The Late Hellenistic Tetradrachms of Parion and Lampsakos

Abstract – This article presents die studies of the tetradrachms minted by Parion and Lampsakos in the Hellenistic period. The Parion Group 1 tetradrachms date to the late 160s or 150s, whereas the Parion Group 2 and Lampsakos tetradrachms date not to the second quarter of the 2nd century as previously thought, but rather to the early 1st century. The overlooked evidence of *IGCH* 1322 (western Asia Minor, 1964/5) provides proof for this later date in the case of Lampsakos. New evidence about the composition of *IGCH* 1322 is presented which allows some progress to be made in identifying the contents of this hoard. The down-dating of these two coinages has two broader consequences. Firstly, Lampsakos' decision to depict Priapos on its coins for the first time with this series should be connected to an epiphany of Priapos which occurred during the war with Aristonikos and significantly altered the god's status at Lampsakos for the rest of antiquity. Secondly, the downdating of the Parian and Lampsakene series to a period of direct Roman rule raises the question of the degree to which Rome was involved in the production of these coinages.

1. Introduction

Our picture of Greek coinage under Rome in the 2nd and 1st centuries has changed dramatically in recent decades.[1] Many silver coinages have been moved down from the first half of the 2nd century to the first half of the 1st century, thus populating a hitherto sparse period of Greek numismatics with coinages using civic types.[2] Even in the case of coinages already thought to have been minted between the mid-2nd and mid-1st centuries, such as those of Athens, Macedonia, Thasos, and Maroneia, there have been substantial readjustments to the chronologies which have consequently placed these series in new historical contexts.[3] Die studies for these coinages have revealed many to be much larger and more intensively minted than was hitherto suspected and thus strengthened the case for linking them to Roman military expenditure, while systematic work on the weight standards of these coinages is beginning to reveal how they came to be aligned with the denarius standard over the course of the 1st century.[4]

The primary focus of much of this scholarship has been on establishing that there was indeed Roman involvement in Greek coinage even when the coin types do not make this explicit. This has been important for dispelling the impression, which Greek mints presumably meant to give when they chose coin types, of Roman involvement in their affairs being limited and late.[5] By revealing the true extent of Roman influence over Greek coinage, we have come much closer to resolving the question of how the Romans paid for their presence in the Greek world given the relatively late point at which they began to bring denarii east with them.[6] A further consequence has been to demonstrate that the Roman authorities by and large did not seek to interfere in how civic mints went about producing the coins which the Romans had requested

[1] All dates are BC unless otherwise stated. This article follows on from my study of the coinage of the koinon of Athena Ilias where die studies of Parion and Lampsakos were promised at Ellis-Evans 2016: 149 n. 129.
[2] To choose just two examples from the Troad which are thus relevant to Parion and Lampsakos, see Callataÿ 1996 and Callataÿ 1998 for Abydos and Tenedos respectively.
[3] See Picard 2008, Picard 2010, and Callataÿ 2016: 315–20, 323–5.
[4] Overview of die studies: Callataÿ 2011 and Callataÿ 2016. Weight standards: Meadows (forthcoming).
[5] For the story of how Roman rule gradually became visible on Greek coins in the 2nd and 1st centuries see Thonemann 2015: 169–90.
[6] For the problem see e.g. Crawford 1985: 116, 119 and for an estimate of the extent to which Greek coinages may have met this need see Callataÿ 2016: 329–32.

from them.[7] Thus, while the reason that a city was minting a high value coinage in the first place may have been because the Roman authorities had asked them to do so, the form which this coinage took (its types, denominations, weight standard, and so on) was a choice which remained in the hands of the civic authorities. As such, these coinages can provide a wealth of incidental detail about Greek cities in the late Hellenistic period – how they conceived of their communal identity, how they related to their civic traditions, and how their institutions continued to operate.

The tetradrachms of Parion and Lampsakos provide an interesting case study for exploring all these issues for two reasons. Firstly, in attempting to establish the degree of Roman influence on Greek coinage scholars have understandably focused on very large coinages which are thus the most likely to represent Roman rather than civic expenditure. By contrast, the Parion Group 2 tetradrachms (one obverse die) and the Lampsakos tetradrachms (five obverse dies) appear to be small coinages. As such, they raise questions about how we identify Roman influence at a mint when volume of production does not settle the matter and, if we acknowledge that there was indeed Roman involvement, how to make sense of these small coinages in the context of Roman finances. Secondly, the re-dating of the Parion Group 2 and Lampsakos tetradrachms to the early 1st century provides an opportunity, particularly in the latter case, to explore the contribution which these coinages can make to our understanding of these cities in the late Hellenistic period.

2. The Apollo Aktaios Tetradrachms of Parion

2.1 Introduction

Our knowledge of this series has developed rapidly in the last 20 years. Whereas four of the five examples of Group 2 have been known since the 19th century, the coins of Group 1 were almost entirely unknown until the 1990s. Meadows (1998) devoted a short note to the series which established the existence of the two groups and dated the coins to *c.* 165–143. At the time he knew of two Group 1 coins, one of which was from *CH* X 308 (Gaziantep, Turkey, 1994; hoard closed pre-Aug./Oct. 143). Since then, five more Group 1 coins have appeared, three of which are from *CH* X 301 ('Demetrius I', Commerce, 2003; hoard closed pre-151). In addition, in 2017 the first undamaged example of a Group 2 coin appeared in trade, thus giving a first indication of the weight standard of this issue.

2.2 Catalogue[8]

Group 1

Obv. Laureate head of Apollo r.

Rev. Apollo semi-draped standing l. on ground line; palm branch in r. hand in front; l. hand on bow resting on ground behind; <RF and LF> ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΟΣ | ΑΚΤΑΙΟΥ written vertically downwards; <EX> ΠΑΡΙΑΝΩΝ; <LF and/or RF> two monograms.

Dies	mm	g	References / Notes

Ref. Meadows 1 (Pl. 15,10). *Rev.* <ILF> ⍙ (above), altar (below), <IRF> ⍦ (above).

[7] Particularly emphasized by Picard 2008: 476–8 and Picard 2010: 189–92.

[8] Abbreviations: Meadows = Meadows 1998: 42–3.

O1/R1 (1)	39	16.88	***CH* X 308.C216.** BM 1996,0107.1 = Spink 106 (11/10/1994), lot 59.
O1/R1 (2)	40	16.61	Künker 236 (7/10/2013), lot 72 = NAC 29 (11/5/2005), lot 197.

Ref. None. *Rev.* <OLF> , <ILF> (above), altar (below).

O1/R2	40	16.95	Nomos 5 (25/10/2011), lot 179 ("From the PGB collection, acquired in the 1970s").

Ref. None. *Rev.* <ILF>  (above), (below).

O2/R3	35	16.88	***CH* X 301.127**. Gemini 1 (11/1/2005), lot 152 = Freeman & Sear List 9 (Spring 2004), lot 35.

Ref. Meadows 2 (Pl. 15,11). *Rev.* <OLF>  , <ILF>  (above), altar (below).

O2/R4	36	17.10	ANS 1991.99.1 = Sotheby's NY (19/6/1991), lot 317 (Nelson Bunker Hunt IV, acq. *c.* 1978–1983).[9]

Ref. None. *Rev.* <ILF>  (above),  (below).

O3/R5	38	16.64	***CH* X 301.129**. Ira & Larry Goldberg (The Pre-Long Beach Sale) 53 (26/5/2009), lot 1680 = Freeman & Sear List 11 (Spring/Summer 2006), lot 45.

Ref. None. *Rev.* <ILF>  (above),  (below).

O3/R6	37	16.77	***CH* X 301.128**. Numismatica Genevensis 8 (24/11/2014), lot 47 = 4 (12/12/2006), lot 92 – Die fault has begun to develop on forehead.

Group 2
Obv. Veiled head of Demeter r. with corn ear in hair, all within dotted border.
Rev. Apollo semi-draped standing l.; in right hand in front, patera over flaming altar; in left behind, lyre resting on omphalos; <RF and LF> written vertically downwards ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΟΣ | ΑΚΤΑΙΟΥ; <EX> ΠΑΡΙΑΝΩΝ | (signer's name).

Polykles
Ref. Meadows 3–4 (Pl. 15,12–13: Fitzwilliam, Paris). *Rev.* <EX> ΠΟΛΥΚΛΗΣ.[10]

O4/R7 (1)	31x28	14.82	*SNG Lewis* 829 (cf. *BMC Mysia*, p. 99) = Hoffmann (15/1/1882), lot 1399 (F. Bompois) [14.78g] – Broken.
O4/R7 (2)	30	14.36	*BNF Fonds Général* 893 (*SNG Paris* 1401) = T. M. Dumersan, *Description des médailles antiques du cabinet de*

[9] For the acquisition dates for this collection see Watson and Todeschini 2006: 129–30.
[10] *Pace* Robert 1966: 44 this individual is not identical with the Polykles in *I. Ilion* 5.5–6: Meadows 1998: 45. *LGPN* VA s.v. nos. 6–7 are in fact the same individual from the coins: the reference to M. J. Price and B. L. Trell, *Coins and Their Cities: Architecture on the Ancient Coins of Greece, Rome, and Palestine* (London, 1977) 121, Fig. 216 is to the example in Paris, the reference to *BMC Mysia*, p. 99 to the example in the Fitzwilliam.

			feu m. Allier de Hauteroche (Paris, 1829) 74, Pl. XII,13 – Broken.
O4/R7 (3)	29	13.03	Berlin, C. R. Fox 1873 (acq. from C. C. Rollin, 1848) – Broken.

Ref. None. *Rev.* <EX> ΠI?PI?NΩN.

