

The Koinon of Athena Ilias and its Coinage

PLATES 36–46

ANEURIN ELLIS-EVANS*

This article presents the first die study of the coinage of the koinon of Athena Ilias, the evidence for which has doubled since the series was last catalogued in Alfred Bellinger's *Troy: The Coins* (1961). The new evidence confirms the longevity of the series (late 180s/early 170s–60s/50s BC) and suggests that the series was minted continually but at a low level of production throughout this period. It also provides an opportunity to revisit the question of the identity of the magistrate named on the reverse of the coins and the length of time they were in office, questions which have primarily been discussed in relation to the epigraphic evidence. It is argued that the purpose of the coinage was twofold: to provide the *agonothetai* who ran the festival with cash with which to make external payments and to act as a status symbol for the koinon's festival. The early dating of the series proposed here contributes to our understanding of the development of the phenomenon of civic spread-flan coinages in the mid-second century, while the late end date combined with the results of the die study provide an opportunity to look at the impact of the Mithradatic Wars on the finances of the koinon's cities.

* aneurin.ellis-evans@classics.ox.ac.uk.

1. INTRODUCTION

The koinon of Athena Ilias was a confederation of cities centred on the Troad which collectively administered the annual *Panathenaia* festival in honor of Athena Ilias from the last decade of the fourth century down to at least the late first century AD.¹ This major regional festival has left no trace whatsoever in the surviving literary sources for the Hellenistic period and is instead only known to us through a rich epigraphic dossier and an impressive silver coinage. The epigraphic evidence illuminates particular moments in the koinon's history, for example the circumstances of its creation in the last decade of the fourth century, its institutions and finances in the late third century, and the same in the very different circumstances of the first century BC. Cumulatively, these documents illustrate a high degree of continuity in the institutional structure of the koinon throughout the Hellenistic period. The koinon's coinage of silver tetradrachms (the drachms and didrachms of the series are late and few) were minted throughout most of the second century and in the first half of the first century BC and have the potential to provide us with a continuous narrative of the koinon's fortunes in the mid- to late Hellenistic period.

It has been over fifty years since Alfred Bellinger's *Troy: The Coins* (1961) catalogued the coins minted by the koinon of Athena Ilias.² Since then, our understanding of the institutions of the koinon has been significantly advanced first by Louis Robert's book-length review of Bellinger, more recently in a wide-ranging article by Denis Knoepfler, and now by a new contribution on the finances of the koinon by François Lefèvre and William Pillot.³ In all three cases, the focus has been on reinterpreting the epigraphy in order to better understand the koinon's institutions. This approach has made a substantial contribution to our understanding of the coins, in particular regarding the identification of the minting authority (the koinon of Athena Ilias, not the city of Ilion) and the identity of the magistrate named in the exergue on the reverse (the Ilian president of the koinon's board of *agonothetai*). More generally, this approach has succeeded in embedding the production of the coinage in its institutional context, as well as suggesting potential prosopographical links with literary and epigraphic texts.

The progress which has been made in understanding the epigraphic evidence has not, however, been matched by a reevaluation of the numismatic evidence, which in the time since Bellinger's publication has increased significantly. To the 56 examples of the series known to Bellinger we can now add 55 more which have either appeared since 1961 or were overlooked in the original publication,

1 All dates are BC unless otherwise stated. For the shift to the administration of the *Panathenaia* by Ilion alone in the second/third century AD see n. 59.

2 For earlier treatments see von Fritze (1902: 2.481–482, 505–506) and Regling (1928: 118–123).

3 Robert 1966; Knoepfler 2010; Lefèvre and Pillot 2015.

doubling the total number of specimens to 111. As a result, whereas Bellinger catalogued 33 magistrates (and was aware of a possible 34th), 47 are now attested (and possibly a 48th).⁴ We can also add six hoards to the two known to Bellinger which help us date ten of the magistrates (16 if we include the magistrates die linked to these). In addition, there are of course numerous new die links which help with the establishment of a relative chronology. This substantially enlarged body of numismatic evidence provides an opportunity to test, critique, and build upon the arguments of those who have primarily approached the koinon from the perspective of its epigraphic evidence.

2. CATALOGUE⁵

Obverse: Head of Athena r. in wreathed, triple-crested helmet.

Reverse: Athena Ilias advancing r. on ground line, distaff in l. hand, spear held above shoulder in r. hand (fillets sometimes attached to distaff, more often to spear), wearing a kalathos on her head and dressed in a peplos; <LF and RF> ΑΘΗΝΑΣ | ΙΛΙΑΔΟΣ written vertically; <EX> magistrate's name in the genitive.⁶

Hegesidemos (1)

Ref. None.

Rev. <EX> ΗΓΗΣΙΔΗΜΟΥ, <RF> owl.

O1 R1 16.48 GM 207 (15/10/2012), lot 289.

O1 R1 16.39 Pecunem 26 (14/12/2014), lot 192—Poor condition.

Antiphanes (1)

Ref. Regling 1, Bellinger T 37, Knoepfler 2.

Rev. <EX> ΑΝΤΙΦΑΝΟΥ, <RF> owl.

⁴ I am counting Philokles and Philon as a single magistrate on the assumption that they served a single term of office together. The 34th magistrate would have been Hermippos son of Menophanes: Bellinger 1961: 35; Robert 1966: 58, n. 1; Knoepfler 2010: 53, n. 89. For the possible 48th magistrate see n. 13.

⁵ Abbreviations: Von Fritze = 1902: 2.481–482; Regling = 1928: 119–123; Bellinger = 1961; Knoepfler = 2010: 52–53. It is a pleasure to thank the following curators for their help: Ute Wartenberg (New York), Bernhard Weisser (Berlin), Amelia Dowler (London), Klaus Vondrovec (Vienna), Helle Horsnaes (Copenhagen), Julien Olivier (Paris), Stefan Krmnicek (Tübingen), and Dimitra Tsangari (Alpha Bank). In addition, Catharine Lorber kindly provided photos of *CH X* 301.136–139. In compiling the catalogue I made use of the auction catalogue collection in the Sackler Library (Oxford) and the photo files of sale catalogues at the Institut für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte (Vienna), the British Museum (London), and the American Numismatic Society (New York).

⁶ Lacroix 1949: 103–112.

- O2 R2 13.45 [IGCH 1774.71 (Babylon, Iraq, 1900), c. 155–150] Berlin, 18252144—Poor condition.
- O2 R3 16.69 Coll. Gulbenkian (1989) 962 = Coll. Jameson (1924) 3. 2231.
- O2 R4 16.77 SNG *Ashmolean* 1159 = Glendinging (21/2/1961) 2212 = SNG *Lockett* 2738 = Naville 1 (4/4/1921), lot 2275 (S. Pozzi)

Athenokles⁷

Ref. None.

Rev. <EX> ΑΘΗΝΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ, <RF> owl.

- O2 R5 16.45 CH X 301.136 ('Demetrius I', Commerce, 2003; pre-151).
- O2 R5 16.81 [CH IV 55 (Near East, Commerce, 1977), pre-160] BM 1977,0704.2.

Iphiades⁸

Ref. None.

Rev. <EX> ΙΦΙΑΔΟΥ, <RF> owl.

- O2 R6 16.84 Tübingen, Inv. 16248 = Brandt & Sonntag (Oct. 1996) = UBS 41 (10/9/1996), lot 67 = UBS 26 (22/1/1991), lot 11.

Thersandros

Ref. Bellinger T 38, Knoepfler 3.

Rev. <EX> ΘΕΡΣΑΝΔΡΟΥ, <RF> owl.

- O2 R7 16.83 Adolph Hess 253 (8/3/1983), lot 224 = Bourgey (5/12/1932), lot 213 (H. Gallice).

Xanthippos

Ref. Regling 11, Bellinger T 36, Knoepfler 1.

Rev. <EX> ΞΑΝΘΙΠΠΟΥ, <RF> owl.

7 Otherwise unattested at Ilion, but a possible restoration of *I. Ilion* 64.41–42 (third/second century list of new citizens): Μητροδό[ωρος | —]νοκλείους. Frisch (*I. Ilion*, p. 162) instead suggests [Agath]okles.

8 This rare name is attested five times at Abydos between the mid-fifth and early first century (*LGPN VA*, s.v. 1–5) and once at Parion in a recently discovered Hellenistic epitaph (P. Hamon, *BE* [2015], no. 593). The individuals from Abydos may all belong to the same family: Robert 1967: 24–25. The magistrate named on this issue of the koinon could be related to the Iphiades who was one of two ambassadors sent to negotiate with Philip V during the siege of Abydos in 200: Plb. 16.30.7. Since the magistrate named in exergue was always an Ilian citizen (see section 4.6), this would imply intermarriage between elite families of Ilion and Abydos.

- O2 R8 15.32 [IGCH 1544.42 (Latakia, Syria, 1759), pre-160] BNF Fonds Général 683 (Mionnet 2.658, no. 190)—Poor condition, part of flan chipped off.

Metriketes


Ref. Regling 10, Bellinger T 39, Knoepfler 4.

Rev. <EX> MHTPIKETOY, <LF> , <RF> owl.

- O2 R9 16.87 CNG 102 (18/5/2016), lot 399 = Cederlind 181 (16/12/2015), lot 80 = GM 207 (15/10/2012), lot 287.
- O2 R9 16.78 GM 207 (15/10/2012), lot 288.
- O2 R10 16.84 Gerhard Hirsch 275 (22/9/2011), lot 3736 = GM 104 (9/10/2000), lot 370.
- O2 R10 16.77 BNF Fonds Général 688 = Coll. Waddington 1150.
- O3 R11 16.71 Gemini 11 (12/1/2014), lot 165 = LHS Numismatik 95 (25/10/2005), lot 657 = H. J. Berk Buy or Bid 118 (17/1/2001), lot 175 = Bank Leu 79 (31/10/2000), lot 633 = Gitta Kastner 10 (18/5/1976), lot 50.
- O? R? 15.35 (not illustrated) Sotheby, Wilkinson & Hodge (7/12/1896), lot 124 (E. Bunbury)—“Much oxydized”⁹.

Akkos¹⁰

Ref. Regling 4, Bellinger T 45, Knoepfler 7.

Rev. <EX> AKKOY, <LF> , <RF> owl.

- O3 R12 16.95 GM 224 (13/10/2014), lot 229.
- O3 R12 13.52 [IGCH 1774.73 (Babylon, Iraq, 1900), c. 155–150] Berlin, 18252272—Poor condition.
- O4 R13 15.64 CNG 53 (15/3/2000), lot 434 = CNR 19.4 (1994), lot 67.
- O5 R14 16.28 Coll. Norman Davis (1969), 202 = Hesperia Art Bulletin 11 (1959), lot 45.

⁹ The catalogue entry reads: “Ilium, Tetradrachm, similar type to the preceding coin [= see under Menephron son of Menephron below], but of more spread fabric [the Paris example of Metriketes is 37 mm, whereas the Menephron son of Menephron coins are 28–34 mm], and on rev. owl before Athena, and magistrate’s name . . . THKETOY, wt. 237 grs. [= 15.35 g], much oxydized, rare.” The two unread letters will be MH. Mistakenly reading H for Pl is an understandable error to make on a poorly preserved coin.

¹⁰ Previously read as Ἀ[ρ]έου on the severely degraded example in the Babylon Hoard, but rightly doubted by Robert (1966) 78 n. 3, 121 n. 3, and 133. Correct reading and discussion of name in Robert (1967: 119–123). Still “très incertaine” and “indéchiffrable” in Knoepfler (2010) 52 n. 84, 55.

Metrodoros

Ref. C. Boehringer, *SNR* 54 (1975): 46–47, no. 95.

Rev. <EX> ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΥ, <LF> , <RF> owl.

- | | | | |
|----|-----|-------|---|
| O6 | R15 | 15.63 | ANS 1977.158.305 (R. F. Kelley, acq. Istanbul, 1952). ¹¹ |
| O6 | R15 | 16.63 | NAC 54 (24/3/2010), lot 109. |
| O6 | R15 | 16.75 | Ponterio & Associates (16/8/2011), lot 21525 = Stack's (18/8/2009), lot 4132 = idem (22/4/2009), lot 1114 = Numismatica Genevensis 5 (2/12/2008), lot 111 = Christie's, New York 7718 (12/6/1993), lot 43 = MM Basel Liste 432 (Apr. 1981), lot 10—Obverse double struck. |

Rev. <LF> .

- | | | | |
|----|-----|-------|--|
| O6 | R16 | 16.85 | [CH IX 530 (Ordu, Turkey, 1970), c. 150] MM Basel 53 (29/11/1977), lot 93. |
| O6 | R17 | 16.16 | MM Basel 37 (5/12/1968), lot 210. ¹² |

Eudemos


Ref. None.

Rev. <EX> ΕΥΔΗΜΟΥ, <LF> , <RF> owl.

- | | | | |
|----|-----|-------|---|
| O6 | R18 | 16.78 | Lanz 158 (5/6/2014), lot 239. ¹³ |
|----|-----|-------|---|

Phoinix

Ref. None.

Rev. <EX> ΦΟΙΝΙΚΟΣ, <LF>  (above), eight-pointed star (below), <RF> owl.

