minting of higher-value silver coinages in the Troad was not evenly spread out across the 4<sup>th</sup> century, but concentrated in the 350s and 340s. As has been noted, the volume and intensity of this minting activity is, to a greater or lesser extent, highly unusual for all the mints involved, and as a result it is difficult to account for purely in terms of civic expenditure. Moreover, the commonalities in the denominations and weight standard of the coins minted suggest that this minting was organized at a supra-civic level. Taken together, these points strongly suggest that these coinages reflect the spending priorities of the Persian authorities rather than of the cities whose types appear on the coins themselves. While the Chian-weight coinages of the Troad can be satisfactorily explained in terms of Artabazos' revolt, the even larger volume of Persic-weight coinage which followed in the 340s still awaits explanation.<sup>78</sup> Finally, the appearance of the archaic cult statue of Athena Ilias on coins of Abydos, Assos, Ilion, and the issues of the anepigraphic mint (perhaps representing Memnon at Ilion) shows that this supra-civic co-ordination of minting went beyond just providing coins to make military payments, and also involved formulating a regional identity for the Troad based on the cult of Athena Ilias (Section 6). This innovation had a long-term impact on the regional identity of the Troad in the Hellenistic and Imperial periods via the subsequent creation of the *koinon* of Athena Ilias.

To return to the themes adumbrated in the introduction, this case study provides us with a number of insights into Persian rule over the Troad in the mid-4<sup>th</sup> century. In particular, it is interesting to note what a central role Memnon appears to have played. In the reconstruction offered here, it is Memnon who co-ordinates the minting activities of the cities, Memnon who coaxes further funds out of recalcitrant cities such as Lampsakos, Memnon who decides on the denominations of the coins and the expedient of using a reduced weight standard, and Memnon who perceives the novel ideological uses to which the cult of Athena Ilias might be put. While the overall strategy for running and later defending the satrapy of Hellespontine Phrygia undoubtedly came from Artabazos himself, the way in which this was implemented in the Troad was mostly left in the hands of Memnon. The Greek experience of Persian rule in the Troad was therefore to a large extent mediated by a fellow Greek operating at a relatively low level in the Persian Empire's overall chain of command. As Pierre Briant has argued, this was both a strength and a weakness of the Persian imperial system – a strength because it allowed Persia to leverage local expertise in order to extract wealth and military forces in as effective and unobtrusive a way as possible, a weakness because it allowed an invader such as Alexander to insert himself and his subordinates effortlessly into the roles played by the likes of Memnon and Mentor of Rhodes in the Troad.<sup>79</sup>

<sup>78</sup> It is perhaps significant that the centre of gravity for this minting activity shifts north and east towards the Hellespont and the Propontis.

<sup>79</sup> For this major theme in Briant's work on the transition from Achaemenid to Macedonian rule see the essays collected in Briant 2017, Part 5.

## Appendix 1

### The Solar Disk Drachms of Memnon of Rhodes

	<b>n</b>	<b>d</b>	<b>n/d</b>	<b>Singletons</b>	<b>D (Carter)<sup>80</sup></b>	<b>D (Esty)<sup>81</sup></b>
<b>Ashton 1990 + 2002</b>	64	21	3.05	11	26.5 ±2.17	31.3 ±7.72
<b>Ellis-Evans</b>	102	27	3.78	9	31.6 ±1.76	36.7 ±6.17

	<b>E-Y</b>	<b>M-E</b>	<b>N-I</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>3.40-9</b>	1	2	-	3
<b>3.30-9</b>	1	3	3	7
<b>3.20-9</b>	2	15	-	17
<b>3.10-9</b>	3	24	-	28
<b>3.00-9</b>	2	16	4	22
<b>2.90-9</b>	1	10	-	12
<b>2.80-9</b>	2	7	-	8
<b>2.70-9</b>	-	3	-	3
<b>2.60-9</b>	1	-	-	1
<b>?</b>	-	2	-	2
<b>Total</b>	13	82	7	102

*Obv.* Youthful, short-haired head of Helios profile l. on a radiate solar disk.

*Rev.* Rose flanked by a bud on either side and by the letter combination E-Y, M-E, or N-I.

#### E-Y

<b>Ellis-Evans</b>	<b>mm</b>	<b>h</b>	<b>g</b>	<b>Provenance</b>	<b>Ashton</b>
<b>O1/R1</b>	14	6	2.68	Ashton Coll. = Savoca Online 11 (18/12/2016) 290	New
<b>O1/R2 (a)</b>		11	2.89	ANS 1959.138.2	1. A1/P1
<b>O1/R2 (b)</b>	13	11	3.24	CNG EA (17/12/2014) 177	New
<b>O1/R3</b>		11	3.08	BM G1969,0519.1 (R. Hecht, 1969)	2. A1/P2
<b>O1/R4</b>	14	6	2.92	Berlin 18262093 (F. Imhoof-Blumer, 1900)	3. A1/P3
<b>O1/R5</b>	13	6	2.83	Berlin 18262094 (G. Rosen, 1854)	4. A1/P4
<b>O1/R6</b>	15		3.45	Ars Classica 12 (18/10/1926) 1875 = Naville 4 (17/6/1922) 905	5. A1/P5
<b>O2/R6 (a)</b>		12	3.23	BM 1979,0101.645 = SNG von Aulock 2862	6a. A2/P5
<b>O2/R6 (b)</b>		12	3.07	Ashton Coll. (acq. 1980)	6b. A2/P5
<b>O2/R5</b>		12	3.14	Ashton Coll. (acq. 1987) = Superior (12/12/1987) 456 (Dr Feori Pipito; ex Jacob Hirsch, 1950s) = Ars Classica 15 (2/7/1930) 979	7. A2/P4
<b>O2/R7</b>	14		3.35	Helbing (20/3/1928) 385	8. A2/P6
<b>O2/R8</b>	15	11	3.18	CNG 99 (13/5/2015) 191	New
<b>O2/R9</b>	14	5	3.11	London Commerce Hoard no. 7	New