O4/R8	29.5	15.77	Triton 20 (9/1/2017), lot 247.

Mandrodikos
Ref. Meadows 5 (Pl. 16,14). This individual not in *LGPN*. *Rev.* <EX> [M]ANΔPOΔIK[OΣ],[11] <RF> ♁ (above).

O4/R9	28	13.95	BM 1896,0601.63 = Sotheby, Wilkinson & Hodge (23/3/1896), lot 522 (H. Montagu) – Heavily corroded to point where obverse die identity not certain.

2.3 Dating
Meadows argued that the Group 2 coins were a separate and later issue than Group 1 on the grounds that: **1)** the Group 1 coins had broader and thinner flans than the Group 2 coins; **2)** the Group 1 coins lacked a magistrate's name, whereas the Group 2 coins feature one in the exergue.[12] With the expanded sample now available to us we can also note two further diagnostic features: **1)** all the Group 1 coins have hammered edges, whereas all the Group 2 coins instead have a dotted border on the obverse; **2)** the weights of the Group 1 coins are uniformly higher (16.6g–17.1g) and clearly conform closely to the 'reduced' Attic standard of 16.9g common in the mid-2nd century, whereas the weight of the one intact Group 2 coin is surprisingly low (15.77g).

The appearance of three Group 1 coins in *CH* X 301 ('Demetrius I', pre-151) allows us to tighten the chronology of this issue still further to the period of the late 160s/150s. Although the sample remains small, we have a ratio of specimens (n = 7) to obverse dies (d = 3) of 2.33:1 with all three obverse dies represented by more than one specimen, suggesting that our sample of the issue is not entirely unrepresentative. These coins may have been produced over a relatively short time span, and the appearance of the monogram ⅄ on reverse dies paired with two separate obverse dies (O1/R1, O1/R2, O2/R4) reinforces this impression.

For want of evidence to the contrary, Meadows also dated the Group 2 coins *c.* 165–143. The implication of his separate grouping of these coins was that they belonged towards the end of this period. He was appropriately cautious about their non-appearance in *CH* X 308 (Gaziantep, pre-Aug./Oct. 143) along with the Group 1 coin which appeared in that hoard, noting that "not even their absence from the 1994 hoard can be pressed since they are so rare".[13] The Group 2 coins have now also failed to turn up in *CH* X 301 (pre-151) which, by contrast, produced three Group 1 coins. At the very least, this strengthens the argument that the Group 2 coins post-date the 150s and are indeed a separate and later issue.

[11] For the restoration of this name and other (less likely) possibilities see Meadows 1998: 45–6.
[12] Meadows 1998: 43–4.
[13] Meadows 1998: 45.

However, we may now also want to question whether the Group 2 coins even belong to the first half of the 140s. One consequence of the full publication of *CH* X 301 and 308 has been a general lowering of the dates for the tetradrachms with autonomous types, with series which began as late as *c.* 143/2 (Herakleia, Lebedos, the 'Syros' tetradrachms) still choosing to adopt the spread-flan design with hammered edges.[14] The implication is that even series starting (or, in the case of Parion, re-starting) as late as the 140s would still be likely to adopt the spread-flan design with hammered edges which had been prevalent in the Greek world since the 170s. The adoption of flans with a reduced diameter of *c.* 30mm, a correspondingly thicker fabric, and a dotted border on the obverse is instead more typical of series which started in the late 2nd/early 1st century such as Abydos, Lampsakos (see below), and the Apollo Smintheus cistophori of Alexandreia Troas.[15] The Group 2 coins may therefore date to the last third of the 2nd century or, more probably, to the first half of the 1st century, and thus to the period of direct Roman rule over Asia Minor.

3. The Priapos Tetradrachms of Lampsakos

3.1 Introduction

The studies of Gaebler (1923, reflecting work pre-1919) and Baldwin (1924) were necessarily cursory in their treatment of this series, since only nine examples had appeared prior to 1921, not all of which were known to either scholar. However, in 1964/5 a hoard reached the market which had reportedly been found in western Asia Minor (*IGCH* 1322). In the subsequent decade nine new examples appeared in trade, with a further two new examples popping up in 1984 and 1990. No new examples have appeared on the market since 1990, and it seems likely that all eleven coins derive from *IGCH* 1322 (these coins are identified as '*IGCH* 1322?' in the catalogue). Although small, this hoard makes a substantial contribution to our knowledge of the series: in addition to adding two new magistrates, a new obverse die, a new die link between two magistrates, and four overstrikes, it also allows us to down-date this series by almost a century from the first half of the 2nd century to the first half of the 1st century, in turn suggesting a rather different context for the production of the series than has hitherto been assumed.

3.2 Catalogue[16]

Obv. Bearded head of Priapos r., wearing an ivy wreath, his hair tightly rolled and down to his shoulders, all within dotted border.
Rev. Apollo Citharoedus standing r. on ground line, wearing chiton and mantle, plectrum in r. hand, lyre under l. arm;[17] <RF and LF> ΛΑΜΨΑ|ΚΗΝΩΝ written vertically downwards; <ILF> monogram; <IRF> control mark; <EX> magistrate's name in the genitive.

Dies	mm	g	References / Notes
Ephesios son of Theodoros			

[14] Callataÿ 2013: 233, Table 6.10.
[15] Apollo Smintheus cistophoroi: Lanz 163 (7/12/2016), lot 95 (Year 216 = 85 BC); GM 249 (11/10/2017), lot 274 (Year 233 = 68 BC).
[16] Abbreviations: Gaebler = Gaebler 1923: 72–3; Baldwin = Baldwin 1924: 30–2.
[17] This depiction of Apollo Citharoedus is common throughout Mysia: see Robert 1955: 134–53 with the reliefs illustrated in Planches XXIII–XXVII.

Ref. Gaebler Group 5,71 (Taf. 2,43); Baldwin Pl. 8,4. *Rev.* <EX> ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ | ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ, <LF> ⏃, <RF> tripod.[18]

O1/R1	32	16.79	*BNF Fonds Général* 769 (*SNG Paris* 1230) = Waddington 884.

Promethion son of Lampon (1)[19]
Ref. Gaebler Group 5,74 (Taf. 2,45); Baldwin Pl. 8,5–6. *Rev.* <EX> ΠΡΟΜΗΘΙΩΝΟΣ | ΤΟΥ ΛΑΜΠΩΝΟΣ, <LF> ⋈, <RF> Hekate facing, wearing kalathos, holding a torch in each hand.[20]

O2/R2	29	16.10	BM 1900,1204.3 (W. Wroth, *NC* 20[3] [1900] 288–9, no. 21, Pl. XIV) = Sotheby, Wilkinson & Hodge (28/5/1900), lot 327 ('Greek Coins of a Late Collector' [Rothschild]).[21]
O2/R3	30	15.93	ANS 1948.29.3 = Jameson 3 (1924) 2221 = Naville 1 (4/4/1921), lot 2238 (S. Pozzi).
O2/R4	31	16.12	*SNG Lewis* 825 = Hoffmann (15/1/1882), lot 1395 (F. Bompois) [16.05g].
O2/R5		16.49	***IGCH* 1322?** Elsen 102 (12/9/2009), lot 97 = BM Cast ("Mallers Hd. 1965").[22]
O2/R6 (1)	29	16.63	***IGCH* 1322?** Triton 8 (11/1/2005), lot 379 = Triton 2 (1/12/1998), lot 413 = Kovacs 13 (3/6/1998), lot 48 = Lanz 74 (20/11/1995), lot 197 = Sotheby's London (28/1/1976), lot 31 – Die breaks on obverse. **Overstruck** (dotted border of undertype visible on obverse).
O2/R6 (2)	34	15.45	*BNF Fonds Général* 770 (*SNG Paris* 1231) = Waddington 885 (Waddington [1853] 74–5, no. 1) – Die breaks on obverse.

Andromachos son of Menophilos
Ref. None. This individual not in *LGPN*. *Rev.* <EX> [A]ΝΔΡΟΜΑΧΟΥ | [ΤΟ]Υ ΜΗΝΟΦΙΛΟΥ, <LF> K, <RF> headdress of Isis.[23]

[18] The ethnic appears to read ΛΑΜΨΑ|ΚΕΙΝΩΝ instead of ΛΑΜΨΑ|ΚΗΝΩΝ. However, this is more likely to be a case of die-fill, whereby fine details in the die become temporarily filled up by metal fragments that have become detached from the flan of a previous coin, than a genuine change in spelling (in general, the city ethnic is the most conservative aspect of reverse designs). I thank Philip Kinns for discussion on this point.
[19] The order of O2/R2–R6 is based on a worsening die break above the head of Priapos on the obverse die.
[20] This is the same figure which appears on lifetime Alexanders minted at Lampsakos (Price 1351–6) where it has been incorrectly identified as Demeter.
[21] For the identity of the owner see Spring 2009: 299–300.
[22] François de Callataÿ drew my attention to this cast in the BM for which he noted down the information "Mallers Hd. 1965" on his index card (dated summer 1992). No such hoard of Greek coins is known. However, Peter Thonemann has suggested to me that this may be a re-used label for the Mallers(tang) hoard of Roman denarii found in 1926, part of which was deposited at the BM. If that is correct (and I have no better solution), then presumably this is a coin which was seen in trade in 1965 and thus at precisely the time when *IGCH* 1322 was coming on the market. The Elsen catalogue refers to this coin as, "Provient de Sotheby, vente d'octobre 1992, 51". However, there is no such coin in Sotheby's (8/10/1992).
[23] This control mark also appears on issues of Abydos and Tenedos in the first third of these two series: Callataÿ 1996, D10/R1a (Apollonios) and Callataÿ 1998, D11/R1.