- | | | | |
|----|-----|-------|---|
| O6 | R19 | 16.69 | Künker 236 (7/10/2013), lot 81 = Triton 11 (7/1/2008), lot 215. |
|----|-----|-------|---|


¹¹ In a letter dated 28/9/1952, the Istanbul dealer Nicolas Avgheris offers Kelley this and five other coins, writing, “Je viens de retourné d’un petit voyage d’Anatolie, où j’ai acheté quelques pièces rares qui peuvent vous intéresser je vous remets ci-joint les empreintes” (Kelley Correspondence, ANS).

¹² This may have appeared earlier in the year as the unidentified coin in E. Bourgey FPL (March 1968), lot 124.

¹³ Between EY and MOY a longer series of about four letters has been incompletely scratched out and replaced with ΔΗ. In the upper left space of the line after EY there is the beginning of a letter, and the efforts to conceal what comes to its right suggests there may have been a crossbar here. Before MOY, there are traces of an epsilon that bear comparison with the one at the name’s beginning. Considering the options listed in *LGPN*, I would suggest that the name which EYΔΗΜΟΥ replaced may have been EY[Γ][OΛ]ΕΜΟΥ. A Eupolemos son of Poseidonios is the Ilian *agonothetes* in *I. Ilion* 5 (late third century). If correct, we should expect an issue of Eupolemos with the O6 die to turn up in the future.

Dionysodoros

Ref. Regling 6–7, Bellinger T 41–42, Knoepfler 5.

Rev. <EX> ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΔΩΡΟΥ, <LF> , <RF> owl.

O7 R20 14.35 [IGCH 1774.74 (Babylon, Iraq, 1900), c. 155–150] Berlin, 18252273–Poor condition, reverse double struck.

Rev. <LF> .

O8 R21 13.01 [IGCH 1774.75 (Babylon, Iraq, 1900), c. 155–150] Berlin, 18252274–Poor condition.

Apemantos

Ref. Regling 2, Bellinger T 43–44, Knoepfler 6.

Rev. <EX> ΑΠΗΜΑΝΤΟΥ, <LF> , <RF> owl.

O8 R22 16.82 The Hague.

Rev. <LF> .

O8 R23 16.72 BNF Fonds Général 680 (Mionnet 2.657, no. 186).

O9 R24 16.90 [CH X 308.C222 (Gaziantep, Turkey, 1994), pre-Aug./ Oct. 143] Alpha Bank, Inv. 5128 = *NCirc* 103.2 (Mar. 1995), lot 882 = Spink 106 (11/10/1994), lot 62.

O10 R24 16.89 UBS 55 (16/9/2002), lot 1731.

Rev. <LF> .

O11 R25 16.95 MM Basel Liste 525 (Sep. 1989), lot 16 = Auctiones Basel 17 (7/6/1988), lot 212 = MM Basel Liste 483 (Nov./ Dec. 1985), lot 34.

Antiphanes (2)

Ref. Bellinger T 53, Knoepfler 16.

Rev. <EX> ΑΝΤΙΦΑΝΟΥ, <LF and RF> ΚΛΕ–ΩΝΟΣ, <RF> owl.

O12 R26 16.38 Védrières (29/12/1984), lot 53 = Auctiones Basel 8 (27/6/1978), lot 233 = *SNG von Aulock* 1521.

O12 R27 16.85 Künker 262 (13/3/2015), lot 7168.

Zoilos


Ref. von Fritze 16, Regling 8, Bellinger T 52, Knoepfler 15.


Rev. <EX> ΖΩΙΛΟΥ, <LF and RF> ΚΛΕ–ΩΝΟΣ, <LF> winged caduceus (below), <RF> owl (below).

- O12 R28 16.02 [CH X 301.138 ('Demetrius I', Commerce, 2003), pre-151] Stack's (11/10/2010), lot 150 (C. Vermeule) = CNG 66 (19/5/2004), lot 429.
- O12 R29 16.79 [CH X 301.139 ('Demetrius I', Commerce, 2003), pre-151] Gemini 1 (11/1/2005), lot 153.
- O12 R29 17.03 CNG 91 (19/9/2012), lot 249 = CNG 70 (21/9/2005), lot 205.
- O12 R30 16.69 NAC, Auction P (12/5/2005), lot 1505.
- O12 R30 16.60 BM BNK,G.1153 (*BMC Troas* 58,10; acq. 1877).

Soterides

Ref. Regling 12, Bellinger T 50, Knoepfler 14.

Rev. <EX> ΣΩΤΗΡΙΔΟΥ, <LF>  (above), Gorgon's head (below), <RF> owl.

- O13 R31 15.89 BM 1979,0101.281 = *SNG von Aulock* 1520.
- O13 R31 16.78 Spink 196 (24/9/2008), lot 11 = Bank Leu 15 (4/5/1976), lot 284.
- O13 R31 15.47 NAC, Auction H (30/4/1998), lot 1354.
- Rev. <LF>  (above).
- O13 R32 15.89 Berlin, 18252275 (A. Löbbecke, 1906)—Poor condition.

Apollodoros

Ref. Regling 3, Bellinger T 48, Knoepfler 8.

Rev. <EX> ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΥ, <LF>  (above), caduceus (below), <RF> owl.

- O14 R33 16.69 CH X 301.137 ('Demetrius I', Commerce, 2003; pre-151).
- O14 R34 14.90 Berlin, 18252271 (F. Imhoof-Blumer, 1900)—Poor condition.¹⁴
- O15 R35 15.04 [IGCH 1774.72 (Babylon, Iraq, 1900), c. 155–150] Berlin, 18252160—Poor condition.
- O16 R36 16.81 Bank Leu 36 (7/5/1985), lot 148.

Demetrios (I)

Ref. None.


Rev. <EX> ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ, <LF> , owl, <RF> ship's prow.

¹⁴ Counted twice by Bellinger (the second time as T 49a).

O17 R37 16.74 CGB.fr 47 (19/3/2011), lot 103.

Euboules

Ref. Bellinger T 49, Knoepfler 9.

Rev. <EX> ΕΥΒΟΥΛΙΔΟΥ, <LF>  (above), caduceus (below), <RF> owl.


O18 R38 16.87 ANS 1945.33.5.

O19 R39 16.85 GM 164 (17/3/2008), lot 178 = Lanz 123 (30/5/2005), lot 225 = CNG 67 (22/9/2004), lot 651 = NFA 29 (13/8/1992), lot 130 = Sotheby's New York (21/6/1990), lot 474 = Bank Leu 20 (25/4/1978), lot 121.

O19 R40 16.74 Triton 1 (2/12/1997), lot 523.

Lysikles

Ref. Bellinger T 51, Knoepfler 12.


Rev. <EX> ΛΥΣΙΚΛΕΙΟΥ, <LF>  (above), small eight-pointed star (below), <RF> crested helmet (above), owl (below).

O20 R41 15.90 CGB.fr 51 (17/11/2011), lot 178 = Giessener Münzhandlung 46 (30/10/1989), lot 229 = Leu 45 (26/05/1988), lot 205 = Hess-Leu 45 (12/5/1970), lot 251 = *SNG von Aulock* 1522—Poor condition.

O20 R41 16.00 BNF 1984.1053 = Banque Populaire du Nord & Nomisma 32 (June 1984), lot 114 = Kircheldorf 14 (7/7/1964), lot 105 = *Hesperia Art Bulletin* 23 (1962), lot 53 = MM Basel Liste 131 (Jan. 1954), lot 36—Poor condition.¹⁵

Protokleides

Ref. Bellinger T 46, Knoepfler 11.

Rev. <EX> ΠΡΩΤΟΚΛΕΙΔΟΥ, <LF>  , <RF> palm branch (above), owl (below).

O20 R42 16.68 BNF 1973.1.142 (H. Seyrig)—Poor condition.

Rev. <LF>  (above), small eight-pointed star (below).

O20 R43 16.34 Coll. Zhuyuetang (2004) 42 = Leu Numismatik 83 (6/5/2002), lot 292 = NAC 7 (1/3/1994), lot 236 = idem 4 (27/2/1991), lot 138.


O20 R43 16.86 NFA 32 (10/6/1993), lot 69.

¹⁵ Presumably, this is the “other specimen in a dealer’s hands” referred to in Bellinger 1958: 13 and 1961: 25.

O20 R44 16.48 Boston, MFA 1988.257 = NFA 20 (9/3/1988), lot 715.

Dionysios


Ref. von Fritze 17, Regling 5, Bellinger T 40, Knoepfler 30.

Rev. <EX> ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ, <LF> , <RF> winged Nike holding palm branch facing r.

O21 R45 16.71 BNF Fonds Général 686 = Coll. Waddington 1148.

Hermokreon


Ref. None.

Rev. <EX> ΕΡΜΟΚΡΕΟΝΤΟΣ, <LF>  (above), Athena Ilias with spear and distaff (below), <RF> owl.

O22 R46 16.93 [Malko Tarnovo, Bulgaria, 1968?]¹⁶ UBS 33 (20/9/1993), lot 284 = Poindessault (30/5/1979), lot G23 = MM Basel Liste 404 (Sep. 1978), lot 8.

Melantas


Ref. Regling 9, Bellinger T 47, Knoepfler 10.

Rev. <EX> ΜΕΛΑΝΤΟΥ, <LF>  (above), caduceus (below), <RF> owl.

O23 R47 16.44 BM 1936,0504.1 (NC [1937] 245, no. 19; T. O. Mabbott) = Leo Hamburger 92 (11/6/1930), lot 311 (Niklovitz, Budapest) = Coll. Jameson (1913) 1.1456 = Feuardent (9/6/1913), lot 274.

Prytanis


Ref. None.

Rev. <EX> ΠΡΥΤΑΝΙΔΟΣ, <LF> winged thunderbolt, <RF> .

O24 R48 16.73 Peus 332 (23/10/1991), lot 187.

Menephron¹⁷

Ref. von Fritze 18, Regling 15, Bellinger T 79, Knoepfler 18.

Rev. <EX> ΜΕΝΕΦΡΟΝΟΣ, <LF> , <RF> palm branch.

¹⁶ For this possibility see n. 33.

¹⁷ Very likely to be the father of Menephron son of Menephron (see below): Kraft 1962: 240; Guépin 1969: 212; Knoepfler 2010: 56.

- O25 R49 16.76 Berlin, 18252277 (F. Imhoof-Blumer, 1900) = Rollin & Feuardent (27/5/1889), lot 81 (M. le Comte de Duchâtel).

Melanippides

Ref. von Fritze 19, Regling 14, Bellinger T 80–81, Knoepfler 19.

Rev. <EX> ΜΕΛΑΝΙΠΠΙΔΟΥ, <LF> ☸ (above), palm branch (below), <RF> bull suspended from post.¹⁸

- O25 R50 16.37 Winterthur 2.2744 (O. Bernhard, F. Imhoof-Blumer, 1952) = A. Ladé 19 (Apr. 1902), lot 1359.

Rev. <LF> owl (below).

- O26 R51 16.23 Berlin, 18252276 (A. von Prokesch-Osten, 1875)—Center of reverse chipped away.

- O27 R52 16.10 BNF Fonds Général 687 = Coll. Waddington 1149—Pierced.

Diopethes son of Zenis

Ref. Regling 19–20, Bellinger T 93, Knoepfler 21.

Rev. <EX> ΔΙΟΠΕΙΘΟΥΣ | ΤΟΥ ΖΗΝΙΔΟΣ, <LF> ☸, <RF> winged Nike holding wreath facing r. above ship's prow.

- O27 R53 16.67 Künker 94 (27/9/2004), lot 1028 = Müller 18 (23/9/1976), lot 99—Poor condition.

- O27 R53 16.45 Berlin, 18252281 = Schlessinger 13 (4/2/1935), lot 1205 (Hermitage) = Yakunovich 1909: 33, pl. 5.66.¹⁹

Rev. <RF> Athena facing r.

- O27 R54 16.61 SNG Munich 218 (Mionnet 2.658, no. 187; E.-M. Cousinéry).

¹⁸ For this method of sacrifice in the cult of Athena Ilias and its representation on Ilion's Roman provincial coinage see von Fritze (1902: 2, 514–516), Brückner (1902: 2, 563–566), and Bellinger (1961: 31, 54).

¹⁹ Regling (1928: 122) has a reference to “Jakuntschikoff, Zapisok imp. russ. arch. obsch. 1908, Taf. V 66”. As Kienast (1959–1960: 239) and Robert (1966: 80 n. 6) noticed, this is missing from Bellinger 1958 and 1961. Robert thought the coin might be the Munich example. In fact, Regling's reference is to a lecture given to the Russian Archaeological Society in 1908 by Boris Mihailovich Yakunovich (1859–after 1917) about his private collection. It was published in St. Petersburg as a pamphlet, *Neizdannye i redkie drevne-grecheskie monety* [*Unpublished and Rare Ancient Greek Coins*], and as an article in *Zapiski*

Kallisthenes

Ref. None.

Rev. <EX> ΚΑΛΛΙΣΘΕΝΟΥΣ, <LF> ⸥⸥, <RF> ear of corn.

O28 R55 16.78 Giessener Münzhandlung 97 (11/10/1999), lot 350 =
Gerhard Hirsch 204 (5/5/1999), lot 334.

Metronax son of Hippodamas

Ref. None.