<sup>80</sup> Carter 1983.

<sup>81</sup> Esty 2011.

## M-E

<b>O2/R10 (a)</b>	16	4	3.20	Lanz 48 (22/5/1989) 341 = Elsen 12 (18/2/1989) 46 = A.E. Cahn 65 (15/10/1929) 214 = Helbing (24/10/1927) 3084 [3.25g]	9. A2/P7
<b>O2/R10 (b)</b>	13	5	3.19	Roma Numismatics ES 14 (27/12/2014) 171	New
<b>O2/R10 (c)</b>	15	6	3.05	Roma Numismatics ES 7 (22/3/2014) 685	New
<b>O2/R11 (a)</b>	14	6	3.25	Berlin 18262048 (A. Prokesch-Osten, 1875)	10. A2/P8
<b>O2/R11 (b)</b>			3.21	Dorotheum 515 (15/5/2012) 1039 (Dr Erwin Hartmann)	New
<b>O2/R12 (a)</b>		12	2.93	Brussels, Royal Library (acq. 1910)	11. A2/P9
<b>O2/R12 (b)</b>	13	6	3.14	London Ancient Coins 46 (12/10/2015) 88	New
<b>O2/R12 (c)</b>	14	6	3.28	London Commerce Hoard no. 8	New
<b>O3/R13</b>		6	3.14	Ashton Coll. (acq. 1985) = Sotheby's (21/11/1985) 157 (Prof. R.J. Hopper) = NCirc (Feb. 1980) 2116 = NFA 6 (27/2/1979) 316 = Glendining (4/10/1957) 161	12. A3/P9
<b>O3/R14</b>		6	3.16	Sadberk Hanım 274	New
<b>O3/R15</b>		5	2.97	L. Cancio Coll. (acq. 1968) = Hesperia Art Bulletin 24 (early 1960s) 27 [3.05g]	13. A3?/P10
<b>O4/R16</b>	14.5	11	3.24	CNG EA 415 (28/2/2018) 208	New
<b>O5/R17</b>		12	3.39	Ashton Coll. = MM Basel 54 (26/10/1978) 312 = A. E. Cahn 60 (2/7/1928) 902 <sup>82</sup>	14. A4/P8
<b>O6/R18</b>			3.05	CNG 55 (13/9/2000) 577	15A. A5A/ P11A
<b>O7/R19 (a)</b>			3.01	Italo Vecchi 10 (24/3/1998) 385	15B. A5B/ P11B
<b>O7/R19 (b)</b>			3.14	Lanz 154 (11/6/2012) 188	New
<b>O7/R20</b>		6	3.16	Sadberk Hanım 274	New
<b>O8/R21</b>		12	3.14	BM 1884,0610.5 ( <i>BMC Caria</i> 221,3)	15. A5/P11
<b>O9/R22</b>		12	2.79	BM 1839,0919.389 ( <i>BMC Caria</i> 221,1; J. Millingen) = J. Millingen, <i>Sylloge of Ancient and Unedited Coins</i> (1837) 75, Plate 2,51	16. A6/P12
<b>O10/R23</b>		12	3.20	NAC 10 (9/4/1997) 243 = Glendining (21/2/1961) 2442 (R. C. Lockett) = <i>SNG Lockett</i> 2975 = Naville 4 (17/6/1922) 904	17. A7/P13
<b>O11/R24 (a)</b>			3.21	GM 195 (7/2/2011) 256	New
<b>O11/R24 (b)</b>			2.90	Priv. Coll. (USA)	New
<b>O12/R24 (a)</b>		12	3.33	NCirc (Apr. 2000) 1346 = Bourgey (14/12/1934) 107	18a. A8/P14
<b>O12/R24 (b)</b>		11	2.90	BM 1920,0907.56 (F.W. Hasluck, 1920) <sup>83</sup>	18b. A8/P14
<b>O12/R24 (c)</b>	14	11	3.10	Obolos 6 (20/11/2016) 481	New
<b>O12/R24 (d)</b>	14	5	3.21	London Commerce Hoard no. 10	New

<sup>82</sup> Ashton 1990, p. 28 n. 4 comments, 'Die A4 is very similar to die A1 used on E-Y coins'.