O3/R7	26	15.81	***IGCH* 1322?** ANS 1972.15.1 (acq. from Marcel Salton, 12/10/1971) = R. J. Myers, Ancient Coins Summer Sale (1971), lot 24.

Herodes son of Dorotheus

Ref. None. This individual not in *LGPN*. *Rev.* <EX> HPΩΔOY TOY | ΔΩPOΘeOY, <LF> ⋔, <RF> snake wrapped round staff.[24]

O4/R8	27	16.35	***IGCH* 1322?** NAC 2 (21/2/1990), lot 182.

Demetrios son of Demetrios son of Meikalos

Ref. Gaebler Group 5,70 (Taf. 2,42); Baldwin Pl. 8,1–2. Meikalos not in *LGPN*. *Rev.* <EX> ΔHMHTPIOY TOY | ΔHMHTPIOY TOY | MeIK⍰ΛOY, <LF> ⋔, <RF> bow and arrow r.

O4/R9 (1)	27	16.61	***IGCH* 1322?** Sotheby's Zurich (27/5/1974), lot 311 = Stanley Gibbons Coin List 2 (not dated, pre-1973) 41 = Hess-Leu 31 (7/12/1966), lot 406.
O4/R9 (2)	28.5	16.35	***IGCH* 1322?** *Boston MFA* 1973.294 ("by 1969: with Robert E. Hecht Jr.", acq. from Hecht 13/6/1973) – **Overstruck**.
O4/R9 (3)	26	15.23	*BNF* K 1832 (*SNG Paris* 1229) (E. de Cadalvène, 1832) – Worn.
O4/R10 (1)	26	16.88	***IGCH* 1322?** *SNG Cop. Suppl.* 306 (acq. 1970).
O4/R10 (2)		16.45	***IGCH* 1322?** Morton & Eden 86 (24/5/2017), lot 27 = The New York Sale 27 (4/1/2012), lot 475 = GM 46 (30/10/1989), lot 220 = Bank Leu 48 (10/5/1989), lot 220 = MM Basel 41 (18/6/1970), lot 149 – **Overstruck (?)**.
O4/R10 (3)	26	15.95	BM 1899,0103.1 (W. Wroth, *NC* 20^3 [1900] 17, no. 21, Pl. II,7 – "Struck on a somewhat thick *flan*, too small for the die") (W. T. Ready).
O4/R11	30x28	16.73	***IGCH* 1322?** Nomos 3 (10/5/2011), lot 111 = Lanz 102 (28/5/2001), lot 257 = Bank Leu 33 (3/5/1983), lot 363 = MM Basel 47 (30/11/1972), lot 493.
O4/R12 (1)	26	16.65	***IGCH* 1322?** Lanz 28 (7/5/1984), lot 250 ("Stempelbruch auf Vs. (wie bei den meisten bekannten Exemplaren)").
O4/R12 (2)	28	16.31	***IGCH* 1322?** Bank Leu 7 (9/5/1973), lot 205 – **Overstruck** (wreathed border of undertype visible on reverse).

Promethion son of Lampon (2)[25]

[24] This control mark also appears on an issue of Abydos in the middle of the series: de Callataÿ 1996, D16/R1, D17/R2 (Menis). This symbol could perhaps be a reference to Asklepios whose festival at Lampsakos was lavishly endowed in the 2nd century BC (*I. Lampsakos* 9).

[25] Several factors suggest that this issue needs to be dissociated from the other coins minted under a Promethion son of Lampon – **1)** the obverse die link with Sokrates son of Xenophanes; **2)** the letter forms; **3)** the redrawn monogram in left field; **4)** the addition of two lions to the Hekate control mark. Either this is a different individual with the same names (perhaps the grandson of the first Promethion), or the same individual was signing these coins on more than one occasion as we appear to see on the Apollo Smintheus coinage with Herodikos (92 and 80 BC), Nikandros (85, 84, and 78 BC), and Peisistratos (71 and 68 BC).

Ref. Gaebler Group 5,73. *Rev.* <EX> ΠΡΟΜΗΘΙωΝΟΣ | ΤΟΥ Λ□ΜΠωΝΟΣ, <LF> 🔱, <RF> Hekate facing, wearing kalathos, holding a torch in each hand, a pair of recumbent outward-facing lions to either side, all on separate ground line.[26]

O5/R13 30 16.13 Berlin 18245862 (A. Löbbecke, 1906).

Sokrates son of Xenophanes
Ref. Gaebler Group 5,72 (Taf. 2,44); Baldwin Pl. 8,3. *Rev.* <EX> ΣωΚΡ□ΤΟΥ ΤΟΥ | ΞeΝΟΦ□ΝΟΥ, <LF> 🔱, <RF> palm branch.

O5/R14 30 16.41 BM RPK,p131D.1.Lam (*BMC Mysia*, p. 86, no. 68).

3.3.1 The Arrangement of the Issues

The arrangement of the issues is highly uncertain. As we shall see below (section 3.3.2), we probably have an unrepresentative sample of the series and, consequently, new discoveries are likely to expose problems with the arrangement I have adopted here.

Obverse die links connect two pairs of signers: Herodes son of Dorotheus and Demetrius son of Demetrius son of Meikalos (O4), and Promethion son of Lampon (2) and Sokrates son of Xenophanes (O5). However, the decision to place these four signers at the end of the sequence is largely based on the assumption that issues where the signer's name shows more 'late' forms (i.e. lunate letters, alphas with broken crossbars, thetas with a line across the middle) belong later in the series. The evidence for these 'late' forms is set out in Table 1. It should be noted, however, that where we have thorough surveys of well-dated material, the conclusion is that letter forms provide only a very rough indication of dating and do not follow a straightforward trajectory of stylistic development.[27]

Table 1. Diagnostic Letter Forms of the Ethnic (top letter) and Signer (bottom letter).

Ephesios son of Theodoros	O1	Σ Σ	E E	Ω Ω	- Θ	A -
Promethion son of Lampon (1)	O2	Σ Σ	- -	Ω Ω	- Θ	A A
Andromachos son of Menophilos	O3	Σ -	- -	Ω -	- -	□ A
Herodes son of Dorotheus	O4	Σ -	- e	Ω Ω	- Θ	A -
Demetrios son of Demetrios son of Meikalos	O4	Σ -	- e	Ω -	- -	□ □
Promethion son of Lampon (2)	O5	Σ Σ	- -	Ω ω	- Θ	□ A
Sokrates son of Xenophon	O5	Σ Σ	- e	Ω ω	- -	□ □

Although several factors can be adduced to argue for Ephesios son of Theodorus coming first in the series, all have their problems. The most significant factor in favour of placing him first

[26] For discussion of Hekate on this and the issue of Promethion son of Lampon (1), see Imhoof-Blumer 1913: 14.
[27] The most comprehensive recent survey of this kind is Kinns 2014 on lunate letter forms in the coinage of Hellenistic Ionia.

is style, since the die cutting of O1 is appreciably finer than that of O2–O5. However, if we compare the contemporary and much better attested Athena Ilias and Apollo Smintheus series, we see that, while there is an overall decline in the quality of die-cutting over the course of the whole series (and above all in the first half of the 1st century), within this general trend there can be considerable variation from one issue to the next.[28] Secondly, there is the higher weight of the coin (16.79g). This suggests that it was struck to the reduced Attic standard (16.9g) which was widespread in the first half of the 2nd century. However, it is obviously problematic to extrapolate the average weight of an issue based on a single example. Moreover, as Table 2 indicates, other signers whose issues display 'late' features such as Demetrios and Promethion (1) likewise have weights consistent with a theoretical standard of 16.9g.[29]

Table 2. Weight Table of the Lampsakos Tetradrachms with Relevant Signers.

Weight Ranges	**Signers and Weights**
16.80–9	Demetrios (**16.88**)
16.70–9	Ephesios (**16.79**), Demetrios (**16.73**)
16.60–9	Promethion 1 (**16.63**), Demetrios (**16.61**, **16.65**)
16.50–9	-
16.40–9	Promethion 1 (**16.48**), Demetrios (**16.45**), Sokrates (**16.41**)
16.30–9	Herodes (**16.35**), Demetrios (**16.35**, **16.31**)
16.20–9	-
16.10–9	Promethion 1 (**16.10**, **16.12**), Promethion 2 (**16.13**)
16.00–9	-
15.90–9	Promethion 1 (**15.93**), Demetrios (**15.95**)
X<15.90	Andromachos (**15.81**), Promethion 1 (**15.45**), Demetrios (**15.23** – worn)

3.3.2 The Size of the Series

The sample we have looks to be representative (i.e. it has an n/d > 3):

n	**d**	**n/d**	**Singletons**	**D (Carter)**[30]	**D (Esty)**[31]
20	5	4	2 (O1, O3)	5.7 ±0.73	6.7 ±2.43

However, this masks issues of both over- and under-representation within our sample. For example, the obverse die used for the issue of Demetrios son of Demetrios son of Meikalos is significantly over-represented (9 out of 20) because coins of this magistrate make up the majority of the Lampsakene portion of *IGCH* 1322 (7 out of 11). Conversely, two of the five obverse dies are only known from a single example (the 'singletons' O1 and O3). In addition, our two examples of O5 show considerable wear, raising the possibility that this obverse die had already been in use for some time, perhaps with one or several previous magistrates who are as yet unattested.