Rev. <EX> ΜΗΤΡΩΝΑΚΤΟΣ ΤΟΥ | ΙΠΠΟΔΑΜΑΝΤΟΣ, <LF> ⸥⸥, <RF> Tyche
facing l. holding cornucopia.

O29 R56 16.86 CNG 97 (17/9/2014), lot 163.

Sostratos

Ref. Regling 16, Bellinger T 95, Knoepfler 23.

Rev. <EX> ΣΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ, <LF> ⸥⸥, <RF> wreath.

O29 R57 16.40 BNF Fonds Général 684 (Mionnet 2.658, no. 191).

Hermippos son of Menophanes

Ref. Bellinger p. 35, Knoepfler 24.

Rev. <EX> ΕΡΜΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΟΥ | ΜΗΝΟΦΑΝΟΥ, <LF> ⸥⸥, <RF> wreath.

O29 R58 – *Hesperia Art Bulletin* 16 (June 1961), lot 35—Weight not
given.

Theokydes

Ref. Regling 13, Bellinger T 94, Knoepfler 22.

Rev. <EX> ΘΕΟΚΥΔΟΥ, <LF> ⸥⸥, <RF> horse facing r.

O29 R59 17.04 ANS 1944.100.43909 (E. T. Newell) = Naville 5
(18/6/1923), lot 2486 = Rodolfo Ratto (26/4/1909), lot
3687 (W. Fröhner)—Poor condition.

numizmaticheskogo otdeleniya Russkogo arkheologicheskogo obshchestva [Notes of the Numismatic Department of the Russian Imperial Archaeological Society] 1.2–3 (1909): 7–59. The publication cross-references the example in Mionnet from Cousinéry's collection, confirming that it is not the same coin. Yakunovich was shot and his collection confiscated sometime after being dismissed from his government post by the Bolsheviks on December 14, 1917. His collection ended up at the Hermitage before parts of it (including this coin) were sold off at the Schlessinger sale in Berlin. I am grateful to Georgy Kantor for helping me track down this publication and for translating the Russian.

Menephron son of Menephron

Ref. Regling 21–23, Bellinger T 96–99, Knoepfler 25.

Rev. <EX> ΜΕΝΕΦΡΟΝΟΣ ΤΟΥ | ΜΕΝΕΦΡΟΝΟΣ, <LF> ☉, <RF> spider.²⁰

- | | | | |
|-----|-----|-------|--|
| O29 | R60 | 16.25 | BM 1841.B.2596 (<i>BMC Troas</i> 58,13; T. Burgon). |
| O29 | R60 | 16.24 | BNF Fonds Général 689 (Mionnet 2.658, no. 189). |
| O29 | R61 | – | Malloy 9 (9/5/1977) 122—Broken and worn, weight not given. |

Rev. <LF> ☉, <RF> winged horse drinking l.

- | | | | |
|-----|-----|-------|--|
| O29 | R62 | 15.72 | BM RPK,p130A.1.Ili (<i>BMC Troas</i> 58,12; R. Payne Knight, 1824). |
| O29 | R62 | 16.66 | Kölner Münzkabinett 87 (25/4/2007), lot 16 = idem 85 (10/5/2006), lot 35 = Sotheby's Zurich (27/10/1993), lot 602 = MM Basel Liste 427 (Nov. 1980), lot 16 = Seaby 723 (Nov. 1978), lot C1094 = MM Basel 53 (29/11/1977), lot 94 = <i>SNG von Aulock</i> 7604. |
| O29 | R62 | 16.54 | ANS 1944.100.43910 (E. T. Newell). |
| O29 | R62 | 16.67 | BNF Fonds Général 682 (Mionnet 2.658, no. 188). |
| O29 | R62 | 16.58 | Berlin, 18252294 (C. R. Fox, 1873) = S. Leigh Sotheby (31/7/1848), lot 893 (Earl of Pembroke; cf. <i>Numismatum Antiquorum in Musaeo Pembrochiano</i> [1746] II, Table 45). |
| O29 | R62 | 16.62 | Berlin, 18252289 (acq. from Rollin & Feuarent, 1872). |
| O29 | R62 | 16.62 | <i>SNG Copenhagen</i> 363 = <i>Katalog. Auktionen i Brygger Dr. phil. Carl Jacobsens Dødsbo</i> (26/11/1914), lot 112. |
| O29 | R62 | 16.70 | A. E. Cahn 60 (2/7/1928), lot 795 (Osman Nouri Bey). |
| O29 | R62 | 16.35 | Coll. McClean 3.7828 = Jacob Hirsch 14 (27/11/1905), lot 510 (F. Merckens). |

²⁰ There is a long history of misidentifying the animal on T 96 as a fly (Wroth, *BMC Troas* p. 58, no. 13), an ant (Bellinger 1961: 33), or even a bee (de Callataÿ 1997: 291). However, it is quite clearly a spider: it has no wings, eight legs (not six), and two *tagmata* (not three). The choice of image perhaps alludes to Arachne, a particularly appropriate myth for this cult of Athena given its focus on weaving. The cult image of Athena Ilias which appears on both the coins and stamped onto loom weights and spindle whorls dedicated in the sanctuary in the fourth century show her holding a distaff and spindle in her left hand: Wallrodt 2002; Rose 2014: 56, 153.

- O29 R62 16.72 Triton 8 (11/1/2005), lot 389 = NFA 25 (29/11/1990), lot 128 = NFA 20 (10/3/1988), lot 716 = Sternberg 9 (15/11/1979), lot 36.
- O29 R62 16.13 Boston, MFA 1.1629 (E. P. Warren, 1901).
- O? R? 16.39 (not illustrated) Sotheby, Wilkinson & Hodge (7/12/1896), lot 123 (E. Bunbury)—Perhaps the same as Coll. McClean 3.7828?

Rev. <LF> ☉, <RF> wreath.

- O30 R63 15.93 SNG *Copenhagen* 362 = Sotheby, Wilkinson & Hodge (11/7/1877), lot 261 (D. Dundas)—Pierced.

Demophon son of Dionys[?]

Ref. Bellinger T 18, Bellinger T 92, Knoepfler 20.

Rev. <EX> ΔΗΜΟΦΩΝΤΟΣ | ΤΟΥ ΔΙΟΝΥΣ[?], <LF> ☉, <RF> wreath.

- O30 R64 16.77 Berlin, 18252280 (A. Löbbecke, 1906).²¹

Demetrios (2)

Ref. Bellinger T 119, Knoepfler 29.

Rev. <EX> ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ, <LF> ☉.

- oA rA 2.50 Berlin, 18252278 = Jacob Hirsch 25 (29/11/1909), lot 1917 (G. Philipson)—Top and one side of flan missing.

Philokles and Philon

Ref. Bellinger T 55, Knoepfler 17.

Rev. <EX> ΦΙΛΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ | ΚΑΙ ΦΙΛΩΝΟΣ, <LF> ☉, <RF> ΥΛΛ . Ν (?).²²

- O31 R65 15.33 ANS 1953.54.14—Large crack obscures legend in right field.

Hegesidemos (2) son of Diophanes

Ref. Bellinger T 54, Knoepfler 34.

Rev. <EX> ΗΓΗΣΙΔΗΜΟΥ | ΤΟΥ ΔΙΟΦΑΝΟΥ, <LF> ☉, <RF> owl above palm branch.

²¹ The die link with Bellinger's T 99 was first spotted by Kraft (1962: 240). It is difficult to see in Bellinger's plates, but perfectly clear on the coins themselves (the shared die faults, e.g., across the bottom of the helmet plume and leading away from the chin, clinch it).

²² Robert 1966: 79 n. 1: "Je ne les lis ni ne les comprends". Bellinger (1961: 25, 27) read the penultimate letter as *omega*, but this does not fit the traces. The other readings are secure. A solution to what is written in the right field will have to await a second example of the issue.

O32 R66 13.83 Paunov 2013: 282–285 (Georgi Dobrevo, Bulgaria, 2000; c. 55–40)—Bottom corner of flan broken.

Rev. <LF> .

O32 R67 16.26 ANS 1967.152.422 (E. T. Newell).

Hippodamas


Ref. Bellinger T 58, Knoepfler 28.

Rev. <EX> ΙΠΠΟΔΑΜ|ΑΝΤΟΣ, <LF> , <RF> tripod.

oB rB 3.37 Berlin, 18252300.

Philodromos son of Tychandros


Ref. Regling 25, Bellinger T 104, Knoepfler 31.

Rev. <EX> ΦΙΛΟΔΡΟΜΟΥ|ΤΟΥΤΥΧΑΝΔΡΟΥ, <LF> , <RF> winged Nike holding wreath r.

O33 R68 16.62 BNF Fonds Général 681 = Coll. Waddington 1152.

Mnaseas son of Demetrios


Ref. Regling 24, Bellinger T 103, Knoepfler 30.

Rev. <EX> ΜΝΑΣΕΟΥ ΤΟΥ|ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ, <LF> , <RF> prize amphora and torch.

O34 R69 16.42 Auctiones Basel 6 (1/10/1976), lot 204 (W. Giesecke).

Hermias

Ref. Bellinger T 57, Knoepfler 27.

Rev. <EX> ΗΡΜΙΟΥ, <LF> , <RF> owl.

oC rC 3.30 Gotha = Brüder Egger 46 (11/5/1914), lot 653 (T. Prowe).

Opsigonos


Ref. None.

Rev. <EX> ΟΨΙΓΟΝΟΥ, <LF> , <RF> palm branch.

ooAA rrAA 8.32 ANS 1967.152.423 (E. T. Newell).

Pylades

Ref. Bellinger T 56, Knoepfler 26.

Rev. <EX> ΠΥΛΑΔΟΥ, <LF> , <RF> palm branch.

oD rD 3.94 BNF Fonds Général 690 = Coll. Waddington 1151—
Pierced and repaired.

Zmithinas

Ref. F. Imhoof-Blumer, *SNR* 19 (1913): 29–30.

Rev. Not illustrated. According to catalogue, “i[m] F[eld] ΠΥ-ΛΟ.”

o? r? 4.02 Jacob Hirsch 13 (15/5/1905), lot 3472 (A. Rhusopoulos).

Agathes son of Menophilos

Ref. Regling 17, Bellinger T 102, Knoepfler 33.

Rev. <EX> ΑΓΑΘΟΥ | ΤΟΥ ΜΗΝΟΦΙΛΟΥ, <LF> $\overline{\Sigma}$, <RF> palm branch.

O35 R70 16.58 BM G.4422 (*BMC Troad* 58,11).

O35 R70 16.59 BNF Fonds Général 685 (Mionnet 2.657, no. 185).

O35 R70 13.11 BNF AA.GR.502

O35 R70 16.62 Naples, 7972.

O35 R71 16.54 Coll. Hunterian (1901) 2.301, pl. XLIX 14

O35 R71 15.72 Vienna, Gr 33870 = Jacob Hirsch 21 (16/11/1908), lot 2584 (Consul Weber).

Euthydikos²³

Ref. Bellinger T 105, Knoepfler 32.

Rev. <EX> ΕΥΘΥΔΙΚΟΥ, <LF> $\overline{\Sigma}$, <RF> owl.

oE rE 3.72 *SNG Ashmolean* 1163 (acq. 1924) = Naville 4 (17/6/1922), lot 804 = Coll. Weber 5382 = Sotheby, Wilkinson & Hodge (2/2/1891), lot 216 (C. Babington)

oE rE 3.60 Winterthur 2.2746 (F. Imhoof-Blumer, *SNR* 19 [1913]: 29–30, no. 77; F. Imhoof-Blumer 1910, A. O. van Lennepe 1908).

Forgeries

Rev. <EX> ΑΓΑΘΟΥ, <LF> $\overline{\Sigma}$, <RF> palm branch.

– – 15.50 MM Basel 41 (18/6/1970), lot 159.

²³ Name not read in Bellinger (1961: 36), missing from Robert (1966: 78–79), read as]ΥΛΑ in *SNG Ashmolean* (2007), still considered illegible in Knoepfler (2010: 53). See, however, Imhoof-Blumer 1913: 29–30, no. 77, Robert 1967: 123–124, and Winterthur 1997 ad loc.

The coin is obviously trying to copy the issue of Agathes son of Menophilos (e.g., palm branch control mark, similar monogram, magistrate's name). However, many details are wrong. On the obverse, the helmet strap covering the ear is unparalleled in the series and the chin protrudes unnaturally beyond the lips. On the reverse, the patronymic is missing, the crossbars of the *alphas* are not broken, and the monogram has been incompletely copied.

3. METROLOGY

Table 1 compares the distribution of weights in the Athena Ilias coinage to 1) the Apollo Smintheus tetradrachms of Alexandria Troas which were produced over a similar time span (mid-170s–65), 2) three well-attested series of wreathed tetradrachms from the 150s–140s (Herakleia, Smyrna, Kyme), and 3) two wreathed coinages from the Troad dating to c. 100–70 (Tenedos, Abydos).²⁴

The widespread phenomenon of civic tetradrachms minted on a gradually lighter standard between the mid-second and early first century is illustrated here by the contrast between the mode and median of the wreathed tetradrachms of Herakleia, Smyrna, and Kyme and those of Abydos and Tenedos.²⁵ This trend can likewise be observed in the precisely dated Apollo Smintheus coinage. From its beginning in the mid-170s down to 86 there are only three years (163, 157, and 135) in which coins below 16.00 g appear, whereas between 85 and the final emission in 65 coins below this weight appear six times in just 20 years (85, 80, 79, 78, 68, 65).²⁶ By contrast, the Athena Ilias coinage appears to have maintained its weight standard relatively well even in the late second and early first centuries, with coins below 16.00 g encountered as commonly in the first half of the series as in the second, even after one discounts damaged specimens.