<sup>83</sup> Hasluck's collection was formed during the period he spent in the Dardanelles region: Robinson 1921, p. 1.

<b>O12/R24 (e)</b>	13		3.08	Ebay 132497698989 ending 19/4/2018	New
<b>O12/R25 (a)</b>		12	3.13	Ashton Coll. (acq. 1983) = Sternberg 11 (20/11/1981) 145	19a. A8/P15
<b>O12/R25 (b)</b>		12	3.00	Priv. Coll. (acq. 2002) = Ebay 1347993809 ending 28/4/2002 – From the Troad	19b. A8/P15?
				<b>NB</b> – The M-E legend on R26 is retrograde.	
<b>O13/R26 (a)</b>		6	3.10	Ashton Coll. (acq. 1984)	20a. A9/P16
<b>O13/R26 (b)</b>	14	12	3.16	Berlin 18262055 (W. von Knobelsdorff, 1822)	20b. A9/P16
<b>O13/R26 (c)</b>	15	5	3.40	London Commerce Hoard no. 12	New
<b>O13/R26 (d)</b>	13		3.13	Savoca Online 9 (21/8/2016) 253	New
<b>O14/R26</b>			3.32	Hesperia Art Bulletin (1965) 102 = MM Basel Liste 141 (Dec. 1954) 23	21. A10/P16
<b>O14/R27 (a)</b>	15	6	2.76	Berlin 18262058 (F. Imhoof-Blumer, 1900)	22. A10/P17
<b>O14/R27 (b)</b>	14	12	3.05	CNG EA 348 (8/4/2015) 265	New
<b>O15/R27 (a)</b>	14	6	3.01	Ashton Coll. = Galerie des Monnaies (Los Angeles) (9/6/1978) 1422 = Jacob Hirsch 31 (6/5/1912) 473 = 25 (29/11/1909) 2419 (G. Philipsen)	23. A11/P18
<b>O15/R27 (b)</b>	14	1	2.89	London Commerce Hoard no. 11	New
<b>O16/R27 (a)</b>	14	6	2.97	McClean 8553 = Hirsch 21 (16/11/1908) 3234 (Consul Weber)	24a. A12/P18
<b>O16/R27 (b)</b>		6	3.12	Rodolfo Ratto (26/4/1909) 4157 (W. Froehner)	24b. A12/P18
<b>O16/R27 (c)</b>		12	2.93	BNF Fonds Général 1344	24c. A12/P18
<b>O16/R28 (a)</b>		12	2.77	Ashton Coll. (acq. 1980)	25a. A12/P19
<b>O16/R28 (b)</b>		12	3.00	Ashton Coll. (acq. 1985) = Schweizerische Kreditanstalt (Bern) 3 (19/4/1985) 234 = Glendining (20/11/1975) 841 = MM Basel Liste 340 (Nov.-Dec. 1972) 15 = A.E. Cahn 60 (2/7/1928) 903	25b. A12/R19
<b>O16/R28 (c)</b>	15		2.87	Savoca 3 <sup>rd</sup> Blue Auction (26/11/2017) 246 = Naumann 48 (20/11/2016) 126 [2.90g]	New
<b>O17/R28</b>	14	12	3.16	London Commerce Hoard no. 9	New
<b>O17/R29 (a)</b>			-	Priv. Coll. Athens	26a. A13/P19
<b>O17/R29 (b)</b>		12	3.04	CNG 78 (14/5/2008) 761 = Lanz 131 (27/11/2006) 796 = GM 81 (3/3/1997) 349	26b. A13/P19
<b>O17/R29 (c)</b>			3.01	GM 147 (7/3/2006) 1477	New
<b>O17/R29 (d)</b>	14		3.17	Naumann 64 (1/4/2018) 136	New
<b>O17/R30</b>	15	6	3.48	CNG 94 (18/9/2013) 648	New
<b>O18/R31</b>			3.09	Salton-Schlessinger List (NY) 28 (Spring 1959) 59 = Naville 1 (4/4/1921) 2662 (S. Pozzi)	27. A14/P20
<b>O19/R32 (a)</b>	14	3	3.00	Berlin 18262059 (C. R. Fox, 1873)	28a. A15/P21