[28] See the plates in Ellis-Evans 2016 for Athena Ilias and Bellinger 1961, Plates 16–18 for Apollo Smintheus.
[29] Two further points could be made. Firstly, Ephesios displays the fewest 'late' letter forms despite his name providing opportunities for lunate epsilons, sigmas, and omegas. Secondly, the monogram is reminiscent of one we find on coins minted in the name of Apollo Smintheus by Alexandreia Troas in 148 BC (Bellinger A 136 = ANS 1967.152.420; cf. Bellinger A 137 = ANS 1947.49.2 [135 BC], CNG 99 (13/5/2015), lot 194 [128 BC], and Roma Numismatics 9 (22/3/2015), lot 270 [127 BC]).
[30] Carter 1983.
[31] Esty 2011.

In light of all this, the slightly higher estimate of the original number of obverse dies arrived at using Esty's formula seems more realistic. That said, although the current evidence suggests that we have somewhat underestimated the size of the series, both the extremely rare appearance of these coins in trade (see below) and the evidence of the die study (imperfect as it is) do not encourage us to think that we have dramatically underestimated the overall size of the series. The number of obverse dies might realistically rise to as many as 10, but more than double that to equal the wreathed tetradrachms of Tenedos, or five times that to surpass the wreathed tetradrachms of Abydos, seems highly unlikely.[32]

3.3.3 The Date of the Series

It was traditionally assumed that the series began either after 196 (Flamininus declaring the freedom of the Greeks) or 190–188 (the end of the war with Antiochos III) and was then minted continuously over the next century until the war with Mithridates in 88–85.[33] Otto Morkhølm instead assumed a date *c.* 160 in both *IGCH* (1973) and his *Early Hellenistic Coinage* (1991, reflecting work pre-1982).[34] While Morkhølm did not explicitly set out his reasons for this later date, he was presumably influenced by the widescale downdating of autonomous tetradrachm series to the mid-2nd century in the 1970s.[35] Morkhølm's authority has subsequently encouraged some auction cataloguers to adopt his later date.[36] It is worth noting, finally, that in the mid-19th century William Waddington had instead preferred a late Attalid date, while the catalogue of Robert Jameson's collection had already suggested a date "vers 100" in 1924.[37] As we shall see, the overlooked evidence of *IGCH* 1322 shows that the Jameson catalogue is closest to the mark and that this series belongs not to the second quarter 2nd century but rather to the early 1st century.

Before discussing this hoard in detail, it is worth noting that this later date makes much better sense of a number of the coinage's characteristics which strongly suggest a late Hellenistic date even without the evidence of this hoard. **1) Letter Forms** – Although problematic as evidence for a coinage's internal arrangement (as discussed in Section 3.3.1), the presence of 'late' letter forms favours a date in the first half of the 1st century over a date a century earlier. **2) Diameters** – In the mid-2nd century the trend was towards broader, thinner flans with hammered edges (typical diameter: 35–40mm). In the later 2nd century there is then a return to thicker flans with a reduced diameter (typically around 30mm) which often replace hammered edges with a dotted border. The coins of Parion Group 2 are a good example of this change, and the Lampsakos tetradrachms also appear to fit here (range of recorded diameters: all but one 26–32mm). **3) Patronymics** – A variety of factors determined whether the signer's patronymic was included (e.g. the rest of the design, available space on the flan, the traditions of the city in question), but broadly speaking when it does appear it is usually a phenomenon of the late 2nd/early 1st century. For example, it does not appear on the Athena Ilias series until the issue

[32] Tenedos (*c.* 100-70): n = 86, d = 21, n/d = 4.1, D (Esty) = 28. Abydos (*c.* 100-70): n = 126, d = 35, n/d = 3.6, D (Esty) = 48.
[33] E.g. *BMC Mysia*, p. 86, no. 68.
[34] Morkhølm 1991: 25, 266; cf. Le Rider 1972: 235 assuming a date *c.* 175.
[35] Influential here is the work of Boehringer 1972 and the die studies made possible by the discovery of the Kırıkhan hoard in 1972 (*CH* X 310).
[36] See e.g. Nomos 3 (10/5/2011), lot 111: "The general dates given for this series are c. 190–85 BC: this seems far too long a time span. A date of around 160 seems more likely, though it is certainly possible that it could be later, given the prominent broken-bar alphas in the reverse legend. The elaborate patronymic, Demetrios, son of Demetrios, son of Meikalos, also argues for a late date". As we shall see, the criteria cited here for a *c.* 160 date in fact point to a rather later period.
[37] Waddington 1853: 75 (discussing *BNF Fonds Général* 770 = *SNG Paris* 1231): "Le style de cette médaille décèle une antiquité peu reculée; elle doit avoir été frappée vers la fin de la dynastie des rois de Pergame".

of Diopeithes son of Zenis at the very end of the 2nd century, but after this the inclusion of the patronymic then becomes the fashion for this coinage.[38] The fact, therefore, that all the Lampsakos tetradrachms include the magistrate's patronymic, and that one issue even goes back to the grandfather's generation, strongly points to these coins having been minted in the late 2nd/early 1st century. **4) Control Marks** – The series shares two distinctive control marks (a headdress of Isis and a staff with a snake wrapped round it) with issues belonging to the wreathed tetradrachms minted by Abydos and Tenedos *c.* 100–70.[39]

3.3.4 The Hoard Evidence: *IGCH* 1322

Morkhølm reported in *IGCH* that the hoard was found in western Asia Minor in 1964/5, that it contained silver tetradrachms of Abydos (20+) and Lampsakos (10+), and that it had been dispersed in trade. Since Morkhølm's purview for *IGCH* was the European market, we may presume that this is where the hoard was dispersed, and indeed the earliest provenances we have for the coins likely to derive from the hoard largely support this. In addition, we have two further pieces of information. Firstly, because Priapos tetradrachms turn up so infrequently on the market, the appearance of this hoard is fairly easy to trace in auctions. As mentioned above (Section 3.1), prior to 1965 a new example had not appeared since 1921, whereas in the decade after 1965 nine new examples appeared. It is thus fairly clear that these coins are the Lampsakene portion of the hoard (the coins which appeared in 1984 and 1990 probably also belonged to the hoard, but the attribution is of course rather less certain).

Secondly, there are two wreathed tetradrachms of Abydos in the Heberden Coin Room (*SNG Ashmolean* 1002 and 1004) which were purchased in June 1966 from Spink with money from the E. S. G. Robinson Trust "from a small hoard of 4 drs [i.e. tetradrachms], mostly Abydus, but also Tenedus & Lampsacus".[40] It seems highly likely that the hoard in question is *IGCH* 1322, but with the added information (unknown to Morkhølm in *IGCH*) that it also contained wreathed tetradrachms of Tenedos. François de Callataÿ has demonstrated beyond doubt that the wreathed tetradrachms of Abydos and those of Tenedos in 'phase two' of the mint's production date *c.* 100–70.[41] The appearance of the Lampsakos tetradrachms in a hoard alongside these two series thus confirms that it belongs in the first half of the 1st century.

Unfortunately, it is not currently possible to identify the Tenedian portion of the hoard with any confidence, or indeed to establish whether the hoard contained issues from other mints.[42] However, it may be possible to make some progress in reconstructing the Abydene portion of the hoard. This can be attempted by identifying issues which have become over-represented in our sample since the appearance of *IGCH* 1322 in 1964/5.

The wreathed tetradrachms of Abydos were a fairly sizeable coinage (d = 35, D [Esty] = 48). To judge from the substantial die-linking immediately apparent from de Callataÿ's study, the series was intensively minted over a fairly short period of time. Thus, although over forty individuals are named on the coins, it is clear that these were not annual magistrates covering this many years of production. Rather, the moneyers signing these coins probably formed a

[38] Ellis-Evans 2016: 124–5.
[39] See nn. 23 and 24 above.
[40] I am grateful to Volker Heuchert for looking up this information for me.
[41] Callataÿ 1996 and 1998. For 'phase one' of Tenedian production of this series in the 150s see Meadows and Houghton 2010: 185 discussing *CH* X 301.140–141 (151/0 BC) and now Meadows (forthcoming) section 2.e.i.
[42] I wonder whether it is merely coincidental that the sale in which one of the Lampsakene hoard coins (an example of O2/R6) first appeared also included the first appearance of an Apollo Smintheus tetradrachm minted under Diophanes in 68 BC: Sotheby's (28/1/1976), lots 31–32.

board of an as yet undetermined size which minted the issues in parallel.[43] Within the series, the issue of Iphiades, which de Callataÿ placed penultimate in his arrangement, appears to be a strong candidate for an issue which we have come to know much better since the appearance of *IGCH* 1322. Of the 25 examples of this issue now known, 12 have appeared since the discovery of the hoard, of which seven first appeared in the 1970s, and five specifically in the period 1970–1973. There is therefore a good chance that *IGCH* 1322 was responsible for this spike in the appearance of Iphiades coins.