²⁴ The single didrachm and seven drachms in the Athena Ilias series are too few for a metrological analysis to be worthwhile. The data for the Apollo Smintheus coinage is based on a die study I have prepared. The data for the other five coinages is taken from de Callatay (1998: 112). It should be noted that two examples of the Tenedian series have now appeared in a hoard which closed in 151/0 (*CH X* 301.140–141), half a century earlier than the c. 100 start date de Callatay (1998) proposed. However, the evidence of die links and overstrikes indicates that the overwhelming majority of these coins were indeed minted c. 100–70, and therefore that this coinage was a revival of an earlier and much smaller issue from the mid-second century.

²⁵ See in general Thonemann 2015: 124–127.

²⁶ De Callatay 1997a: 153.

Table 1. Metrology.

Weight	Athena Ilias	Apollo Smintheus	Herakleia	Smyrna	Kyme	Tenedos	Abydos
X>17.09	0	0	4	1	0	2	2
17.00-9	2	0	12	0	1	0	1
16.90-9	4	5	12	1	19	0	2
16.80-9	14	6	29	5	37	4	6
16.70-9	18	7	45	24	68	7	7
16.60-9	15	11	23	22	56	13	14
16.50-9	5	7	19	8	47	7	14
16.40-9	7	3	14	2	41	8	11
16.30-9	6	3	8	3	27	7	12
16.20-9	5	3	9	5	24	8	7
16.10-9	3	1	1	1	32	6	11
16.00-9	2	3	3	4	19	5	10
15.90-9	3	2	X<16.00) 21	(X<16.00) 19	(X<16.00) 62	(X<16.00) 17	(X<16.00) 24
15.80-9	1	0					
15.70-9	2	2					
15.60-9	2	2					
15.50-9	0	0					
15.40-9	1	0					
15.30-9	3	0					
15.20-9	0	0					
15.10-9	0	1					
15.00-9	1	1					
X<15.00	7	4					
N/A	2	2					
Total	103	64	200	95	433	83	121
Mode	16.70-9	16.60-9	16.70-9	16.70-9	16.70-9	16.60-9	16.50-69
Median	16.61	16.59	16.70	16.62	16.52	16.37	16.37

4. DATING

4.1 Hoards and Dating Principles

There are eight relevant hoards, six buried in the period c. 160–143 and two in c. 90 and c. 55–40 respectively. These hoards contain a total of 16 tetradrachms representing 10 magistrates and two cases where the magistrate was not recorded before the coin was dispersed in trade, but the identity of whom can in one case be deduced with some confidence:

- 1) *IGCH* 1544 (Latakia, Syria, 1759).²⁷
Burial: c. 160 BC.
Magistrates: Xanthippos
- 2) *CH* IV 55 (Near East, Commerce, 1977).
Burial: c. 160 BC.
Magistrates: Athenokles
- 3) *IGCH* 1774 (Babylon, Iraq, 1900).²⁸
Burial: c. 155–150 BC.
Magistrates: Akkos,²⁹ Antiphanes (1), Apollodoros, x 2 Dionysodoros
- 4) *CH* X 301 ('Demetrius I', Commerce, 2003).
Burial: 151/0 BC.³⁰
Magistrates: Apollodoros, Athenokles, x2 Zoilos
- 5) *CH* IX 530 (Ordu, Turkey, 1970).
Burial: c. 150 BC.³¹
Magistrates: Metrodoros
- 6) *CH* X 308 (Gaziantep, Turkey, 1994).
Burial: August/October 143 BC.³²
Magistrates: Apemantos, Unknown

²⁷ Seyrig (1973: 49–56) argued for c. 169 BC, but Mattingly (1993) 85–6 has now argued for c. 160 BC on the basis of the Ma'aret En-Nu'man Hoard (Syria), 1980 (= *CH* VIII 433). Kinns (1999: 55–60) provides independent validation of this lower date for the hoard with his study of the Ephesian drachms.

²⁸ For arguments favoring 155 over 150 see Regling 1928: 98 and Meadows and Houghton 2010: 179 n. 13.

²⁹ For this reading instead of Ἀ[ρ]έου see n. 10.

³⁰ Lorber 2010: 125.

³¹ *CH* IX 530 follows Arslan and Lightfoot (1999: 42–43) in dating this hoard c. 140–120, but Boehringer (1975: 51–52) and Meadows and Houghton (2010: 179 n. 13) rightly prefer 150.

³² Meadows and Houghton 2010: 179.

7) Gerasimov (1979) 138 (Malko Tarnovo, Bulgaria, 1968).

Burial: c. 90 BC.³³

Magistrates: Hermokreon (?)

8) *CH X* 165 (Georgi Dobrev, Bulgaria, 2000).³⁴

Burial: c. 55–40 BC.³⁵

Magistrates: Hegesidemos (2) son of Diophanes

Five of the magistrates from hoards dated c. 160–150 are obverse die linked to six further magistrates.³⁶ With 16 magistrates predating August/October 143, two features of these issues from the beginning of the series become apparent which help with dating. First, a monogram first appears in left field with *Metriketes*. This magistrate is die linked to five magistrates who do not have a monogram, of which three (*Xanthippos*, *Antiphanes* (1), *Athenokles*) appear in hoards from c. 160–150. By contrast, once a monogram does appear in the left field with *Metriketes* it then always appears here except in three cases: the issue of *Prytanis* instead places it in right field and those of *Antiphanes* (2) and *Zoilos* spell out the name referred to by the monogram (*ΚΛΕ-ΩΝΟΣ*). Since the examples of *Hegesidemos* (1) lack a monogram, they belong at the very beginning of the series. Second, the only control mark used is an owl in the right field until the issue of *Phoinix*, which adds an eight-pointed star in the left field below the monogram. From *Zoilos* onwards, two or three control marks become the norm.³⁷ Since *Hegesidemos* (1) has only the owl in the right field, this again argues for it belonging at the beginning of the series.

In the rest of the series, three general trends can be observed which contribute to establishing a relative chronology. First, the magistrate's patronymic first appears on the coins of *Diopieithes* son of *Zenis*. Thereafter, it is included by eight of the remaining twelve magistrates who produce tetradrachms (the six issues of drachms and the didrachm issue can be excluded from consideration since their flans are too small).³⁸ This distinctive feature of the later issues is not only a useful dating criterion, but also allows us to start making prosopographical links with

³³ Paunov 2013: 289–290. The coin of *Apollo Smintheus* (Year 208 = 93 BC) found in this hoard first appeared in *GM* 15 (17/12/1978), lot 68. I therefore wonder whether the unidentified coin of *Athena Ilias* in this hoard is in fact the coin of *Hermokreon* which first appears in *MM Basel Liste* 404 (Sep. 1978), lot 8 and belongs to the right part of the series.

³⁴ See now Paunov 2013.

³⁵ Paunov 2013: esp. 291–292.

³⁶ Die links: *Xanthippos*, *Antiphanes* (1), *Athenokles* (Hoards 1, 2, 3) to *Iphiades*, *Thersandros*, and *Metriketes*; *Metrodoros* (Hoard 5) to *Eudemos*, *Phoinix*; *Zoilos* (Hoard 4) to *Antiphanes* (2).

³⁷ Unlike with the monograms, I see no reliable pattern in the control marks and so have not used them for dating.

³⁸ See e.g., the drachm issue of *Hippodamas* where just the magistrate's name on its own has to be split over two lines because of lack of space.

epigraphic and literary texts.³⁹ Second, if one compares the issues from Hoards 1–6 (c. 160–143) with the issue of Hegesidemos (2) son of Diophanes from Hoard 8 (c. 55–40) it is immediately clear that significant stylistic changes have occurred in the intervening century and that, generally speaking, the types have become much cruder.⁴⁰ Third, if we look at the monograms on sets of magistrates which are die linked or which we know belong together for other reasons it becomes clear that this is often a good indication that two coins belong together, or at least near to one another. Caution is needed, however, since there is at least one die linked sequence where minor variations of two different monograms are used alternately (Phoinix, Dionysodoros, Apemantos).

4.2 Relative Chronology

Hegesidemos (1) to Akkos. The position of these eight magistrates at the beginning of the series is guaranteed by hoard finds, die links, and diagnostic features such as monograms and control marks. The order of the five magistrates only using O2 cannot currently be determined, so I have ordered them alphabetically.

Metrodoros to Soterides. The presence of magistrates from hoards dated c. 155–150 (Dionysodoros), 151/0 (Zoilos), 150 (Metrodoros), and August/October 143 (Apemantos) indicate that these four magistrates and the three magistrates to which they are die linked belong soon after the Hegesidemos (1) to Akkos sequence. The three magistrates sharing O6 are placed first because Metrodoros (𐌢, 𐌢) and Eudemos (𐌢) display variations of the same monogram as Metriketes (𐌢) and Akkos (𐌢) which come before and some of the examples of Dionysodoros (𐌢) and Apemantos (𐌢, 𐌢) which follow, whereas Phoinix (𐌢) introduces the monogram that will be used on the other examples of Dionysodoros and Apemantos. Metrodoros is placed before Eudemos because the monogram on two of this magistrate's reverse dies adds a crossbar at the top that will then appear on Eudemos. Soterides is included in this group of eight magistrates because the obverse die is exceptionally close to that of Antiphanes (2) and Zoilos and it shares a monogram (𐌢) with Eudemos.

Apollodoros to Hermokreon. These nine magistrates can be split into three groups which, for lack of good dating criteria, I have arranged alphabetically: 1) Three examples of Apollodoros have appeared in hoards dated c. 155–150 and 151/0. They share a monogram (𐌢, 𐌢) with Demetrios (1) and Euboulides and

³⁹ The approach is exemplified by Robert (1966: 58–82) and Knoepfler (2010: 47–59). For harsh (and only occasionally justified) criticism of Robert's prosopographical approach see Guépin 1969: 207–212.

⁴⁰ Kraft 1962: 240. The assertion to the contrary of Guépin (1969: 211) is difficult to understand. For example, delicate work on the obverse, such as the streaming plumes of Athena's helmet and the wavy hair which tumbles down the back of her neck, are increasingly executed in a blocky style or avoided altogether from Melanippides onwards. Likewise, the

the dies of all three magistrates display strong stylistic affinities with earlier issues. 2) Lysikles and Protokleides are die linked and share a monogram.⁴¹ The dies display the beginnings of stylistic developments typical of the second half of the series (e.g., Athena's dress billowing out behind her on the reverse). 3) There are then four magistrates (Dionysios, Hermokreon, Melantas, Prytanis) which display even clearer stylistic affinities with the coins in the next sequence (especially with the first two magistrates, Menephron and Melanippides). If the Athena Ilias coin in the Malko Tarnovo hoard (buried c. 90) is indeed the issue of Hermokreon as I have speculated (see n. 33 above), then these four magistrates will date to the late second/very early first century.

Menephron to Demetrios (2). These 10 magistrates can be ordered with some confidence since all but one (Kallisthenes) are die linked to other magistrates in this group. Kallisthenes shares a monogram (𐀓𐀔) with some of these issues (cf. 𐀓𐀔 on Menephron son of Menephron, O29/R62) and is stylistically similar. The order of the five magistrates sharing O29 (Metronax son of Hippodamas to Menephron son of Menephron) can be determined by a worsening fault on the left side of the obverse die.⁴²

Philokles and Philon to Euthydikos. Since six of the 10 magistrates in this sequence chose to mint drachms and one magistrate didrachms instead of tetradrachms, the chances of identifying obverse die links between the issues of tetradrachms are greatly reduced, and indeed none has so far appeared. Consequently, we must instead rely on monograms. 1) Philokles and Philon and the example of Hegesidemos (2) son of Diophanes in the Georgi Dobrevho hoard (c. 55–40) share a monogram (𐀓𐀔) with Demetrios (2) who dates to 77 (see sections 4.5 and 4.6) and ends the previous sequence. 2) The other example of Hegesidemos (2) son of Diophanes and Hippodamas share a monogram (𐀓𐀔). 3) Philodromos son of Tychandros, Mnaseas son of Demetrios, Opsigonos, and Hermias all share variations of the same monogram (𐀓𐀔, 𐀓𐀔). 4) I see no good way to determine the position of Pylades and Zmithinas, and so have placed them before the pair of magistrates most likely to have come last. 5) Agathes son of Menophilos and Euthydikos share variations of a monogram (𐀓𐀔, 𐀓𐀔) and probably come latest in the series given the prosopographical evidence (see section 4.5).

depiction of the drapery of Athena Ilias's dress on the reverse becomes increasingly poor. In particular, the back of her dress goes from falling naturally to the floor to billowing out behind her (e.g., Lysikles, Protokleides) to becoming a blocky protrusion (e.g., Melantas, Prytanis).