<b>O19/R32 (b)</b>		9	3.16	Priv. Coll. Brisbane = Glendining (9/6/1982) 202 = Stanley Gibbons List 46 (Aug. 1980) 9	28b. A15/ P21
<b>O19/R32 (c)</b>		12		Princeton, Firestone Library 92-48	28c. A15/ P21
<b>O19/R32 (d)</b>	14	5	3.07	Roma Numismatics 13 (23/3/2017) 292	New
<b>O19/R33 (a)</b>	15	12	3.26	<i>SNG</i> Ashmolean 671 (acq. 11/11/1971 from J. Schulman stock) = Glendining (21/2/1961) 2441 (R. C. Lockett) = <i>SNG</i> Lockett 2974 = Naville 7 (23/6/1924) 1541 = Weber 3.6698 = Sotheby, Wilkinson & Hodge (10/7/1884) 1135 (J. Whittall)	29. A15/P22
<b>O19/R33 (b)</b>	14		3.14	Naumann 57 (3/9/2017) 278 = Pecunem 32 (7/6/2015) 181	New
<b>O20/R33 (a)</b>	13	12	3.13	Berlin 18262090 (A. Löbbecke, 1906)	30a. A16/ P22
<b>O20/R33 (b)</b>		12	2.82	Ashton Coll. (acq. Jan. 1976, Baldwin's) = Hirsch 87 (1/4/1974) 151	30b. A16/ P22
<b>O20/R33 (c)</b>		9	2.89	Bank Leu 77 (11/5/2000) 324 = Kricheldorf 28 (18/6/1974) 117	30c. A16/ P22
<b>O20/R32</b>		12	3.20	<i>SNG</i> Cop. 913 (J.P. Lambros, 1889)	31. A16/P21
<b>O21/R33 (a)</b>		3	3.26	<i>SNG</i> Delepierre 2781 (BNF 1966.453.2781) = MM Basel Liste 117 (Sep. 1952) 15 = Jameson 3 (1924) 2309	32a. A17/ P23
<b>O21/R33 (b)</b>			3.19	MM DE 21 (24/5/2007) 823 = Aufhäuser 11 (21/3/1995) 111	32b. A17/ P23
<b>O21/R34 (c)</b>	14	6	3.18	Obolos 4 (21/2/2016) 320	New
<b>O21/R34 (d)</b>			3.13	Helios 5 (25/6/2010) 100	New
<b>O21/R35 (a)</b>		12	3.20	Bank Leu 76 (27/10/1999) 192 = <i>SNG</i> von Aulock 8812	33. A17/P24
<b>O21/R35 (b)</b>	13		3.22	Naumann 56 (6/8/2017) 149	New
<b>O21/R36 (a)</b>		2	2.97	BM 1872,0709.201 ( <i>BMC</i> Caria 221,2; <i>NC</i> 15 1873, p. 315, no. 107) (E. Wigan, 1872)	34a. A17/ P25
<b>O21/R36 (b)</b>			2.80	GM 108 (3/4/2001) 1270	34b. A17/ P25
<b>O22/R36</b>			2.95	NAC 1 (29/3/1989) 211 = <i>SNG</i> von Aulock 2769 = MM Basel Liste 96 (Oct. 1950) 14 = <i>Ars Classica</i> 15 (2/7/1930) 978	35. A18/P25
<b>O23/R37 (a)</b>			3.29	A.E. Cahn 60 (2/7/1928) 901 = Naville 5 (18/6/1923) 2650	36. A19/P26
<b>O23/R37 (b)</b>			3.24	GM 118 (15/10/2002) 1466	New
<b>O23/R38</b>		12	3.16	Ashton Coll. (acq. 1985, ex Baldwin stock, Dec. 1980-Mar. 1981)	37. A19/P27
<b>O24/R39 (a)</b>		12	2.96	R.J. Myers (NY) 9 (5/12/1974) 147	38. A20/P28
<b>O24/R39 (b)</b>	13		3.00	Savoca Online 16 (25/6/2017) 160	New
<b>O24/R40</b>	14	6	2.81	Berlin 18262091 (Sabbas, 1879)	39. A20/P29

<b>O24/R41 (a)</b>	15	6	3.15	Nomos 16 (10/5/2018) 119 ('From the Cinquantenaire Collection, Switzerland, once in the stock of Tradart') = MM Basel 66 (22/10/1984) 268	40a. A20/P30
<b>O24/R41 (b)</b>			3.02	Alpha Bank 9497 = GM 87 (2/3/1998) 234 = 79 (14/10/1996) 230	40b. A20/P30
<b>O24/R42</b>		6	3.12	Ashton Coll. = Malter 49 (15/11/1992) 779 (J.S. Wilkinson, Canada, acq. 1965)	41. A20/P31
<b>O24/R43 (a)</b>	17		3.03	Naumann 50 (5/2/2017) 176	New
<b>O24/R43 (b)</b>	13		3.04	Naumann 64 (1/4/2018) 135	New
				<b>NB</b> – O25-26 have Helios facing r.	
<b>O25/R44</b>	16	6	2.87	CNG EA 359 (9/9/2015) 67	New
<b>O26/R45</b>	13	9	2.94	Ashton Coll. = Naumann 62 (4/2/2018) 190	New

**N-I**

<b>O27/R45 (a)</b>		12	3.05	BNF Fonds Général 1347	42a. A21/P32
<b>O27/R45 (b)</b>		6	3.08	Ashton Coll. (acq. 1995)	42b. A21/P32
<b>O27/R46</b>	15	8	3.37	Berlin 18262095 (Osman Noury Bey, 1925)	43. A21/P33
<b>O27/R47</b>		12	3.02	ANS 1966.288.13 = Hesperia Art Bulletin 36 (May 1966) 46 = Rodolfo Ratto 22 (9/10/1934) 211 = 11 (4/4/1927) 2073 = Naville 1 (4/4/1921) 2663 (S. Pozzi) = Mr. Hawkins, Bignor Park (J. Millingen, <i>Sylloge of Ancient and Unedited Coins</i> [1837] 75, Plate 2,50)	44. A21/P34
<b>O27/R48 (a)</b>	15	6	3.35	Ashton Coll. = MM Basel 79 (28/2/1994) 370 (Priv. Coll. Switzerland) = 13 (17/6/1954) 1185 = Naville 5 (18/6/1923) 2651	45a. A21/P35
<b>O27/R48 (b)</b>	15		3.31	Helbing (20/3/1928) 384 = Naville 5 (18/6/1923) 2652	45b. A21/P35
<b>O27/R48 (c)</b>			3.01	CNG 64 (25/9/2003) 287	New