It should be noted, however, that the Abydene portion of the hoard was clearly not just made up of examples of this one issue, since the two coins in the Ashmolean deriving from this hoard belong instead to Philiskos (this coin: O23) and Antigonos (this coin: O27). Given that de Callataÿ places these two issues in the latter half of the series and Iphiades (O32–34) penultimate in his arrangement, it would seem that *IGCH* 1322 primarily included examples from late in the series. This may be significant if Andrew Meadows is correct to argue that the Iphiades issue is a separate and later issue which revived the Abydos coinage of *c.* 100–70 in the early 40s, since this latter date would thus become the *terminus post quem* for the deposit of the hoard.[44] Comparison with the late Hellenistic hoards which Paunov has collected for Thrace suggests that the possible profile of *IGCH* 1322, with coins from both the early and the mid-1st century found circulating together, is typical of tetradrachm hoards from this period.[45]

3.3.5 Priapos Epiphanes

The downdating of the Priapos tetradrachms to *c.* 100–70 raises new questions about the one piece of epigraphic evidence we have for the worship of Priapos at Lampsakos. *I. Lampsakos* 7 republishes two decrees of Lampsakos which were passed in successive years and led to the city granting proxeny to a certain Dionysodoros of Thasos. The copy of these decrees which we have is part of a monument in the Thasian agora which included two more proxeny decrees for Dionysodoros from Assos and Rhodes and one from Samothrace for his brother Hestiaios.[46] All four decrees used to be dated to the 80s/70s primarily on palaeographic grounds. However, it has now been shown that the eponymous magistrate mentioned in the Rhodian decree dates to 131 and therefore that the Lucius Aurelius referred to there who is governor of Macedonia must be L. Aurelius Orestes (*cos.* 126) who was praetor *c.* 131–129.[47] The likelihood therefore is that Dionysodoros and Hestiaios had performed their benefactions for all four cities in the context of the war with Aristonikos *c.* 133-129 and that these are the "difficult times" (ἐγ καιροῖς ἀναγκαίοις) referred to in the Assian decree.[48]

---

[43] The inclusion of dates on the Apollo Smintheus coins allows us to see that pairs of moneyers started to be responsible for a single year's output from 93 BC onwards. We are presumably looking at a similar arrangement for Abydos, but without the ability to easily discern the pattern because of the lack of dates on the coins.

[44] Meadows (forthcoming) section 2.e.ii.

[45] Compare Paunov 2013: 286–91 on late Hellenistic hoards from Thrace, particularly those containing tetradrachms from Troad mints.

[46] *Recherches Thasos* II 169 (Samothrace), 170 (= *I. Assos* 11a), 171 (= *I. Lampsakos* 7), 172 (Rhodes). Patrice Hamon will re-edit these texts in his forthcoming *Corpus des inscriptions de Thasos, III: documents publics du IVe siècle et de l'époque hellénistique*, Études thasiennes XXVI (Ecole francaise d'Athènes).

[47] Badoud 2015: 173–4.

[48] *I. Assos* 11a.5–6: γενόμενος εὔχρηστος τῆι π[όλει]| ἐγ καιροῖς ἀναγκαίοις. Regarding the end date of the war with Aristonikos, note that the first examples of his year 5 = 130/29 BC coinage minted at Stratonikeia have recently appeared: Naumann 53 (7/5/2017) 297, Naumann 79 (7/7/2019) 177. M. Perperna captured Aristonikos prior to the arrival of M'. Aquilius in early 129. It has therefore traditionally been assumed Aristonikos was captured in 130, and the fact we only had his coinage up to year 4 = 131/30 BC seemed to confirm this. Since the years of Aristonikos' reign began in September, the new year 5 coins presumably indicate that he hung on at Stratonikeia into the winter of 130/29.

The decrees of Lampsakos are of particular interest because in both cases the eponymous magistracy is filled not by a citizen of Lampsakos, but by one of the city's gods: Priapos in the first decree, his mother Aphrodite in the second. Moreover, in both cases the god is described as ἐπιφανής ('manifest').[49] We have numerous examples from throughout the Hellenistic and Imperial periods of a god being declared the eponymous magistrate of a city.[50] In at least some of these cases, this resulted from the fact that the polis was experiencing financial or political difficulties and as a result could not find a citizen willing or able to fulfil the role.[51] For example, a decree of Akraiphia in Boiotia dating to the reign of Claudius explicitly states that Zeus Soter had fulfilled the magistracy for three consecutive years during a period of famine because no one could be found to take up the post.[52]

On balance, the case of Lampsakos is likely to be a context of crisis for two reasons. Firstly, the city's inability to fill the office for (at least) two consecutive years suggests a persistent problem such as that which prevented Akraiphia from filling their eponymous magistracy for three years running.[53] Secondly, we know that the war with Aristonikos really did precipitate political and financial crises in cities throughout western Asia Minor, especially in the period prior to spring 131 when Roman troops finally arrived in force under P. Licinius Crassus. Before this, the majority of the fighting on both land and sea had been borne by the Greek cities and the allied kingdoms. So far as we can tell, Roman support was limited to the legation led by P. Scipio Nasica which provided overall command of the Greek forces from either late 133 or early 132 and possibly a detachment of troops from Macedonia under the command of the governor M. Cosconius.[54]

The Hellespontine region appears to have been particularly hard hit, especially at the beginning of the war. The decrees for Dionysodoros and Hestiaios indicate that Assos, Lampsakos, and Samothrace were all in some kind of trouble during the war, and as we have seen the Assian decree explicitly refers to difficult times. An honorific decree of Kyzikos refers to the city being encircled *c.* 133/2 and sending first to M. Cosconius and later to the senate for help.[55] The honorific decree for Menas of Sestos likewise refers to the city in the context of *c.* 133/2 facing "a dangerous crisis because of fear of the neighbouring Thracians and other difficulties arising from the sudden contingency [i.e. the death of Attalos III]" which prompted Menas to seek an audience with Nasica's legation.[56] Finally, of particular interest is a decree of Methymna which dates to *c.* 129 but refers to events from throughout the war.[57] The city had found itself hard pressed by a continual grain shortage, the consequent cost of exactions to support the grain fund, and the expense of supporting the Roman war effort. This seems to have precipitated a political crisis at Methymna over whether it was more important to solve the food crisis or show loyalty to Rome by supporting the war effort. At this juncture, the *neoi* of the city made the highly unusual decision to intervene and propose a way out of the political

[49] *I. Lampsakos* 7.9: Πρυτανεύοντος Πριάπου Ἐπιφανοῦς; 27–8: Πρυτανεύοντος Ἀφροδίτης Ἐπιφανοῦς.
[50] List of examples: Robert 1946, Robert and Robert 1976: 234.
[51] Robert 1946: 54–5 n. 9, Tréheux 1953: 434–5, Frisch 1978: 47–8.
[52] *SEG* XV 330.45–8: τοῦ γὰρ ἐνστάντος ἐνιαυτοῦ Δι|ὸς Σωτῆρος τοῦ μετὰ Ἀφροδίσιον τὸ γ΄, | ἐν τῇ τῆς χώρας ἀπωλείᾳ, δεομένης τῆς πό|λεως ἀρχείων. See Robert 1935: 441, 446–8.
[53] The months mentioned at *I. Lampsakos* 7.10 and 29 appear to suggest that the two decrees were passed over a winter: Tréheux 1953: 435–8, Frisch 1978: 53.
[54] See Jones 2004, esp. 483–5, for a persuasive reconstruction of the early years of the war.
[55] *IGR* IV 134.
[56] *I. Sestos* 1.16–23.
[57] *IG* XII Suppl. 116.

impasse.[58] The case of Methymna illustrates precisely how the disruption caused by war could precipitate the kind of political crisis which might leave civic offices unfilled at Lampsakos.

This context of crisis at Lampsakos in turn helps us understand why Priapos and Aphrodite are both referred to as ἐπιφανής. Given that this term had not yet come to have the more banal meaning it would later have in the Imperial period and does not prosaically refer to the god being 'present' in the person of their priest, we should interpret ἐπιφανής here as an epithet which Priapos and Aphrodite had gained as a result of performing an epiphany at Lampsakos.[59] This can be paralleled in a decree of Knidos where it is explicitly stated that Artemis Hyakinthotrophos gained the epithet ἐπιφανής after performing an ἐπιφάνεια.[60] Epiphanies often occurred in the context of warfare when a city was faced with a much more powerful opponent and yet somehow escaped destruction.[61] For example, an inscription from Bargylia in Caria refers to an epiphany of Artemis Kindyas as having saved the city and its whole way of life at a time when Bargylia was threatened by many and great dangers on all sides during the war with Aristonikos.[62] As we have seen, cities in the Hellespontine region such as Lampsakos, Sestos, and Kyzikos faced no shortage of extreme dangers 133–131. It is therefore entirely plausible that an epiphany of Priapos and Aphrodite (and perhaps also of Priapos' father Dionysos) should have occurred at Lampsakos in the particularly perilous opening stages of the war when Roman support seemed very far away. While epiphanies of multiple deities are somewhat unusual, we in fact have a parallel case at nearby Kyzikos. When Mithridates was besieging Kyzikos in 73, the city's principal deity Kore Soteira appeared in a dream to the city's *grammateus* Aristagoras promising to defend Kyzikos, and the very next day a strong wind blew down the siege engines of Mithridates. At the same time, Athena Ilias, the principal deity of Ilion, likewise appeared in a dream to the Ilians covered in sweat and with her peplos torn saying that she had been helping defend the Kyzikenes.[63]

Priapos has the reputation of being the principal deity of Lampsakos, with Pausanias for example remarking that: "This god is worshipped where goats and sheep pasture or there are swarms of bees; but the Lampsakenes consider him greater than the rest of the gods, saying that he is the son of Dionysos and Aphrodite".[64] The special connection between Priapos and Lampsakos was likewise well-known to Latin poets who habitually refer to his origins on the Hellespont.[65] Consequently, his appearance on the tetradrachms studied above and as an eponymous magistrate in *I. Lampsakos* 7 has been taken for granted as a choice which was no less obvious and inevitable at Lampsakos than Athena was at Athens.[66] On the contrary, the

[58] Gauthier 1997: 359–60.

[59] See already Prêteux 2005: 251–2 and Boulay 2009: 125. For the other two possibilities canvassed here see Frisch 1978: 52.

[60] *IG* XII (4,1) 166.7–9 (*c.* 200–150 BC): διὰ τὰς γεγενημένας ὑπ᾽ αὐτᾶ[ς ἐπιφανεί|ας], καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ποταγορεύσαντος αὐτὰν [θεὸν Ἐπιφα|νῆ] (the restorations here are based on the repeated phrase at lines 29–30). For an inscription using the new epithet see *I. Knidos* 171 (*c.* 200–150 BC).