⁴¹ Kraft 1962: 240.

⁴² De Callataj 1997a: 291 n. 80.

4.3 The Beginning of the Series

The hoard evidence indicates that the series had begun by c. 160, and it is generally agreed that autonomous, spread-flan tetradrachms are an innovation of the post-Apameia period.⁴³ Unfortunately, we cannot tell from the hoard evidence or the coins whether the series began over two decades earlier in the mid-180s or just a few years earlier in the mid-160s. However, it has long been recognized that the spread-flan tetradrachms which Alexandria Troas minted in the name of Apollo Smintheus bear a striking similarity to the Athena Ilias series and were therefore probably minted in imitation of them.⁴⁴ Since the Apollo Smintheus coins can be precisely dated because they feature an era date on the reverse, we can therefore use them to infer a *terminus ante quem* for the Athena Ilias series. The earliest example known to Bellinger was from Year 137. Bellinger assumed that this was an era which began in 301 when Lysimachos changed the city's name from Antigoneia to Alexandria, and so he dated the coin to 164 BC.⁴⁵ Consequently, Boehringer, for example, argued for a date not long before this for the beginning of the Athena Ilias coinage.⁴⁶ However, in 2005 an example appeared in trade from Year 130 which would therefore date to 171 BC. To this we can now add an example which is die linked to the Year 130 issue and shares a monogram with Year 130 and Year 137, but lacks an era date and so should probably be placed first in the series.⁴⁷ The beginning of the series may now be described as follows:

43 For a recent overview see Thonemann 2015: 45–65 and for the chronological development of coinages with broader flans in the 3rd and 2nd c. see Mørkholm (1991: 12) and de Callatay (2006: 148–152).

44 E.g., Bellinger 1961: 93–94.

45 Knoepfler (2010: 60) has recently revived the suggestion that the era on the coins may be the Seleukid Era which would make a Year 137 coin date to 176 instead of 164 BC. However, Paul Kosmin (pers. comm.) reminds me that Seleukid Era dates always go from smallest to largest (i.e., ZAP—7–30–100) not largest to smallest (i.e., PAZ—100–30–7) as we find in all other contexts and, indeed, on the Apollo Smintheus coins. On this phenomenon, see (e.g.) J. and L. Robert, *BE* (1967): 557, no. 651.

46 Boehringer 1972: 15.

47 Another example without an era date has appeared in trade: Elsen 92 (9/6/2007), lot 125 = Elsen 88 (10/6/2006), lot 113 = Triton 8 (11/1/2005), lot 388 = Triton 1 (2/12/1997), lot 522 (16.65 g), Rev. <EX> ΑΛΕΞΑΝ, <LF> Π, <RF> Σ. If this were genuine it would be the earliest example. However, I am relatively sure it is a forgery: 1) On the obverse, the three locks of Apollo's hair on his neck are tightly braided until Year 183, whereas here they are loose; the forger's model may be Year 185 (*SNG Copenhagen Suppl.* 320 = Bank Leu 13 (29/4/1975), lot 209 = *SNG von Aulock* 7548); 2) On the reverse, Apollo always holds a recurved bow (pulled in at the grip, each limb a half-moon, bends back at the tips), but on this coin he instead has a longbow with its distinctive half-moon shape; 3) The bow also lacks the decorative recurve on the upper limb curving back on itself (a prominent feature until Year 144 and still common thereafter) and the arrow is notched implausibly high, a

Obverse: Head of Apollo l. wearing laurel wreath with ties floating behind; hair rolled above forehead, falling in three braided locks on neck (tightly braided until Year 183 [= 118 BC], loosely braided thereafter).

Reverse: Apollo Smintheus standing r. on ground line, recurved bow with arrow notched in l. hand, patera in r. hand, quiver over l. shoulder, head wreathed, dressed in himation; <LF and RF> ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΟΣ | ΖΜΙΘΕΩΣ written vertically, in exergue the city ethnic above (ΑΛΕΞΑΝ, lengthened to ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΩΝ between Year 166 and Year 173⁴⁸ (135–128 BC) and the magistrate's name in the genitive below (introduced between Year 144⁴⁹ and Year 148⁵⁰ (157–153 BC).

Earliest Issue 1

Ref. None.

Rev. <EX> ΑΛΕΞΑΝ, <LF> , <RF> .

O1 R1 16.68 MM DE 40 (4/6/2014), lot 221 = Bank Leu 28 (5/5/1981), lot 138.

Year 130

Ref. None.

Rev. <EX> ΑΛΕΞΑΝ, <LF>  (above),  (below) <RF> ΠΛ (130).

O1 R2 16.94 NAC 29 (11/5/2005), lot 198.

Year 137

Ref. Bellinger A 134.

Rev. <EX> ΑΛΕΞΑΝ, <LF>  (above),  (below) <RF> ΠΛΖ (137).

O2 R3 16.44 BNF Fonds Général 117 = Coll. Waddington 1081.

Rev. <LF>  (below).

O2 R4 16.71 Lanz 158 (5/6/2014), lot 235.

Since Earliest Issue 1 is die linked to Year 130, it probably dates to the late 170s BC. It may also be significant that these three early issues are the only ones in the Apollo Smintheus series to share monograms with issues in the Athena Ilias

stylistic infelicity typical of late issues (e.g., Year 216); 4) While the left field monogram is plausible, the one in right field looks to be a misdrawn version of a monogram which appears on Lampsakene Lysimachi: Thompson 1968: 171, nos. 49–52.

48 Not in Bellinger: CNG 99 (13/5/2015), lot 194 (16.85 g).

49 Not in Bellinger: Künker 236 (7/10/2013), lot 80 = GM 207 (15/10/2012), lot 284 (16.91 g); BM 1998,1007.1 = Spink 128 (7/10/1998), lot 170 (15.64 g).

50 Not in Bellinger: Roma Numismatics 9 (3/22/2015), lot 269 = Lanz 158 (5/6/2014), lot 236 (16.98 g).

series. Earliest Issue 1, Year 130, and the example of Year 137 in Paris share a monogram (𐌆) which is almost identical to that on the *Metriketes* issue of the *Athena Ilias* series (𐌆). Likewise, the new Year 137 specimen has an almost identical monogram (𐌆) to the *Akkos* issue (𐌆) which followed *Metriketes*. In both cases, the only difference is that the hasta descending from right to left meets the crossbar at its middle rather than at its left hand end. Finally, it should be noted that whereas the five issues which follow *Akkos* only lightly modify its monogram, from Year 138 onwards the monograms on the *Apollo Smintheus* issues bear no relation to those on the *Athena Ilias* coinage.

Monograms on coins are notoriously difficult to interpret, but some progress can perhaps be made with this one. On the *Apollo Smintheus* coinage there are always two monograms down to Year 144. However, after the magistrate's name first appears written in full in Year 148, there is only ever one monogram, implying that the second monogram was previously referring to this magistrate. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that in the issues we currently know of prior to Year 148 one of the monograms changes from year to year whereas the other can remain for longer periods. For example, later in the series the 𐌆 monogram lasts from Year 183 to Year 236 (= 118–65 BC) and so cannot represent a single living individual.⁵¹ It also seems likely that the monogram which does not refer to the magistrate on the *Apollo Smintheus* coinage served the same function as the lone monogram on the *Athena Ilias* coinage. First, the *Athena Ilias* monogram cannot be concealing the magistrate's name because this is spelled out in exergue from the very beginning of the series. Second, of the two monograms on the early issues of *Apollo Smintheus*, the *Athena Ilias* coins share the monogram that lasts for several years at a time, not the annually changing one. Finally, the monogram on the *Athena Ilias* series lasts for extended periods (albeit often with minor variations over time).

Bellinger thought that these monograms recorded individuals who had given money towards the cost of minting the coins, a theory Louis Robert long ago cast doubt on.⁵² An alternative explanation would be that the monogram refers to the workshop which produced these coins.⁵³ The shared monograms would then reflect the fact that, when *Alexandreia Troas* decided to begin the *Apollo Smintheus* series, the city hired the same workshop the *koinon* used for the *Athena Ilias* coinage, perhaps in order to make sure that its coinage was of a similar artistic quality.⁵⁴ After about a decade (i.e., Earliest Issue 1–Year 137), the city decided to bring the work of die engraving in house. As a result, whereas the monogram

⁵¹ Bellinger 1961: 98; de Callatay 1997a: 155 n. 2.

⁵² Bellinger 1961: 30 n. 94 with L. Robert, *OMS* 6:125–35.

⁵³ As noted, the monograms can last beyond a single person's career, so they are less likely to refer to individual die engravers.

⁵⁴ For an experienced workshop cutting dies for other mints see Marinescu (1996: 334–372) on the 'Bosporus Workshop' of die engravers at Byzantion and Kalchedon which in the third and second centuries produced *Lysimachi* dies for mints throughout the region.

mostly stays the same for the five magistrates after Akkos in the Athena Ilias series, it completely changes for the Apollo Smintheus coinage. If correct, this has two implications for the Athena Ilias series. First, it would confirm the longstanding assumption that the Apollo Smintheus series imitated the Athena Ilias series and not vice versa. Second, if on this basis we date the end of Metriketes's magistracy to 165/4 and assume that the term of office was one year, then the remaining six magistrates without a monogram would date the beginning of the series to 171/0 at the earliest. However, as we shall see, the koinon's epigraphy strongly suggests that the magistrate named in exergue (the Ilian president of the board of *agonothetai*, as shall be argued in section 4.6 below) could serve for up to four years. As a result, the remaining six magistrates could suggest a date as early as 189/8.

4.4 A Gap in the Middle of the Series?

If we split the series into three roughly dateable periods—1) c. 185–c. 150 (beginning to Babylon hoard), 2) c. 150–c. 100 (Babylon hoard to Malko Tarnovo hoard), and 3) c. 100–c. 50 (Malko Tarnovo hoard to end)—and divide the length of each period by the number of magistrates attested for that period, we see that the average length of a magistracy for periods 1 and 3 is just above two years, whereas that for period 2 (the Apollodoros to Hermokreon sequence described in section 4.2 above) is about five years.⁵⁵ There are two possible explanations for this discrepancy: either there was a gap in production in the second half of the second century or the magistrates for period 2 are underrepresented in our sample. Bellinger preferred the first explanation, arguing on stylistic grounds that there was a break in production 119–95. While the specific argument he made can now be disproved (it involves assigning the die linked magistrates Melanippides and Diopeithes son of Zenis to two different periods), a gap at this point nevertheless remains a possibility.⁵⁶

However, it is worth noting that Bellinger likewise posited a break in the Apollo Smintheus series 135–118 which new examples from 128 and 127 have now shown to be illusory.⁵⁷ As will be argued in section 5.4, the Apollo Smintheus coinage is by far the best comparandum for the Athena Ilias coinage, and so this new evidence suggesting unbroken production of the series is a strong argument in favor of the Athena Ilias series likewise having been produced continually. Moreover, it is well known that hoards containing civic tetradrachms primarily appear in the mid-second century in relation to the Seleukid dynastic wars and in the first half of the first century in relation to the Mithradatic Wars, a pattern

55 1) c. 185–c. 150 (35 years/16 magistrates = 2.2 years per magistrate); 2) c. 150–c. 100 (50/9 = 5.5), 3) c. 100–c. 50 (50/22 = 2.3).

56 Bellinger 1961: 30, 32–33.

57 Bellinger 1961: 98, most recently followed by Thonemann (2015: 180). Year 173 = 128 BC: see n. 48. Year 174 (Anaxikrates) = 127 BC: Roma Numismatics 9 (22/3/2015), lot 270 (16.89 g).

we see in the Athena Ilios coins from Hoards 1–6 (dating to c. 160–143) and 7–8 (dating to c. 90–c. 55/40) respectively. We would therefore expect period 2 (the second half of the second century) to be quite poorly represented by comparison with periods 1 and 3. In addition, as I will argue in section 4.6, the die study of the series suggests that we do not yet have a representative sample of the series: we should therefore be looking to identify areas of potential ‘growth’ in the series, and this is the most obvious one.

While the existence of a gap in production in the second half of the second century cannot be ruled out, this argument from silence should not be viewed as the safer hypothesis. Comparison with the Apollo Smintheus coinage shows that continual production is perfectly possible and also illustrates the evidence problem: the two examples disproving Bellinger’s argument only appeared in 2015 and can only be used to disprove his argument because they bear era dates which the Athena Ilios coins lack. Likewise, if we viewed the Athena Ilios series in isolation we might imagine that six magistrates sharing a single obverse die (O₂) must indicate the compactness of production. Yet the die study I have prepared of the Apollo Smintheus series attests an obverse die lasting from Year 138 to Year 153 (and perhaps as late as Year 165) = 163–c. 148/136. Were it not for the era dates of these coins we would not have imagined that these obverse dies lasted so long, yet this is the situation we find ourselves in with the Athena Ilios series. In sum, underrepresentation at this point in the series is to be expected given the nature of the hoard evidence, and the die study of the Athena Ilios series provides grounds for believing that new examples will in time appear to fill this gap.