**M-E (Bronze)**

*Obv.* Youthful, short-haired head of Helios profile r., surrounded by rays (*not* a solar disk).  
*Rev.* Rose flanked by M-E; no bud.

<b>O1/R1 (a)</b>	9	12	0.70	BNF Fonds Général 1346	1a. A1/P1
<b>O1/R1 (b)</b>	9	6	0.47	Ashton Coll. = Peus 355 (27/4/1998) 136 (in lot of 15 AE); P. Hammerich, Copenhagen, ex Finn Rasmussen acq. 1971 from J. C. Holm) = Jacob Hirsch 21 (16/11/1908) 3235 (Consul Weber)	1b. A1/P1
<b>O1/R1 (c)</b>	8	7	0.70	SNG Turkey 9.826	New

<b>O1/R2</b>	9	6	0.73	BM 1894,0402.61 ( <i>BMC Caria</i> 221,4)	2. A1/P2
<b>O1/R3 (a)</b>	8	12	0.63	<i>SNG</i> Cop. 914 = Jacob Hirsch 25 (29/11/1909) 2420 (G. Philipson)	3. A1/P3
<b>O1/R3 (b)</b>	9		0.76	Naumann 37 (1/11/2015) 288	New
<b>O1/R4 (a)</b>	9	6	0.72	Priv. Coll.	4a. A1/P4
<b>O1/R4 (b)</b>	9	6	0.77	Priv. Coll.	4b. A1/P4
<b>O1/R5</b>	9	6	0.69	Priv. Coll.	5. A1/P5
<b>O1/R6</b>	9	12	0.69	Priv. Coll.	6. A1/P6
<b>O2/R7</b>			0.70	Priv. Coll. (Ebay 379367981 ending 17/7/2000) – Bought at Didyma	7. A2/P7
<b>O2/R8</b>			0.64	MM Deutschland 30 (28/5/2009) 581 = Künker 133 (11/10/2007) 7613 = Aufhäuser 10 (5/10/1993) 203	8. A2/P8
<b>O2/R9 (a)</b>	9	9	0.61	Priv. Coll.	9a. A2/P9
<b>O2/R9 (b)</b>	9	3	0.78	Priv. Coll. (acq. 1998)	9b. A2/P9
<b>O2/R10 (a)</b>	9			Zühlsdorf Sonderliste 2 (undated) O14	10. A2?P10
<b>O2/R10 (b)</b>		8	0.80	Ebay 1346432392 ending 21/4/2002	New
<b>O2/R10 (c)</b>	10		0.82	Naumann 28 (1/2/2015) 182	New
<b>O2/R11</b>		4	0.66	<i>SNG</i> Kayhan 1001 (acq. 2002)	New
<b>O2/R?</b>				MM De 30 (28/5/2009) 839 (in lot of 9) – Reverse not illustrated	New
<b>O2/R?</b>	9	2	0.80	<i>SNG</i> Turkey 9.825	New
<b>O3/R12</b>		6	0.80	Priv. Coll. USA (acq. 1998)	11. A3/P11
<b>O4/R13</b>			0.77	GM 212 (5/3/2013) 2077	New
<b>O5/R13 (a)</b>	9	6	0.77	CNG EA 351 (20/5/2015) 242	New
<b>O5/R13 (b)</b>	9		0.70	Naumann 14 (2/3/2014) 352	New
<b>O?/R?</b>	9	2	0.90	<i>SNG</i> Turkey 9.827	New
<b>O?/R?</b>	9		0.68	Ebay 173076342857 ending 3/2/2018	New
<b>O?/R?</b>	10	12	0.72	Forum Ancient Coins, SKU GB86426 (seen 17/1/2018)	New

## Appendix 2 The Silver Coinage of Sigeion

*Obv.* Head of Athena facing three-quarters r., wearing triple-crested helmet, disc earrings, and necklace.

*Rev.* Owl standing r., head facing; <LF> crescent; <RF> ΣΙΓΓΕ written vertically downwards, all within square incuse.

<b>O1/R1</b>	3.15			H.J. Berk Buy or Bid 115 (2/8/2000) 294.
	3.09	16	12	CNG 100 (7/10/2015) 1422. [ <i>Figure 2</i> ]
	3.03			Jameson 3 (1924) 2232.
	2.43	15	12	Berlin 18262096 (A. Löbbecke, 1906) – Very worn.

*Rev.* All within round incuse.