[61] Boulay 2009: 119–21, Platt 2011: 147–59, Müller and Prost 2013: 109–14, Petridou 2015: 107–70.

[62] *I. Iasos* 613.2–5: ἐ[πειδὴ ἐν τῶι πολέμωι πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων]| περιστάντων κινδύνων την τε πόλιν ἡμῶν καὶ [τὴν χώραν, ὁ δῆμος, διὰ τὴν τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος]| ἐπιφάνειαν την τε πάτριον αὐτονομ[ίαν διέσωσε καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς]| παρεγενήθη κατάστασιν. For discussion of the restorations and the context see Robert 1937: 459–65, esp. 465 for the suggestion that this epiphany occurred in the difficult early years of the war.

[63] Plut. *Luc.* 10 with discussion in Petridou 2015: 128–9.

[64] Paus. 9.31.2: τούτῳ τιμαὶ τῷ θεῷ δέδονται μὲν καὶ ἄλλως, ἔνθα εἰσὶν αἰγῶν νομαὶ καὶ προβάτων ἢ καὶ ἐσμοὶ μελισσῶν· Λαμψακηνοὶ δὲ ἐς πλέον ἢ θεοὺς τοὺς ἄλλους νομίζουσι, Διονύσου τε αὐτὸν παῖδα εἶναι καὶ Ἀφροδίτης λέγοντες.

[65] See Frisch 1978: 150–2 for the testimonia.

[66] See e.g. Gaebler 1923: 31 on the coins and Frisch 1978: 52 on the inscription.

numismatic evidence suggests that this epiphany may have been crucial in elevating Priapos to the status of being the city's principal deity.

Before the Imperial period, Priapos appears on only four issues of Lampsakene coinage. There are two bronze issues which share the same obverse portrait of Priapos as the tetradrachms and must therefore all date *c.* 100–70, one with the *parasemon* of Lampsakos, a protome of Pegasos, on the reverse (Figure 1), the other with an ivy wreath (Figure 2).[67] In addition, there is a bronze issue with a quite different portrait of a crowned Priapos on the obverse and a kantharos on the reverse (Figure 3).[68] These coins are difficult to date, but they are conventionally ascribed to the 2nd century, and the fact that the die axes are adjusted to 12h supports this.[69]



Figure 1. Lampsakos, *c.* 100–70 BC. *BNF Fonds Général* 786 = *SNG Paris* 1248 (20mm, 12h, 7.20g). Scale 2:1. © Bibliothèque nationale de France.



Figure 2. Lampsakos, *c.* 100–70 BC. *BNF Fonds Général* 787 = *SNG Paris* 1253 (15mm, 12h, 2.40g). Scale 2:1. © Bibliothèque nationale de France.



Figure 3. Lampsakos, 2nd c. BC? *BNF Fonds Général* 788 = *SNG Paris* 1249 (20mm, 12h, 4.21g). Scale 2:1. © Bibliothèque nationale de France.

[67] Pegasos protome: *SNG Ashmolean* 695. Ivy wreath: *SNG Ashmolean* 700–1.
[68] *SNG Ashmolean* 696–9.
[69] Many of the coins from this issue appear to be overstruck and a large number were subsequently countermarked with a bunch of grapes in a circular punch (e.g. *SNG Ashmolean* 696–7). This perhaps points to their production in an emergency context.

This late and rather meagre showing for Priapos is all the more surprising given the unusually wide and comprehensive variety of deities which Lampsakos had displayed on its coinage in the Classical and Hellenistic periods.[70] Most telling is the gold coinage which Lampsakos produced in the first half of the 4th century. In the course of its production, this coinage cycled through almost fifty types depicting gods and heroes from myth, including Priapos' parents Aphrodite and Dionysos, yet not once does Priapos himself appear.[71] By contrast, from the reign of Augustus onwards the situation is entirely reversed. Of the 66 types catalogued in the volumes of *Roman Provincial Coinage* published so far, 34 have Priapos as the reverse type.[72]

One is left with the impression that, prior to his epiphany during the war with Aristonikos, the Lampsakenes considered Priapos either too unimportant or, more likely, too inappropriate to appear on coins. Indeed, in the remark of Pausanias quoted above the point of the contrast he draws between the environmental margins where Priapos is usually worshipped and how the Lampsakenes honour him above all other gods is that it is deeply unusual, and thus noteworthy, to consider Priapos so important as a civic deity. Although Lampsakos was identified as the home of Priapos from at least the 3rd century, it was only in the late Hellenistic period that the Lampsakenes elevated him to the status of their principal civic deity.[73] However, once this change in status had taken place, Priapos became a natural choice for civic iconography, with the first opportunity to do so on coins apparently occurring *c.* 100–70 when Lampsakos minted the Priapos tetradrachms and the accompanying two issues of bronze coinage with the same portrait. We can usefully compare the case of Artemis Hyakinthotrophos at Knidos. The epiphany of Artemis probably occurred during Philip V's failed attack on the city in 201.[74] The immediate result was an increased status for the goddess: the Knidians gave her the epithet ἐπιφανής, established a penteteric festival in her honour, and sent to Delphi to request recognition of the festival as isopythian. Consequently, when an opportunity later arose in the 160s/150s to mint tetradrachms with civic types, the Knidians abandoned their traditional Aphrodite and lion types for a depiction of Artemis Hyakinthotrophos with her cult statue.[75]

Perhaps the earliest literary witness to this shift in status is an epigram by Erykios of Kyzikos whose *floreat* was in the mid-1st century.[76] In appropriately ribald terms, Erykios talks of Priapos' "heavy … and well-hardened weapon" and his insatiable desires. However, he ends the poem by advising Priapos to put away his phallus, "for you do not dwell on a lonely

[70] See already Prêteux 2005: 252–4.
[71] For discussion of the types see Gaebler 1923 for the silver and Baldwin 1924 for the gold and bronze.
[72] The following does not take account of *RPC* 5/2, 8, and 10 which are as yet unpublished. All *RPC* 4/2 and 6 references are to the temporary numbers. Statue of Priapos: *RPC* 1.2274–6 (Augustus), 2.890–1 (Domitian), 3.1547–8, 1550 (Trajan), 3.1550B, 1552A (Hadrian), 4/2.2562, 2564 (Antoninus Pius), 4/2.595, 2366, 11265–6 (Marcus Aurelius), 6.3895, 3898 (Severus Alexander), 6.3902–3 (Maximinus), 7/1.47 (Gordian III), 9.386–7, 389 (Trajan Decius), 9.394–5 (Trebonianus Gallus). Head of Priapos: *RPC* 1.2280 (Caligula), 3.1551, 1551A (Hadrian), 4/2.2563 (Marcus Aurelius), 4/2.2367, 8206, 9175 (Commodus). Statue of Priapos in temple: *RPC* 6.3897 (Severus Alexander).
[73] The sanctuary of Artemidorus of Perge on Thera (second half of 3rd century) includes an epigram in which Priapos declares himself to be from Lampsakos: ἥκω Πρίαπος τῆιδε Θηραίωμ πόλει | ὁ Λαμψακηνός πλοῦτον ἄφθιτομ φέρων (*IG* XII (3) 421c.1–2). For evidence of Priapos' earlier presence along the Hellespont see Prêteux 2005.
[74] Polyb. 16.11.1.
[75] For the date of the Knidian tetradrachms see Ashton 2014: 21 n. 95 and for their relation to the epiphany see Meadows 2018: 301-3. Another case are the tetradrachms of Klazomenai from the 160s/150s which refer to Zeus Soter Epiphanes: Boulay 2009, Meadows 2009. Both authors assume that the coins were minted close to the time of the epiphany, but the lag we see between when the epiphany happens and when this is reflected on the coins in the case of Knidos and Lampsakos suggest that this assumption is not valid.
[76] R. Reitzenstein, *RE* s.v. Erykios.

mountain, but guard holy Lampsakos by the shore of the Hellespont".[77] In a few short lines, Erykios brilliantly captures the fundamental oddness of having Priapos as one's tutelary deity by systematically subverting the genre conventions of Priapos poetry. Typically, Priapos inhabits isolated and marginal spaces, guards fruit trees and crops, and does so by impotently threatening sexual violence. By contrast, the Priapos of Lampsakos dwells in a city, is responsible for the city's defence, and must be told by the poet to put away his phallus and show characteristically civic restraint in his desires so as to fulfil his duties. The very notion that the ὅπλον (line 1) with which Priapos defends Lampsakos is in fact his φαλλός (line 5) captures his essential inappropriateness for the role. Deeply unusual as this conception of Priapos is, it makes perfect sense if we assume that the Lampsakenes really did believe that the city had been saved from certain disaster by an epiphany of Priapos, his mother Aphrodite, and perhaps also (though evidence is lacking) his father Dionysos during the war with Aristonikos.[78]

4. Conclusions

The evidence we now have for the tetradrachm coinages of Parion and Lampsakos allows us to place them in their proper historical context. The Parion Group 1 series was a relatively small coinage (3 obverse dies) which was briefly issued in the late 160s/150s. Given the close similarity in the design of these coins to those of Athena Ilias and Apollo Smintheus, it seems likely that the correct context for these coins is the intra-regional rivalry which existed between the members of the koinon of Athena Ilias. On this interpretation, Parion's Apollo Aktaios coins were a short-lived attempt to place the city's Aktaia festival on a par with the region's more eminent Panathenaia and Smintheia festivals.[79] If this is correct, then the coinage was wholly civic in character.