4.5 The End of the Series

The koinon continued to exist as a multi-state confederation well into the first century AD,⁵⁸ and it was only in the second or early third century AD that the Panathenaia of Athena Ilios came to be organized by Ilios alone.⁵⁹ However, long before this the number of Greek mints producing autonomous silver coinage dropped precipitously in the middle decades of the first century BC, and by the

⁵⁸ Ilios honours Licinnius Proclus Themison as τὸν φιλι[όπατ]ριν καὶ προστάτην καὶ κόσμον τοῦ συνεδρί[ου] τῶν ἐννέα δήμων καὶ εὐεργέτην τοῦ δήμου (*I. Ilios* 107.4–8, first century AD). Since the synedrion was the executive body of the koinon, the nine demoi will be the member states, and the demos of which he is a benefactor will be Ilios itself. Also relevant is *I. Pergé* 272.16–17 (first century AD?) in which L. Robert, *OMS* 2: 1096 restored [Παναθηναία ἐ]ν Εἰλίῳ π[αίδας].

⁵⁹ *I. Alex. Troas* 50 (post-AD 212) honors an Ilian athlete who competed at the νέα Παναθηναία and *I. Alex. Troas* 51 is a fragment of a similar text. Frisch (followed by Riel) wrongly attributed these texts to Alexandria Troas when in fact they belong to Ilios: J. and L. Robert, *BE* (1974): no. 458, (1976): no. 567. An unpublished text found in the recent excavations of Ilios (by the gift shop when I saw it in July 2013) helps confirm the attribution of all three texts to Ilios and will be published by Reyhan Körpe.

reign of Augustus only a handful continued to do so.⁶⁰ In the Troad, the silver tetradrachms issued by Abydos and Tenedos ended in c. 70 and the Apollo Smintheus coinage in 65. Bellinger had assumed that the Athena Ilios series ended in 85, but it has been persuasively argued that the Demetrios (2) on an issue of drachms is in fact the Demetrios son of Hippodamas who is the Ilian *agonothetes* in *I. Ilios* 10 (77 BC; for the argument in detail see section 4.6).⁶¹ In addition, an example of Hegesidemos (2) son of Diophanes has now appeared in a hoard dated to c. 55–40 (Hoard 8). The coin in the hoard has a monogram (Ϟ) which is different from the other example of the issue (Ϟ), but is the same as that on the issues of Demetrios (2) and Philokles and Philon, whose obverse types are also stylistically similar.⁶² This brings the series down to the late 70s/early 60s and supports Robert's identification of Hegesidemos (2) as the Ilian *epistates* mentioned in *I. Ilios* 59 (c. 70–50) and the father of Diophanes and Hipparchos, sons of Hegesidemos, listed as debtors in *I. Ilios* 65 (c. 30–20), with Hipparchos appearing again as an Ilian *synedros* of the koinon who honors Augustus with a statue in *I. Ilios* 81 (c. 25).⁶³ After this, the series continues under nine more magistrates. Among these are Agathes son of Menophilos, who is praised in an honorific decree of the koinon (*I. Ilios* 12, mid-first century) for his service as *agonothetes* and *agoranomos*,⁶⁴ and Euthydikos, who is probably the father of the Melanippides son of Euthydikos who hosted Augustus in Ilios, set up a statue to him in 12 BC (*I. Ilios* 83), and became high priest of the Imperial cult and a Roman citizen (*I. Ilios* 85, 85a).⁶⁵ The issues of Agathes son of Menophilos and of Euthydikos share a monogram, and if, as I have supposed on the basis of these prosopographical arguments, they come last in the series, then they may date to the 50s. As with the beginning of the series, the unknown variable is the length of time these magistrates were in office.

⁶⁰ Kinns 1987: 111–113; Thonemann 2015: 177–182.

⁶¹ Knoepfler 2010: 58. Bellinger (1961: 39–40) instead thought this was an Augustan issue ("19 B.C.–A.D. 14"), presumably influenced by the bronzes of Ilios with Obv. Bare head of Augustus I., Rev. Head of Athena in crested helmet I., ΙΛΙ (I.), ΔΗΜΗΤ (below) which are a similar weight and size (*RPC I* 2309).

⁶² See already Kinns (1987: 111 n. 52) making some of these points.

⁶³ Robert 1966: 68–70. Contrast Bellinger 1961: 25–27 (mid-second century); Guépin 1969: 211 (same, *contra* Robert); Knoepfler 2010: 59 n. 121 (c. 120–100, thinks style rules out post-Mithridatic period).

⁶⁴ L. Robert, *OMS* 2: 1027; Robert 1966: 73–75; Knoepfler 2010: 59. Possible descendants include Menophilos son of Menophilos, *panegyrikos agoranomos* of the koinon (*I. Ilios* 4, first century AD) and L. Stlaccius Menophilos (*I. Ilios* 181, first/second century AD). However, the name is extremely common (at Ilios: *LGPN VA*, s.v. Μηνόφιλος nos. 341–351, s.v. Μηνόφιλα no. 19).

⁶⁵ Robert 1966: 75–78; Robert 1967: 123–124.

4.6 Dating the Magistrates

Denis Knoepfler has recently argued that there is the possibility of being able to precisely date this series on the basis of the magistrates named in exergue on the reverse. This suggestion combines two earlier insights: Louis Robert's identification of this magistrate as the Ilian president of the board of *agonothetai* and John Ma's suggestion that the Panathenaia was a penteteric festival.⁶⁶ Knoepfler has argued that the *agonothetai* were in office for the whole penteteric cycle and therefore that each magistrate's name should represent a four-year period in the chronology of the series. If correct, this would suggest that we could precisely date every magistrate once a relative chronology of the series was established and a chronological fixed point within the series identified. Knoepfler's assumption is that the series ran from the Peace of Apameia in 188 to the Battle of Actium in 31 and therefore covered a period of about 39 penteteric cycles. Given that his catalogue (based on Bellinger) contained 34 magistrates, his assumption was that we were relatively close to having the full series.⁶⁷

However, it is now clear that this argument must be either abandoned or significantly modified. At least 47 magistrates are now attested which, at four years per magistrate, would equate to a 188-year period. If we follow Knoepfler's assumption that the series began in 188, then this would lead to the unlikely conclusion that the koinon was still producing autonomous silver coinage by the middle of Augustus's reign. Conversely, if we adopt his end date of 31, then we would have to imagine that the koinon began minting an autonomous spread-flan coinage in 219 almost four decades before this innovation appeared anywhere else in the Greek world. Moreover, these already problematic chronological arrangements do not account for the fact that hoard finds and obverse die links mean that in practice there is even less flexibility than this. For example, the first quarter of the series from Hegesidemos (1) down to Apollodoros in the Babylon hoard (c. 155–150) includes 17 magistrates who, if they had all served for four years, would have begun the series in c. 223–218.

Knoepfler assumed that the body of evidence collected by Bellinger was fairly representative.⁶⁸ However, it can be shown that even after more than doubling the number of specimens known from the series there are still quite a few more examples to come. Table 2 below shows the progress in our knowledge of this series by comparing the die study which could have been done with the coins available to Regling and Bellinger with my own die study. When the ratio between the number of specimens (n) and the number of obverse dies observed (d) is above 3 it becomes possible to estimate the original number of obverse dies (D) with

⁶⁶ Robert 1966: 58–59, 67–94, with the objections of Guépin (1969: 208–209) answered by Le Rider (1973: 77–79); Ma 2007: 55.

⁶⁷ Knoepfler 2010: 50.

⁶⁸ Knoepfler 2010: 50.

some confidence using the calculations of Carter and Esty.⁶⁹ Since the number of drachms currently falls well below this threshold ($n = 7$, $d = 6$, $n/d = 1.16$) and only one didrachm is so far known, I have not likewise applied these calculations to these other denominations. Finally, I give $n = 101$ rather than $n = 103$ since I have been unable to check the obverse dies of two tetradrachms.

Table 2. Progress in knowledge of the Athena Ilias series.

	<i>n</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>n/d</i>	singletons	<i>D</i> (Carter) ⁷⁰	<i>D</i> (Esty) ⁷¹
Regling	41	18	2.27	12	26.5 ±3.42	32.0 ±12.53
Bellinger	51	22	2.31	12	32.0 ±3.63	38.6 ±13.34
Ellis-Evans	101	35	2.89	20	45.3 ±3.05	53.6 ±10.97

The first thing to note is that in all three data sets the obverse die (O29) shared by the issues of Metronax son of Hippodamas, Sostratos, Hermippos son of Menophanes, Theokydes, and Menephron son of Menephron is substantially overrepresented (12/41 for Regling, 14/51 for Bellinger, 19/101 for Ellis-Evans). This artificially inflates the n/d figure, giving the impression that we know the series better than we really do. Table 3 excludes the examples of this die to see how well we know the series when this outlier is set aside.

Table 3. Progress in knowledge of the Athena Ilias series (excluding O29).

	<i>n</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>n/d</i>	singletons	<i>D</i> (Carter)	<i>D</i> (Esty)
Regling	29	17	1.71	12	32.1 ±6.51	41.1 ±25.68
Bellinger	37	21	1.76	12	38.4 ±6.60	48.6 ±25.86
Ellis-Evans	82	34	2.41	20	48.4 ±4.15	58.1 ±15.26

This much greater degree of uncertainty is what we should expect given that more than half of the obverse dies are known from only one example (“singletons”). It is therefore a certainty that new examples of the series will continue to appear. Some of these new specimens will be further examples of dies already known to us, some will be new dies of already attested magistrates, and a small number will be new magistrates. In sum, Knoepfler’s argument that each magistrate should represent a four-year period is only likely to become less tenable as new evidence appears.

In a recent article, Johannes Nollé has likewise noted that too many magistrates exist for Knoepfler’s argument to work.⁷² However, he has concluded from this that, since the numismatic evidence appears to contradict the epigraphic arguments of

69 For discussion of these two methodologies and the advantages of Esty’s see de Callatay 2006: 28–39.

70 Carter 1983.

71 Esty 2011.

72 Nollé 2014: 301 n. 75, citing the 40 magistrates listed in Leschhorn (2002–2009: 2, 1015) which, unfortunately, contains a number of significant errors.

Knoepfler, they must also invalidate the epigraphic arguments of Robert on which Knoepfler's arguments are built. As a result, he not only argues that Knoepfler is wrong to conclude that the magistrates named in exergue on the coins were in office for a full penteteric cycle, but more fundamentally that the coins were not even minted by the koinon of Athena Ilias but rather by the city of Ilion.⁷³ This sweeping rejection of the carefully constructed epigraphic arguments of Robert and Knoepfler is somewhat rash. While the numismatic evidence now shows that Knoepfler's argument about the dating of the magistrates cannot be completely right, it does not necessarily follow that it is completely wrong.

If we reexamine the epigraphic evidence, we see that the fundamentals of the case built by Robert and Knoepfler are strong. Robert originally argued that the koinon was the minting authority for these coins because they were minted in the name of Athena Ilias (Ἀθηνᾶς Ἰλιάδος) and lacked a city ethnic. By contrast, the bronze and silver coinage of Ilion always bore the ethnic Ἰλι(έων) and the coins minted at Alexandria Troas in the name of Apollo Smintheus and at Parion in the name of Apollo Aktaios bore the ethnics Ἀλεξανδρέων and Παριανῶν respectively.⁷⁴ Nollé objects to Robert's argument on several grounds. First, he emphasizes that the word κοινόν is never used on the Athena Ilias coinage.⁷⁵ However, this is an unreasonable expectation since no koinon calls itself a koinon on its coinage before the Imperial period. More substantively, he notes that Robert used the example of Athena Ilias to formulate the maxim that coinages in the name of a god which lack a city ethnic were produced by religious koina. This led to the conclusion that the Athena Nikephoros and Artemis Pergaia coinages were not minted by Pergamon and Perge respectively, but rather by religious koina similar to the koinon of Athena Ilias.⁷⁶ As Nollé notes, there is no epigraphic evidence for the existence of these confederations, only numismatic arguments which in recent years have been overturned.⁷⁷ In both cases, therefore, it seems that a city rather than a koinon produced these coinages, and therefore that while Robert's maxim may hold true for the Troad, it does not elsewhere. However, Nollé takes

⁷³ Nollé 2014: 300–301 (esp. n. 75) and 310.

⁷⁴ Robert 1966: 36–46.

⁷⁵ Nollé 2014: 300.

⁷⁶ Robert 1966: 45–46.