<b>O2/R2</b>	2.77			GM 104 (9/10/2000) 375.
--------------	------	--	--	-------------------------

	2.55		12	Malter 49 (15/11/1992), 701 (Dr J.S. Wilkinson) = Glendinging (21/2/1961) 2214 (R.C. Lockett) = <i>SNG</i> Lockett 2740 = Naville 1 (4/4/1921) 2280 (S. Pozzi) – Worn.
	2.52	15	3	BM 1844,1015.121 ( <i>BMC</i> Troas 86,1; Thomas Thomas, Esq.) = S. Leigh Sotheby's & Co. (29/7/1844) 2013 (H.P. Borrell, <i>NC</i> 6, 1843, p. 199 – 'My cabinet').
<b>O2/R3</b>	2.78	15	9	Bank Leu 33 (3/5/1983) 366 = <i>SNG</i> von Aulock 1569. [Figure 3]

### Appendix 3

#### Series Depicting the Archaic Cult Statue of Athena Ilias

##### Abydos (Chian Tetradrachm)

*Obv.* Laureate head of Apollo l.

*Rev.* Archaic cult statue of Athena Ilias r. on base, spear held over shoulder pointing downwards in r. hand, distaff in l., one fillet over her l. wrist and another attached to the distaff; she wears a tall polos on her head, to which is attached a long veil which wraps round her arms, and a peplos over a floor-length garment; <LF> ABYΔHNON; all within incuse square.

<b>O1/R1</b>	15.15	23	11	Gulbenkian 595 (c.387-325) = Jameson 4 (1932) 2583 (c.400; found near Çanakkale). [Figure 5]
--------------	-------	----	----	--

##### Assos (Chian Tetradrachm)<sup>84</sup>

*Obv.* Head of Athena l. in crested Attic helmet decorated with griffin.

*Rev.* Same as Abydos tetradrachm, but <LF> ΑΣΣΙΟΝ.

<b>O1/R1</b>	15.01	23		BnF Fonds Général 498 (c.430-400 – Babelon, <i>Traité</i> 2.2:1267-70, no. 2302) = Waddington (1897) 655 [14.95g] <sup>84</sup> (450-400 – <i>BMC</i> Troas, p. 36, no. α). [Figure 4]
--------------	-------	----	--	--

##### Anepigraphic Mint (Reduced Chian Drachm?)

*Obv.* Head of Athena r. in crested Attic helmet decorated with a palmette design and a laurel wreath.

*Rev.* Archaic cult statue of Athena Ilias l. on base, spear with fillets held over shoulder pointing downwards in r. hand, distaff in l., polos on head; <LF> rose; round incuse occasionally visible.

<b>O1/R1</b>	2.99	14	12	ANS 1950.191.20 = Jameson 3 (1924) 2229 = Naville 4 (17/6/1922) 802 (Assos, tetrobol, ca. 400).
	2.66	14	12	London Commerce Hoard no. 6. [Pl. 00, 6]
	2.65	15	12	Berlin 18262099 = Jacob Hirsch 25 (29/11/1909) 1886 (G. Philipsen) <sup>85</sup> (Assos, tetrobol (?), c.450-400).
	2.63	14	12	CNG 99 (13/5/2015) 195 (Assos, tetrobol, c.450/40-400).
<b>O1/R2</b>	2.59			Hirsch 258 (25/9/2008) 2208 (Assos, tetrobol, c.400).
<b>O2/R3</b>	2.87			GM 108 (3/4/2001) 1234 (Ilion, hemidrachm, 3 <sup>rd</sup> c.).

<sup>84</sup> The coin originally belonged to James Whittall, but does not appear in the sale of his collection (Sotheby, Wilkinson & Hodge [10/7/1884]), and so Waddington presumably purchased it privately.

<sup>85</sup> The Jacob Hirsch catalogue records the letters Α | Λ on the reverse, but I cannot see them and nor could Mannsperger and Mannsperger (2002) 1092 n. 77.

**Anepigraphic Mint (Reduced Chian Hemidrachm?)**

*Types:* Same as drachms.

<b>O1/R1</b>	1.39	12	12	SNG Turkey 9.580 (Ilion, diobol, 4 <sup>th</sup> c.).
	1.38	12		Pecunem-Solidus 22 (21/9/2014) 83 (Ilion, diobol, c.400).
	1.19	12		Naumann 62 (4/2/2018) 146 (Assos, diobol, c.450/40-400) – Worn. [Figure 7]

**Anepigraphic Mint (Bronze)**

*Types:* Same as drachms.

<b>O1/R1</b>	1.48	12	1	Berlin 18262108 (Osman Noury Bey, 1925). [Figure 8]
--------------	------	----	---	---

**Ilion (Bronze)**

*Ref.* Bellinger T 2

*Obv.* Head of Athena I. in crested Attic helmet decorated with laurel wreath.

*Rev.* Archaic cult statue of Athena Ilias I. on base, spear held over shoulder pointing downwards in r. hand, distaff in l. and fillet over this arm; she wears a tall polos on her head, to which is attached a long veil, and a floor-length garment; <RF> IAI; all within round incuse.