The Parion Group 2 and Lampsakos coinages both belong *c.* 100-70 as is indicated by the general characteristics of both coinages, the absence of Parion Group 2 from the many mid-2nd century hoards, and the presence of the Lampsakos coins in *IGCH* 1322. The small size of both coinages means that we cannot argue for Roman involvement in their production on the basis of volume of minting. While these coinages may, therefore, reflect civic expenditure, there are nevertheless several reasons to suspect Roman involvement. Firstly, Parion had not minted silver coinage with civic types since the 150s and Lampsakos had not done so since the 4th century. It is therefore striking that both cities chose to return to this practice *c.* 100-70 at precisely the point when nearby Abydos and Tenedos likewise did so in order to produce their much larger coinages. Since de Callataÿ has made a strong case for Roman involvement in the Abydos and Tenedos coinages, there is a good *prima facie* case for the Parion and Lampsakos

[77] *AP* 16.242: Ὡς βαρὺ τοῦτο, Πρίηπε, καὶ εὖ τετυλωμένον ὅπλον / πᾶν ἀπὸ βουβώνων ἀθρόον ἐκκέχυκας / εἰς γάμον οὐκ ἀνέτοιμον· ἔχει δέ σε δίψα γυναικῶν, / ὦ ᾽γαθέ, καὶ σπαργᾷς θυμὸν ἅπαντα πόθοις. / ἀλλὰ καταπρήϋνε τὸν ἐξῳδηκότα φαλλὸν / τόνδε, καὶ ἀνθηρῇ κρύψον ὑπὸ χλαμύδι· / οὐ γὰρ ἐρημαῖον ναίεις ὄρος, ἀλλὰ παρ᾽ Ἕλλης / ἠόνα τὴν ἱερὴν Λάμψακον ἀμφιπολεῖς. For the injunction to cover up his phallus in lines 5–6 contrast Robert and Robert 1950: 82 with Planche V.5 for a relief of Priapos from Parion where he is in his characteristic pose of lifting his cloak up so as to expose himself.

[78] Another possibility is that Priapos was on this occasion being identified with Dionysos, as Ath. 1.30b claims happened at Lampsakos. The ability of Priapos to take on this tutelary role at Lampsakos might be connected to his cult's particular association with protecting seafarers along the Asian shore of the Hellespont: Prêteux 2005: 256–65.

[79] For this argument with regard to the Panathenaia and Smintheia see Ellis-Evans 2016: 146–9 and Ellis-Evans 2019: 46–55. Boulay 2009: 117 also raises the attractive (but as yet unprovable) hypothesis that the decision to depict Apollo Aktaios, whose sanctuary in fact belonged to Adrasteia, may mark the fact that Parion had recently swallowed up this settlement (perhaps as a prize in the Peace of Apameia?).

coinages likewise having been produced at the behest of the Romans. Secondly, in the case of Parion it is suggestive that all three of the Polykles coins have snapped edges. The breaking of coins by folding their edges over is a phenomenon commonly seen in tetradrachms coming out of hoards from Thrace, and may thus suggest that the Group 2 coins were circulating there. If correct, then Parion's coins were perhaps a small contribution to the great flood of silver coinage from Athens, Macedonia, Maroneia, and above all Thasos which was used to pay Roman auxiliaries in the Thracian wars between the 120s and 70s.

Thirdly, in the case of Lampsakos it is potentially significant that there is an unusually high proportion of overstrikes (4/20). De Callataÿ has argued that when we encounter coins overstruck on coinages which are firmly attested 'Roman' coinages (e.g. First Macedonian Meris, Thasos, Aesillas, and so on) and which do not ordinarily appear in hoards in the region of the overstriking mint, then we should assume Rome has had a hand in moving these coinages from where they were minted to where they were overstruck – examples of this phenomenon are known for Abydos, Tenedos, and Apollo Smintheus.[80] Although we cannot identify any of the undertypes in the case of Lampsakos, one had a dotted border (O2/R6 (1)) while the other had a wreathed border (O4/R12 (2)), thus indicating that Lampsakos was overstriking at least two different coinages. It may also be significant that all four overstrikes come from *IGCH* 1322 and three from the same magistrate (Demetrios), a pattern which we do not see paralleled even in much larger series such as Abydos, Tenedos, and Apollo Smintheus. If we also take into account that the Lampsakene coins were circulating alongside Abydos and Tenedos, then there is a good circumstantial case for arguing that the Priapos tetradrachms were minted at the behest of the Roman authorities.

Despite all these indications of possible Roman involvement, the Parion Group 2 and Lampsakos tetradrachms may nevertheless represent a late and unexpected return to civic minting for civic purposes at these mints. Conversely, though, if we accept that the Parion and Lampsakos tetradrachms really were minted at the behest of the Roman authorities, should we therefore call them 'Roman coinages'?[81] Such terminology might be deemed unhelpful in several respects. Picard and de Callataÿ have both recently argued that the silver for 'Roman' coinages primarily came not from Rome but from the cities, and therefore that 'Roman' coinages in large part represent Roman monetary exactions.[82] The sums involved in small coinages such as those of Parion and Lampsakos, and even of larger coinages such as Abydos and Tenedos, were by no means beyond the means of a polis and, as de Callataÿ speculates, could have been met by minting stored bullion.[83] Cities clearly did not *prefer* to spend their money in this way, hence, for example, the political tensions which Roman demands caused at Methymna during the war with Aristonikos and the many honorific decrees for benefactors who gained exemptions for their city from such demands. Nevertheless, cities could certainly see the *benefit* of spending their money in this way. If a Roman commander demanded money to pay his troops during wartime so as to deal with a threat such as Aristonikos, the Thracians, or Mithridates, a city could hardly argue this was not to their ultimate advantage. Equally, the importance of showing loyalty to Rome by acceding to such requests (and the implied risk to the community's standing of failing to do so in wartime) clearly weighed on cities, as we see in the case of Methymna.[84] In sum, while the impetus to mint in the first place may have come

[80] Callataÿ 2011: 68–70.
[81] For example, the term is used throughout in Callataÿ 2011 and Callataÿ 2016, although the actual analysis in both articles is a good deal more nuanced than this.
[82] Picard 2010: 190, Callataÿ 2016: 332–3.
[83] Callataÿ 2016: 333.
[84] *IG* XII Suppl. 116.9–20.

from the Roman authorities, the silver was the city's and the decision to spend it in this way may not have been straightforwardly against the city's wishes.

A further difficulty with terming these coinages 'Roman' is that all decisions about how to produce them were left in the hands of the civic authorities. Paradoxically, therefore, by imposing extraordinary financial demands on the cities (and thus compromising their fiscal autonomy) the Roman authorities created an opportunity for the cities to articulate their civic identity through coin types which they would not otherwise have had. As the decree for Menas of Sestos famously demonstrates, cities highly prized the opportunity to produce coins with their own types.[85] However, whereas Menas was referring to bronze coinage whose coin types would therefore only reach an audience of local users, Attic weight silver tetradrachms such as those Parion and Lampsakos produced would circulate internationally and thus present the city's identity to a much broader cross-section of the Greek world. In the case of Parion, the decision to revive the reverse type of Apollo Aktaios sacrificing at an altar from the Group 1 tetradrachms advertised an important civic cult, asserted continuity with the past, and once again placed Parion in competition with the Athena Ilias and Apollo Smintheus coinages which the koinon of Athena Ilias and Alexandreia Troas continued to produce. In the case of Lampsakos, the portrait of Priapos commemorated a key episode in the city's recent history when the city's piety towards its gods had been rewarded by an epiphany in its hour of need and when the city's loyalty to Rome had been demonstrated in the most testing circumstances. In addition to this, the combination of a detailed portrait of Priapos on the obverse with a full-figure depiction of Apollo Citharoedus flanked by the city's ethnic on the reverse clearly resembles the types of the Athena Ilias, Apollo Smintheus, and Apollo Aktaios coinages produced in the 2nd century.[86] Lampsakos was therefore not just displaying its close relationship with Priapos, but also participating in peer-polity competition with other members of the koinon of Athena Ilias. While coin types and other questions of production were apparently still a matter of indifference to the Roman authorities in the early 1st century BC, from the perspective of the cities retaining control over these areas of production was a significant advantage. It is far from clear that the minting authorities of Lampsakos and Parion would have understood what we mean when we term such coinages 'Roman', never mind 'pseudo-civic'.[87]

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to thank the following curators for help with specimens in their collections: Julien Oliver (Paris), Amelia Dowler (London), Ute Wartenburg (New York), Helle Horsnaes (Copenhagen), Bernhard Weisser and Karsten Dahmen (Berlin). I am grateful to Andrew Meadows, François de Callataÿ, Philip Kinns, and Peter Thonemann for discussion of this paper at various stages and to the anonymous referee for a number of corrections.

[85] *I. Sestos* 1.43–9.
[86] Le Rider 1972: 235.
[87] For use of the term 'pseudo-civic' in relation to such coinages see (e.g.) Callataÿ 2016: 315.

Illustrations

Parion Group 1
1. O1/R1 – BM 1996,0107.1.
2. O1/R2 – Nomos 5 (25/10/2011), lot 179.
3. O2/R3 – Gemini 1 (11/1/2005), lot 152.
4. O2/R4 – ANS 1991.99.1.
5. O3/R5 – Ira & Larry Goldberg 53 (26/5/2009), lot 1680.
6. O3/R6 – Numismatica Genevensis 8 (24/11/2014), lot 47.

Parion Group 2
7. O4/R7 (Polykles) – *BNF Fonds Général* 893 = *SNG Paris* 1401.
8. O4/R8 (Polykles) – Triton 20 (9/1/2017), lot 247.
9. O4/R9 (Mandrodikos) – BM 1896,0601.63.