⁷⁷ Nollé 2014: 291–295, 299–308. Athena Nikephoros: The monograms on the reverse of the bronzes have been interpreted as referring to the cities which contributed to the koinon and participated in the festival: von Fritze 1910: 28–30, 32; Robert 1966: 46; Le Rider 1973: 77; Psoma 2007: 240; Psoma 2008: 234. However, Marcellesi (2012: 125–127) identifies a number of problems with this argument and more plausibly explains these coins as quasi-royal issues. Artemis Pergaia: Seyrig (1963: 38–51) argued that the dates on the Alexanders issued by Perge, Aspendos, Phaselis, and Sillyon referred to a common era of Pamphylia, which Robert (1966: 46) (followed by Psoma 2007: 240; Psoma 2008: 235) took as evidence for the existence of a koinon perhaps centred on Artemis Pergaia. See, however, Meadows (2009) for evidence that all these cities (as well as Magydos and Termessos) used their own individual eras.

his critique one step further and argues that since the Athena Nikephoros and Artemis Pergaia coinages were minted by cities but lack an ethnic, then the Athena Ilias coinage must likewise have been minted by a city.⁷⁸

This does not follow. As Nollé acknowledges, unlike with Athena Nikephoros and Artemis Pergaia, abundant epigraphic evidence attests a religious koinon of Athena Ilias. The idea that the koinon could have minted its own coinage is therefore an *a priori* possibility in a way that it is not for these two cults whose putative koina are otherwise unattested. Moreover, what Nollé's discussion of the Athena Nikephoros and Artemis Pergaia coinage surely illustrates is not that we need a different hard and fast rule for interpreting these coin legends, but rather that we should not be reducing the interpretation of coins to an analysis of their legends. Discussions of coinages in the name of a god often begin by repeating Robert's mantra that coinages with an ethnic need to be kept quite separate from those without an ethnic.⁷⁹ But what are the numismatic arguments for that being so? As we have seen, as a rule of thumb it does not necessarily help us with identifying the minting authority—it works for Athena Ilias, but not for Athena Nikephoros and Artemis Pergaia. More importantly, it is not self-evident that (for example) the coinage of Alexandria Troas in the name of Apollo Smintheus *was not* minted for reasons to do with the running of the Smintheia simply because it *was* minted by the city that controlled that sanctuary rather than by a religious koinon of cities administering that sanctuary (see further section 5.4). To answer questions of this sort, we need to look to the numismatic evidence: Was the series minted continually or in fits and starts? What do the number of obverse dies tell us about the volume of production? What do the metal, weight standard, and denomination tell us about the transactions these coins were intended to facilitate?

Insofar as we can draw legitimate inferences about a coinage from its choice of legend, the comparanda should be local. In the case of the Athena Ilias coinage, this means not Pergamon or Perge but rather the Apollo Smintheus and Apollo Aktaios coinages of Alexandria Troas and Parion respectively. Both cities were members of the koinon and the style of these coinages clearly emulates that of the Athena Ilias coinage. The fact that both cities include their ethnics suggests that this was the norm in the Troad. As such, the onus is on those who want to attribute the Athena Ilias coinage to Ilion to explain why Ilion placed its ethnic on all its other coinage but not on this series. A better explanation is that, in a regional context where a confederation of cities was minting coins in the name of a god *without* an ethnic, Alexandria Troas and Parion felt obliged to include their ethnic on their similar looking coinages in a way which (for example) Pergamon and Perge, in their very different regional contexts, did not. Furthermore, in light of what we know about the general character of the koinon, the decision not to place an ethnic on the coinage makes good sense. The member states were represented

⁷⁸ Nollé 2014: 300–301.

⁷⁹ E.g., Le Rider 1973: 75–77, Gauthier 2011: 178–183; Psoma 2007: 240; Psoma 2008: 228.

in its two key bodies (the *synedrion* and the board of *agonothetai*) by equal rather than proportional representation. It would therefore have run counter to the spirit in which the koinon's institutions had been designed to place one city's ethnic (i.e., Ilios's) on the coinage. In addition, there is the basic but important point that the wealth being used to mint the coinage belonged not to the city of Ilios, but rather to all the cities of the koinon which collectively managed the confederation and its funds on an equitable basis. Apart from anything else, it would therefore have simply been inaccurate to put any one city's ethnic on the coinage. In sum, while the particular arguments Robert used to identify the minting authority as the koinon of Athena Ilios are open to question, the conclusion itself is not in doubt.

The clearest indication that the name of the magistrate in exergue on the coins is, as Robert argued, that of the Ilios *agonothetes* is provided by the decree concerning the reorganization of the koinon's finances from 77 (*I. Ilios* 10). While two other inscriptions give us a full list of *agonothetai*,⁸⁰ we cannot use them to compare the names they mention with the names on the coins because they date to the third century when the coinage had not yet begun.⁸¹ After its dating formula, *I. Ilios* 10 lists the individuals from each of the seven member states then belonging to the koinon who met with L. Julius Caesar to come to an agreement about how to cut the festival's costs (lines 6–13):

ἐξ Ἰλίου μὲν Δημήτριος Ἴπποδάμαντος,
 Θεοκύδης Ἑρμίου,
 Ποσειδώνιος Ἀπελλεῖους, ἐγ Δαρδάνου δὲ Δίφιλος Ἀριζήλου,
 Ἀπολλοφάνης Διφίλου,
 8 Ἡρακλείδης Ἡρώδου· ἐξ Σκήψεως δὲ Κλέανδρος Πυθοδώρου, Κόνων
 Βακχίου·
 ἐξ Ἄσσου δὲ Ἀνόδικος Ἀριστολόχου νεώτερος, Λάδικος Ἀνοδίκου,
 Βόμβος Λυσι-
 θέμιδος· ἐξ Ἀλεξανδρείας δὲ Φιλίτας Σίμωνος, Ζωΐλος Λεοντίσκου,
 Καλλισ[θέ]-
 νης Κλεόμιδος· ἐξ Ἀβύδου δὲ Ἀπολλωνικέτης Ἀναξαγόρου, Θέσπις
 Λαερτ[ι]-
 12 ἄδου, Ἐκαταῖος Καλλιππίδου· ἐγ Λαμφάκου δὲ Πυθογένης Φιλίσκου,
 Κλεότ[ι]-
 μος Ἀρχεδήμου.

While the official roles of these individuals are not explicitly stated, they can be easily inferred. Five of the cities have three representatives, while two (Skepsis and Lampsakos) only have two. The first of the three individuals from Ilios is also the

⁸⁰ *I. Ilios* 5.1–6, *SEG* LIII 1373.1–4.

⁸¹ Knoepfler 2010: 53–54.

Ilian *agonothetes* named in the dating formula, Demetrios son of Hippodamas.⁸² We know that the koinon had a board of five *agonothetai*,⁸³ that each city provided two *synedroi*,⁸⁴ and that later in the decree it speaks of the *agonothetai* and *synedroi* on this occasion taking decisions jointly.⁸⁵ It is therefore clear that in the five cases where a city has three representatives, one is their *agonothetes*. Furthermore, we can infer from the case of Ilios that the *agonothetes* is the first individual named. Of the five individuals named first in these three-person delegations, only the name Demetrios also appears on the Athena Ilios coinage: once on an issue of tetradrachms and once on an issue of drachms. As discussed earlier, there are numismatic arguments independent of the epigraphy which indicate that the magistrates responsible for these two issues are two different people: the tetradrachms of Demetrios (1) date soon after c. 150, whereas the drachms of Demetrios (2) date to the 70s. It is therefore fairly certain that the Demetrios (2) on the drachms is in fact the Demetrios son of Hippodamas in *I. Ilios* 10. This should not surprise us. Documents of the koinon are dated by naming the board of *agonothetai* in office beginning with the Ilian *agonothetes*, and it was sufficient to name the Ilian *agonothetes* alone.⁸⁶ Moreover, the president of the board of *agonothetai* was also an appropriate person to name on the coins, first, because it was the *agonothetai* who were responsible for contracting out all work for the koinon and thus who would have been responsible for having the coins minted and, second, because it was the *agonothetai* who would have been spending these coins on behalf of the koinon.⁸⁷ This, of course, does not make the *agonothetai* “mint magistrates”—they very obviously did a great deal more than just mint coins—but I think it does explain why the koinon would have found it appropriate to name the president of the board of *agonothetai* on the coins, thus vindicating Robert’s arguments for the identification of this individual.

Finally, the case for the Panathenaia of Athena Ilios being a penteteric festival and for the board of *agonothetai* (and therefore the Ilian *agonothetes* on the coins) serving for a full term is also strong. Inscriptions from all periods of the koinon’s history attest to the existence of a Great and a Little Panathenaia.⁸⁸ The four-year length of this cycle is indicated by the honorific decree for Agathes son of Menophilos, which describes him as ἀγωνοθετήσαντα τῆς κοινῆς τῶν πόλεων

82 *I. Ilios* 10.2: ἐπὶ ἀγωνοθετῶν τῶν περὶ Δημήτριον Ἴπποδάμαντος Ἰλιάα.

83 *I. Ilios* 5.1–6, *SEG* LIII 1373.1–4.

84 *I. Ilios* 2.53–9, 64–66.

85 *I. Ilios* 10.28–29, 32–36, 41.

86 Named first: *I. Ilios* 5.1–2, 7.1–2, 10.6–7; *SEG* LIII 1373.1–2. Named alone: *I. Ilios* 3.8–10, 10.2–3.

87 Contracting out work: *I. Ilios* 1.41–6, 52–3, 2.40–2, 5.27–31; *SEG* LIII 1373.39–44.

88 *I. Ilios* 2.5–6, 45–46, 50–51 (last third of the third century); *SEG* LIII 1373.5–6, 11–12 (last third of the third century), *I. Ilios* 3.7–8 (third century; μεγάλα or μικρά are the likely restorations), *I. Ilios* 5.8 (third century), *I. Ilios* 12.12–13 (first century), *I. Ilios* 9.1–2 (first century; μεγάλων or μικρῶν Παναθηναίων is the likely restoration), *I. Ilios* 10.31–32 (77 BC).

πανηγύρεως ἐπὶ ἔτη τρία εὐσεβῶς καὶ φιλοδόξως καὶ ἀγορανομήσαντα ὑπὸ τὰ μεγάλα [Πα]ναθήνια φιλοδόξως καὶ μεγαλομερῶς (“having acted as *agonothetes* of the common panegyris of the cities for three years in a pious and glory-loving manner and having served as *agoranomos* during the Great Panathenaia in a glory-loving and munificent manner”).⁸⁹ As Lefèvre and Pillot have recently pointed out, it is not clear whether he held these offices cumulatively (*agonothetes* for four years and *also agoranomos* in the fourth year) or consecutively (*agonothetes* for three years and *then agoranomos* in the fourth year).⁹⁰ In either case, the conclusion is the same: the Panathenaia of Athena Ilias ran on a four-year cycle and was therefore a penteteric festival, just like its Athenian model.⁹¹ Bellinger thought that Agathes was unusual in serving for more than one year.⁹² However, the evidence for a Great and a Little Panathenaia (and, by implication, for the existence of a penteteric cycle) comes from all periods of the koinon’s history, and in fact the *gymnasiarchoi* are explicitly said to have served τὰ τε μικρὰ καὶ τὰ μεγάλα Παναθήνια (“at both the Little and Great Panathenaia”) in inscriptions from the late third century.⁹³ There is therefore no reason to think that the length of Agathes’s term of office was exceptional.

The epigraphic arguments for concluding that the coinage was minted by the koinon of Athena Ilias and not Ilion, that the magistrate named in the exergue was the Ilian president of the board of *agonothetai*, and that the festival was organized on a penteteric basis are therefore all strong. The two debatable assumptions which Knoepfler makes are instead, first, that the Ilian *agonothetes* always remained in office for the full four years of the penteteric cycle and, second, that the coins were only issued in the year of the Great Panathenaia. My reasons for thinking that coins were also issued in the other years of the penteteric cycle will be set out in the next section. Regarding the first assumption, however, it should be noted that if, for whatever reason, the Ilian *agonothetes* did not complete the full four years of his term of office, then a new president of the board of *agonothetai* would need to have taken up his duties. We would surely expect coins minted under this new *agonothetes* to bear his name rather than his predecessor’s, thus creating a situation in which more magistrates would be attested on the coins than the number of penteteric cycles.

We can imagine this coming about in one of three main ways. First, the *agonothetes* could have become ill or died in office: it would be extremely surprising if this did not happen on at least a few occasions in almost a century and a half of minting. Second, the *agonothetes* could have been ejected from office

⁸⁹ *I. Ilion* 12.9–13 (first century BC). For bibliography on the identification of this Agathes son of Menophilos with the magistrate on the coins see n. 64.

⁹⁰ Lefèvre and Pillot 2015: 22.

⁹¹ Knoepfler 2010: 59 with n. 120.

⁹² Bellinger 1961: 36.

⁹³ *I. Ilion* 2.5–6, 45–46, 50–51; *SEG* LIII 1373.5–6, 11–12.

for corruption. The *agonothetai* were handling considerable sums of money, and so the temptation to use their office to enrich themselves through graft would have been considerable. While, as is so often the case, corruption is not directly attested by the surviving inscriptions, it would strain credulity to infer from this silence that it never happened. Certainly, we know that the *agonothetai* were expected to keep careful accounts, and there are indications that, as we would expect, their conduct in office was subject to oversight by the *synedrion*.⁹⁴ We could therefore imagine, for example, an annual *euthyna* following the year's festival which would provide an opportunity for allegations of corruption to be levelled and thus for *agonothetai*, if found guilty, to be removed from office.⁹⁵ Finally, Lefèvre and Pillot's suggestion that Agathes could have held the offices of *agonothetes* and *agoranomos* consecutively rather than cumulatively opens up the possibility of *agonothetai* choosing to move sideways into roles such as *agoranomos* or *gymnasiarchos*. The advantage of doing so would have been that these magistracies offered opportunities for making benefactions and thus for receiving honors which, by contrast, were unavailable to *agonothetai*. Perhaps, as in the case of Agathes, this was particularly common in the year of the Great Panathenaia when the opportunities for displaying one's liberality and the rewards for doing so were correspondingly greater.