<b>O1/R1</b>	2.19	13	3	Tübingen-Cincinnati Excavation C277, z7.73.4 (sanctuary of Athena Ilias, Ilion). <sup>86</sup>
	2.11	12	3	SNG Turkey 9.586.
	2.07		9	SNG Munich 207.
	2.06	12	3	SNG Turkey 9.587.
	2.06	12	1	SNG Turkey 9.588.
	1.94	12		Weber 3 (1926) 5381.
	1.87	12	2	SNG Turkey 9.589.
	1.84	12	2	SNG Turkey 9.590.
	1.80	13		Naville Live Auction 11 (30/11/2014) 58.
	1.78	11	3	SNG Ashmolean 1152 (acq. Bodley).
	1.76			BnF R 3810.
	1.67	12	3	Berlin 18262109 (F. Imhoof-Blumer, 1900). [Figure 9]
	1.47	12	7	Forum Ancient Coins 80116 (seen 17/5/2015).

**Bibliography**

- Alram, M. (2012). ‘The coinage of the Persian Empire’, in W.E. Metcalf (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Coinage* (Oxford), pp. 61-87.
- Ashton, R.H.J. (1990). ‘The solar disk drachms of Caria’, *NC* 150, pp. 27-38.
- (2002). ‘A Rhodian-type coinage for Memnon and Mentor?’, *NC* 162, pp. 11-16.
- Ashton, R.H.J. *et al.* (2002). ‘The Pixodarus Hoard (CH 9.421)’, in A.R. Meadows and U. Wartenberg (eds), *Coin Hoards IX: Greek Hoards* (London), pp. 159-243.
- Baldwin, A. (1924). *Lampsakos: The Gold Staters, Silver and Bronze Coinages* (New York).
- Bellinger, A.R. (1957). ‘The earliest coins of Ilium’, *ANSMN* 7, pp. 43-9.
- (1961). *Troy: The Coins, Supplementary Monograph 2* (Princeton).

<sup>86</sup> Mannsperger and Mannsperger (2002) 1092-3 and Abb. 4. I am very grateful to Brian Rose for providing me with information about this find in advance of publication.

- Berlin, A.M. (2002). 'Ilion before Alexander: a fourth century BC ritual deposit', *Studia Troica* 12, pp. 131-65.
- Briant, P. (1982). *Rois, tributs et paysans: études sur les formations tributaires du Moyen-Orient ancien* (Paris).
- (2002). *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire* (Winona Lake, IN).
- (2017). *Kings, Countries, Peoples: Selected Studies on the Achaemenid Empire* (Stuttgart).
- Buckler, J. (1989). *Philip II and the Sacred War* (Leiden).
- Callataÿ, F. de (1996). 'Abydos sur Aesillas', in *Χαρακτήρ. Αφιέρωμα στην Μαντώ Οικονομίδου* (Athens), pp. 81-91.
- Carradice, I. (1987). 'The 'regal' coinage of the Persian Empire', in I. Carradice (ed.), *Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires* (Oxford), pp. 73-108.
- Carter, G. F. (1983). 'A simplified method for calculating the original number of dies from die link statistics', *ANSMN* 28, pp. 195-206.
- Debord, P. (1999). *L'Asie Mineure au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle (412-323 a.C.): pouvoirs et jeux politiques* (Bordeaux).
- Delrieux, F. (2000). 'Les ententes monétaires au type et à la légende ΣΥΝ au début du IV<sup>e</sup> siècle', in O. Casabonne (éd.), *Mécanismes et innovations monétaires dans l'Anatolie achéménide. Numismatique et Histoire* (Paris), pp. 185-211.
- Ellis-Evans, A. (2016a). 'The koinon of Athena Ilias and its coinage', *AJN* 28, pp. 105-58.
- (2016b). 'Mytilene, Lampsakos, Chios and the financing of the Spartan fleet (406-404)', *NC* 176, pp. 1-19.
- Esty, W.W. (2011). 'The geometric model for estimating the number of dies', in F. de Callataÿ (ed.), *Quantifying Monetary Supplies in Greco-Roman Times* (Bari), pp. 43-58.
- Forster, E.S. (1920). *Oeconomica* (Oxford).
- Frisch, P. (1975) *Die Inschriften von Ilion* (Bonn).
- Fritze, H. von (1902). 'Die Münzen von Ilion', in W. Dörpfeld (ed.), *Troja und Ilion: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen in den vorhistorischen und historischen Schichten von Ilion, 1870-1894*, 2 vols. (Athens), Vol. 2, pp. 477-534.
- (1914). 'Die Silberprägung von Kyzikos', *Nomisma* 9, pp. 34-56.
- Gaebler, H. (1923). 'Die Silberprägung von Lampsakos', *Nomisma* 12, pp. 1-38.
- Gartland, S. (2013). 'The electrum coinage of Thebes', *NC* 173, pp. 23-32.
- Heskel, J. (1997). *The North Aegean Wars 371-360 BC* (Stuttgart).
- Hornblower, S. (1991-2008). *A Commentary on Thucydides*, 3 vols (Oxford).
- Karwiese, S. (1980). 'Lysander as Herakliskos Draknognigon', *NC* 140, pp. 1-27.
- Knoepfler, D. (2001). *Décrets érétriens de proxénie et de citoyenneté* (Lausanne).
- Lazzarini, L. (1984). 'La prima monetazione della panegiria a Illo', *RIN* 86, pp. 3-8.
- Le Rider, G. (1963). *Deux trésors de monnaies grecques de la Propontide (IV<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J.-C.)* (Paris).
- (1971). 'Sur le monnayage de Byzance au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle', *RN* 13, 6<sup>th</sup> Ser., pp. 143-53.
- Maffre, F. (2004). 'Le monnayage de Pharnabaze frappé dans l'atelier de Cyzique', *NC* 164, pp. 1-32.
- Mann, M. (1984). 'The autonomous power of the state: its origins, mechanisms and results', *Archives Européennes de Sociologie* 25.2, pp. 185-213.