Lampsakos: Ephesios son of Theodoros
10. O1/R1 – *BNF Fonds Général* 769 = *SNG Paris* 1230.

Lampsakos: Promethion son of Lampon (1)
11. O2/R2 – BM 1900,1204.3.
12. O2/R3 – ANS 1948.29.3.
13. O2/R4 – *SNG Lewis* 825.
14. O2/R5 [Hoard?] – Elsen 102 (12/9/2009), lot 97.
15. O2/R6 [Hoard?] – Triton 8 (11/1/2005), lot 379.

Lampsakos: Andromachos son of Menophilos
16. O3/R7 [Hoard?] – ANS 1972.15.1.

Lampsakos: Herodes son of Dorotheus
17. O4/R8 [Hoard?] – NAC 2 (21/2/1990), lot 182.

Lampsakos: Demetrios son of Demetrios son of Meikalos
18. O4/R9 (1) [Hoard?] – Sotheby's Zurich (27/5/1974), lot 311.
19. O4/R9 (2) [Hoard?] – Boston MFA 1973.294.
20. O4/R10 (1) [Hoard?] – SNG Cop. Suppl. 306.
21. O4/R10 (2) [Hoard?] – Morton & Eden 86 (24/5/2017), lot 27.
22. O4/R11 [Hoard?] – Nomos 3 (10/5/2011), lot 111.
23. O4/R12 (1) [Hoard?] – Lanz 28 (7/5/1984), lot 250.
24. O4/R12 (2) [Hoard?] – Bank Leu 7 (9/5/1973), lot 205.

Lampsakos: Promethion son of Lampon (2)
25. O5/R13 – Berlin 18245862.

Lampsakos: Sokrates son of Xenophanes
26. O5/R14 – BM RPK,p131D.1.Lam = *BMC Mysia* 86,68.

Bibliography

Ashton, R. H. J. 2014. "The late Alexander tetradrachms of Knidos and ?Nisyros." *NC* 174: 19–22.

Badoud, N. 2015. *Le temps de Rhodes: une chronologie des inscriptions de la cité fondée sur l'étude de ses institutions*. Munich.

Baldwin, A. 1924. *Lampsakos: The Gold Staters, Silver and Bronze Coinages*. New York.

Bellinger, A. 1961. *Troy: The Coins*. Princeton.

Boehringer, C. 1972. *Zur Chronologie mittelhellenistischer Münzserien, 220–160 v. Chr.* Berlin.

Boulay, T. 2009. "Une épiphanie de Zeus Sôter à Clazomènes." *RN*[6] 165: 113–27.

Callataÿ, F. de. 1996. "Abydos sur Aesillas." In *Χαρακτηρ. Αφιέρωμα στην Μαντώ Οικονομίδου*, pp. 81–91. Athens.

———. 1998. "Les monnaies hellénistiques en argent de Ténédos." In *Studies in Greek Numismatics in Memory of Martin Jessop Price*, edited by R. H. J. Ashton et al., pp. 99–114. London.

———. 2011. "More than it would seem: the use of coinage by the Romans in late Hellenistic Asia Minor (133–63 BC)." *AJN* 23: 55–86.

———. 2013. "The coinages of the Attalids and their neighbours: a quantified overview." In *Attalid Asia Minor: Money, International Relations, and the State*, edited by P. Thonemann, pp. 207–44. Oxford.

———. 2016. "The coinages struck for the Romans in Hellenistic Greece: a quantified overview (mid-2nd c. – mid-1st c. BCE)." In *Neue Forschungen zur Münzprägung der Römischen Republik: Beiträge zum internationalen Kolloquium im Residenzschloss Dresden 19.–21. Juni 2014*, edited by F. Haymann et al., pp. 315–38. Bonn.

Carter, G. F. 1983. "A simplified method for calculating the original number of dies from die link statistics." *ANSMN* 28: 195–206.

Crawford, M. 1985. *Coinage and Money under the Roman Republic. Italy and the Mediterranean Economy*. London.

Ellis-Evans, A. 2016. "The koinon of Athena Ilias and its coinage." *AJN* 28: 105–58.

———. 2019. *The Kingdom of Priam. Lesbos and the Troad between Anatolia and the Aegean*. Oxford.

Esty, W. W. 2011. "The geometric model for estimating the number of dies." In *Quantifying Monetary Supplies in Greco–Roman Times*, edited by F. de Callataÿ, pp. 43–58.

Frisch, P. 1978. *Die Inschriften von Lampsakos*. Bonn.

Gaebler, H. 1923. "Die Silberprägung von Lampsakos. Eine chronologische Studie." *Nomisma* 12: 1–46.

Gauthier, P. 1997. "Compte rendu: G. Labarre, *Les cités de Lesbos aux époques hellénistique et impériale* (Lyon, 1996)." *Topoi* 7.1: 349–61.

Imhoof-Blumer, F. 1913. "Beiträge zur Erklärung griechischer Münztypen." *Nomisma* 8: 1–22.

Jones, C. P. 2004. "Events surrounding the bequest of Pergamon to Rome and the revolt of Aristonicos: new inscriptions from Metropolis." *JRA* 17: 469–85.

Kinns, P. 2014. "Lunate letter forms in the 4th century and Hellenistic coinage of Ionia." *NC* 174: 1–15.

Le Rider, G. 1972. "Numismatique grecque." *AEPHE 1971–1972*, pp. 227–42.

Meadows, A. R. 1998. "Parion." *NC* 158: 41–6.

———. 2006. "Amyntas, Side, and the Pamphylian plain." In *Agoranomia: Studies in Money and Exchange Presented to John H. Kroll*, edited by P. van Alfen, pp. 151–76. New York.

———. 2009. "The Hellenistic silver coinage of Clazomenae". In *Ancient History, Numismatics and Epigraphy in the Mediterranean World: Studies in Memory of Clemens E. Bosch and Sabahat Atlan and in Honour of Nezahat Baydur*, edited by O. Tekin, pp. 247–62. Istanbul.

———. 2018. "The great transformation. Civic coin design in the second century BC." In *ΤΥΠΟΙ. Greek and Roman Coins Seen through Their Images: Noble Issuers, Humble Users?*, edited by P. P. Iossif et al., pp. 297–318. Liège.

———. Forthcoming. "The Penetration of the *denarius* and *quinarius* standards into Asia Minor in the 1st century BC." In *Graecia Capta? Roman Influence on Coinage and its Circulation in the Aegean Basin in the Second and First Centuries BC*, edited by R. Ashton and N. Badoud.

Meadows, A. R. and Houghton, A. 2010. "The Gaziantep Hoard, 1994 (*CH* 9.527; 10.308)." In *Coin Hoards. X, Greek Hoards*, edited by O. Hoover, A. R. Meadows, and U. Wartenberg, pp. 172–223. New York.

Mørkholm, O. 1991. *Early Hellenistic Coinage: From the Accession of Alexander to the Peace of Apamea (336–188 BC)*. Cambridge.

Müller, C. and Prost, F. 2013. "Un décret inédit du koinon des Ioniens trouvé à Claros." *Chiron* 43: 93–126.

Paunov, E. 2013. "Georgi Dobrevo/2000 reconsidered: note on a 1st-century BC coin hoard from Thrace." *AWE* 12: 281–94.

Petridou, G. 2015. *Divine Epiphany in Greek Literature and Culture*. Oxford.

Picard, O. 2008. “Les tétradrachmes à types thasiens et les guerres thraces au début du Ier siècle avant notre ère.” *CRAI*, pp. 465–93.

———. 2010. “Rome et la Grèce à la basse période hellénistique: monnaies et impérialisme.” *Journal des Savants*, pp. 161–92.

Platt, V. 2011. *Facing the Gods: Epiphany and Representation in Graeco-Roman Art, Literature and Religion*. Cambridge.

Prêteux, F. 2005. “Priapos Bébrykès dans la Propontide et les Détroits: succès d’un mythe local.” *REG* 118.1: 246–65.

Robert, L. 1935. “Études sur les inscriptions et la topographie de la Grèce centrale. VI. Décrets d’Akraiphia.” *BCH* 59: 438–52 = *Opera Minora Selecta* 1: 279–93.

———. 1937. *Études anatoliennes: recherches sur les inscriptions grecques de l’Asie mineure*. Paris.

———. 1946. “Divinités éponymes.” In *Hellenica. Volume II*, pp. 51–64, 154–5. Paris.

———. 1955. “Apollons de Mysie. Apollon Kratéanos.” In *Hellenica. Volume X*, 134–53. Paris.

———. 1966. *Monnaies antiques en Troade*. Paris.

Robert, J. and Robert, L. 1950. “Inscriptions de l’Hellespont et de la Propontide.” In *Hellenica. Volume IX: Inscriptions et reliefs d’Asie Mineure*, pp. 78-97. Paris.

———. 1976. “Une inscription grecque de Téos en Ionie. L’union de Téos et de Kyrbissos.” *Journal des Savants*, pp. 153–235 = *Opera Minora Selecta* 7: 297–379.

Spring, J. 2009. *Ancient Coin Auction Catalogues, 1880–1980*. London.

Thonemann, P. 2015. *The Hellenistic World: Using Coins as Sources*. Cambridge.

Tréheux, J. 1953. “Décret de Lampsaque trouvé à Thasos.” *BCH* 77: 426–43.

Waddington, W. H. 1853. *Voyage en Asie-Mineure au point de vue numismatique*. Paris.

Watson, P. and Todeschini, C. 2006. *The Medici Conspiracy: The Illicit Journey of Looted Antiquities, from Italy’s Tomb Raiders to the World’s Greatest Museums*. New York.