- Mannsperger, B. and Mannsperger, D. (2002). 'Die Ilias ist ein Heldenepos. Ilosgrab und Athena Ilias', in R. Aslan *et al.* (eds), *Mauerschau: Festschrift für Manfred Korfmann*, 3 vols. (Remshalden-Grunbach), Vol. 3, pp. 1075-1101.
- Mannsperger, D. (2006). 'Von Zahlungsmittel zum Leitartefakt: Münzen und Münzfunde in Ilion', in M. Korfmann (ed.), *Troia: Archäologie eines Siedlungshügels und seiner Landschaft* (Mainz am Rhein), pp. 265-74.
- Meadows, A.R. (2005). 'The administration of the Achaemenid Empire', in J. Curtis and N. Tallis (eds), *Forgotten Empire: The World of Ancient Persia* (London), pp. 181-209.
- (2011). 'The Chian revolution: changing patterns of hoarding in 4<sup>th</sup>-century BC western Asia Minor', in T. Faucher, M.-C. Marcellesi, and O. Picard (eds), *Nomisma: la circulation monétaire dans le monde grec antique* (Athens), pp. 273-95.
- Naster, P. (1975). 'Le carré creux en numismatique grecque', in J.-M. Dentzer, P. Gauthier, and T. Hackens (eds), *Numismatique antique. Problèmes et méthodes* (Nancy-Louvain), pp. 17-22.
- Pillot, W. (2016) 'Ilion, Athéna Ilias et les Détroits, d'Alexandre le Grand à Antiochos III. Identité régionale d'une communauté politique et de son sanctuaire, au carrefour d'influences européennes et asiatiques', in M. Dana and F. Prêteux (eds), *Identité régionale, identités civiques autour des Détroits des Dardanelles et du Bosphore (V<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C.- II<sup>e</sup> siècle après J.-C.)* (Clermont-Ferrand), pp. 133-70.
- Robert, L. (1966). *Monnaies antiques en Troade* (Paris).
- (1967). *Monnaies grecques: types, légendes, magistrats monétaires et géographie* (Geneva).
- Robinson, E.S.G. (1921). 'Greek coins from the Dardanelles', *NC* 1, 5<sup>th</sup> Ser., pp. 1-25.
- Sandstrom, F.F. (1993). 'The fourth century BC silver ΣΩΤΕΙΡΑ coinage of Cyzicus: the question of the fractions', in C. Courtois *et al.* (eds), *Actes du XI<sup>e</sup> Congrès international de numismatique*, 4 vols. (Louvain-la-Neuve), Vol. 1, pp. 243-7.
- (1995). *The Silver ΣΩΤΕΙΡΑ Coinage of Cyzicus in the Fourth Century BC* (Diss. Brown University).
- Thompson, M. (1965). 'The coinage of Proconnesus', *RN* 7, 6<sup>th</sup> Ser., pp. 30-5.
- Thonemann, P. (2013). 'The Attalid State, 188-133 BC', in P. Thonemann (ed.), *Attalid Asia Minor: Money, International Relations, and the State* (Oxford), pp. 1-49.
- Tselekas, P. (2010). 'Οι επισημάνσεις στα νομίσματα της ελληνιστικής Λέσβου', in P. Tselekas (ed.), *Coins in the Aegean Islands*, Όβολός 9, 2 vols (Athens), Vol. 1, pp. 127-53.
- Verkinderen, F. (1987). 'The honorary decree for Malousios of Gargara', *Tyche* 2, pp. 247-69.
- Villenoisy, de F. and Frémont, Ch. (1909), 'Le carré creux des monnaies grecques: evolution des procédés de fabrication', *RN* 13, 4<sup>th</sup> Ser., pp. 449-57.
- Weiskopf, M. (1989). *The So-Called "Great Satraps' Revolt", 366-360 BC: Concerning Local Instability in the Achaemenid Far West* (Stuttgart).
- Wiesehöfer, J. (2016). 'Fourth century revolts against Persia: the test case of Sidon (348-345 BCE)', in T. Howe and L.L. Brice (eds), *Brill's Companion to Insurgency and Terrorism in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Leiden), pp. 93-112.
- Zoepffel, R. (2006). *Oikonomika: Schriften zu Hauswirtschaft und Finanzwesen* (Berlin).