In conclusion, while we have good reason to think that the Ilian *agonothetes* named in exergue could in theory serve for up to four years, it is clear from the number of magistrates attested that many must have served for less than this. We would therefore need an extremely fine-grained knowledge of the koinon's history to be able to date the magistrates on the coins precisely, and this is unlikely to be forthcoming. Currently, we have no inscriptions of the koinon from the second century and only a handful from the first half of the first century, of which just the honorific decree for Agathes sheds any light on the problem, and then only in passing. While we therefore cannot hope to date the magistrates on the coins precisely, we can say that each magistrate could represent a period of up to four years and that they were minting coins throughout the penteteric cycle, not just in the year of the Great Panathenaia. On current evidence, however, it would seem that, *on average*, an Ilian *agonothetes* was only in office for about two years.⁹⁶ If more magistrates belonging to the already well-represented beginning (c. 185–c. 150) and end (c. 100–c. 50) of the series appear or if strong arguments are put forward for pushing the start of the series down to the late 170s and bringing the end up into the 60s, then this average will drop to a point where we will have to reassess the validity of the arguments put forward in this section. Alternatively, if new magistrates instead primarily appear in the underrepresented middle of the series (c. 150–c. 100) then this will bring the average length of office for magistrates

⁹⁴ Lefèvre and Pillot 2015: 16–17, 21–2.

⁹⁵ For such procedures in the Hellenistic period see in general Fröhlich (2004).

⁹⁶ See n. 55.

in this period into line with the rest of the series and provide independent support for the epigraphic arguments discussed here.

5. THE PURPOSE OF THE COINAGE

5.1 Panegyris Coinages

Bellinger thought that the individuals named on the coins were wealthy benefactors who, out of a sense of civic pride and a desire to advertise their liberality and patriotism, donated the money to produce these handsome coins.⁹⁷ Robert put paid to this by demonstrating that these individuals were in fact magistrates whose reason for appearing on the coinage had to do with their portfolio of responsibilities within the koinon's institutions rather than euergetism.⁹⁸ More recently, Selene Psoma has interpreted the Athena Ilias series as an example of what she terms a "panegyris coinage." She compares it to other bronze and silver coinages in the name of a god whose use, she argues, was imposed on all transactions at the festival market in order to turn a profit for the sanctaury through money-changing charges.⁹⁹

There are a number of problems with this interpretation of the coinage's purpose. First, if its purpose were to take a cut of as great a proportion as possible of the economic activity at the festival market, the best way to do this would have been to provide a variety of large and small denomination coins in both silver and bronze so that the coinage could be used in transactions of all sizes. Instead, there is no bronze coinage and the silver coins are only minted as tetradrachms until 77, and thereafter on occasion as drachms and didrachms, but always in place of tetradrachms rather than as part of the same issue. This suggests that these smaller denominations were not an attempt to expand the range of denominations (see further section 5.5). Second, perhaps anticipating this criticism, Psoma suggested that the coins were only meant to be used in large transactions.¹⁰⁰ However, it is not clear what the definition of a large transaction would be, nor how the *agoranomoi* would effectively police this even if an arbitrary figure were fixed upon. In any case, even large transactions require denominations below a tetradrachm, as indeed we see in the financial inscriptions of the koinon. In addition, given what a large role the *agoranomoi* would play in such an arrangement, it is a little surprising that it

97 Bellinger 1958: 15–24; Bellinger 1961: 26–27.

98 Robert 1966: 58–59, 67–93; cf. L. Robert, *OMS* 6: 125–135.

99 Psoma 2007 and 2008. Endorsed by Thonemann (2011: 118) but now rejected in 2015: 82–84.

100 Psoma 2007: 243: "The coinage issued in the name and types of the god in whose honour the fairs were organized by the corresponding association of cities was the only legal currency (*dokimon nomisma*) for large payments during this event, and all large-scale transactions had to be made with that currency." This caveat about the size of the transaction does not feature in Psoma 2008, in which case the fact of only silver tetradrachms being minted becomes even more problematic for her argument.

is instead the *agonothetai* who get named on the coinage. Finally, if the idea were to create a mini-closed currency system for the duration of the festival, it would make more sense to use an underweight and overvalued coinage (as the Ptolemies, Attalids, and Byzantines did) which would lose its value outside the context of the festival.¹⁰¹ Instead, the koinon minted a full weight Attic coinage which, unlike other large denomination silver coinages of the late Hellenistic period, maintained its weight rather well right down to the mid-first century and would therefore have been acceptable in international commerce (see section 3).

Nollé has recently attempted to deconstruct the notion of panegyris coinages in general, and it is in this context that he formulates a new interpretation of the purpose of the Athena Ilias coinage in order to establish that it is not, as Psoma supposes, an example of a panegyris coinage at all.¹⁰² He argues that Ilion was attempting to provide coinage for the whole Troad and therefore imagines that the city was exercising its financial hegemony over the Troad via this coinage.¹⁰³ Since we now have a die study of the series, we can test the validity of this argument by using quantitative methods to estimate the coinage's original size.

5.2 The Size of the Coinage

Nollé argues that the Athena Ilias coinage was a large series which served the needs of the Troad as a whole, but does not provide any quantitative data to back up this assertion. Rather, he comes to this conclusion on analogy with his interpretation of the Artemis Pergaia coinage which he likewise interprets as a large coinage serving the needs not just of the sanctuary, but also of Perge and of Pamphylia in general.¹⁰⁴ However, the quantitative arguments he makes in support of this claim are somewhat puzzling. As proof of its size, he cites the 44 (actually 42) obverse and 268 reverse dies of the silver coinage and 470 obverse and 1,675 reverse dies of the bronze coinage.¹⁰⁵ In order to compare like with like, I shall only discuss the silver coinage, since there is no bronze coinage in the name of Athena Ilias and Ilion's bronze coinage (which, on Nollé's view, would have been produced by the same minting authority as the Athena Ilias coinage) has not received a die study.

101 Thonemann 2015: 83–84.

102 Psoma 2007: 240–241; Psoma 2008: 235–236; Nollé 2014.

103 Nollé 2014: 301 n. 75: “Feststeht aber meines Erachtens auch bei diesen Prägungen die Dominanz von Ilion, auf dessen Territorium das Heiligtum der prägenden Göttin lag. Eine Situation ähnlich der in Perge scheint mir gut möglich zu sein; dass die Städte der Kultgemeinschaft sich für ihre Geldwirtschaft der Prägungen des Heiligtums bedienen, ist wahrscheinlich”; 310: “In seltenen Fällen scheinen Heiligtümer die alleinigen oder zumindest wichtigsten Träger der städtischen Geldwirtschaft gewesen zu sein, wie etwa das Athenaheiligtum von Ilion oder das Artemision von Perge. Charakteristisch dafür sind mengenmäßig ins Gewicht fallende Emissionen von Wertgeld (insbesondere Tetradrachmen und Drachmen) über längere Zeiträume.”

104 Nollé 2014: 291–295.

105 Nollé 2014: 292, drawing on the die study of Colin 1996.

Because reverse dies wear out more quickly than obverse dies their usefulness for quantification is limited and so we can set them aside for the moment.¹⁰⁶ In order to reach this figure of 42 AR obverse dies Nollé adds together the tetradrachms, drachms, and hemidrachms from two separate series dated 260–230 and c. 48/7–c. 39/8.¹⁰⁷ There are several problems here. First, the number of obverse dies is only impressive relative to the period of time over which they were used (42 dies in a year is impressive; 42 dies in a century is not) and we need to establish whether the sample of obverse dies we have is representative (i.e., $n/d = >3$) before we can draw any further conclusions. The number of obverse dies is therefore a figure which has to be contextualized before it can become meaningful. More fundamentally, though, it makes no sense to add together different denominations in this way. If the aim is to calculate the number of obverse dies as a proxy for production and by extension the amount of silver being minted and therefore spent, then a tetradrachm die obviously cannot be given the same weighting as a drachm die or a hemidrachm die given that it is four and eight times larger than these respectively.

Table 4 therefore breaks these 42 dies down into their respective denominations and series. In the right-hand column I have converted the number of dies attested in each case into drachm die equivalents to make the figures comparable to one another (i.e., a tetradrachm = 4 drachm dies, so 7 tetradrachm dies = 28 drachm die equivalents) and then divided these figures by the length of time each series was minted to arrive at a rate of annual production. For comparison, I have also included the posthumous Alexanders struck at Perge which were minted following the first Artemis Pergaia series.¹⁰⁸

Table 4. A comparison of the annual production in drachm die equivalents of the Artemis Pergaia and Perge Alexanders coinages.¹⁰⁹

Series 1 = 260–230 Series 2 = 48/7–39/8	<i>n</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>n/d</i>	Drachm Die Equivalents	Annual Production
Tetradrachm (Series 1)	42	7	6.00	28	1.07
Tetradrachm (Series 2)	41	20	2.05	80	8.89
Drachm (Series 1)	14	3	4.66	3	0.10
Drachm (Series 2)	8	4	2.00	4	0.44
Hemidrachm (Series 1)	17	6	2.83	3	0.10
Hemidrachm (Series 2)	10	2	5.00	1	0.11
Alexanders (223/2–191/0)	361	73	4.94	292	9.13

¹⁰⁶ For the uses which can be made of them see de Callatay 2006: 131–143.

¹⁰⁷ For this downdating to c. 48/7–c. 39/8 from Colin's dates of c. 170–c. 100 see Meadows 2014.

¹⁰⁸ For dating and interpretation of the Perge Alexanders (a coinage probably minted from royal rather than civic funds) see Meadows 2009.

¹⁰⁹ Sources: Colin 1996.

The figures for Series 1 certainly do not justify Nollé's claims about the size and importance of the Artemis Pergaia coinage. Moreover, the downdating of Series 2 to the 40s BC and Meadows's argument that it is an imitative series produced on a weight standard compatible with the Roman *denarius* in the context of Antony's campaigns all suggest that this is a series which has very little to do with the civic finances of Perge and therefore needs to be excluded from consideration.¹¹⁰ However, what the Series 2 Artemis Pergaia coinage along with the posthumous Alexanders do demonstrate is what genuinely sizeable coinages look like by comparison with the very low volume of production we see in the Series 1 Artemis Pergaia coinage. Table 5 places the Series 1 Artemis Pergaia tetradrachms, the Perge Alexanders, and the Athena Ilias and Apollo Smintheus tetradrachms in the broader context of several wreathed tetradrachm coinages for which we have die studies and a representative sample of the series. Since only tetradrachms are represented in this table, annual production represents tetradrachm dies per year rather than drachm die equivalents.

Table 5. A comparison of the annual production of i) the Series 1 Artemis Pergaia and Perge Alexander tetradrachms, ii) the Athena Ilias and Apollo Smintheus tetradrachms, iii) wreathed tetradrachm series with $n/d = >3$.¹¹¹

Mint	<i>n</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>n/d</i>	Dates	Annual Production
Apollo Smintheus	62	18	3.44	175–65	0.16
Artemis Pergaia (Series 1)	42	7	6.00	260–230	0.23
Athena Ilias	101	35	2.89	180–50	0.27
Tenedos	86	21	4.10	100–70	0.70
Abydos	126	35	3.60	100–70	1.16
Lebedos	53	8	6.63	140–135?	1.60
Smyrna (Tyche/ΣΜΥΡΝΑΙΩΝ)	71	13	5.46	150–143	1.85
Aigai	36	4	9.00	151–143	2.00
Perge Alexanders	361	73	4.94	221–189	2.28
Magnesia	242	36	6.72	150–140	3.60
Herakleia	117	25	4.68	140–135?	5.00
Myrina	415	97	4.28	160–143	5.70
Kyme	537	79	6.80	155–143	6.58

¹¹⁰ See Meadows (2014) and his forthcoming paper on the penetration of the *denarius* and *quinarius* standards into Asia Minor in the first century BC which he was kind enough to share with me in an early draft.

¹¹¹ Sources: Apollo Smintheus = Ellis-Evans work in progress; Perge = Colin (1996); Tenedos = de Callataÿ (1998); Abydos = de Callataÿ (1996); other wreathed tetradrachm series = de Callataÿ (2013) 233, Table 6.10.

The rates of production for the Athena Ilias, Apollo Smintheus, and Series 1 Artemis Pergaia coinages are very substantially below that of all the other mints. Even if we use Esty's estimated original number of dies for Athena Ilias (53.6), which is higher than Carter's estimate (45.3), and we then contract the time period to the most conservative estimate possible (175–65), we end up with a figure of 0.49 for annual production which is still well below even Tenedos at 0.70. Finally, it is worth noting that one of the assumptions made by both Carter and Esty is that mints were using dies until they broke. However, the Athena Ilias series has a ratio of obverse to reverse dies of 1:2 which is very low (compare e.g., Artemis Pergaia's tetradrachms at 1:6) which suggests that the Athena Ilias mint frequently discarded obverse dies before they were used up. The already low production figures suggested by Carter and Esty's estimates are therefore, if anything, slightly optimistic.¹¹² While, as established earlier, our knowledge of the Athena Ilias series is certain to grow, there is no realistic possibility that it will grow by the orders of magnitude necessary to put it on a par with any of the other mints in Table 5. The mints producing the Athena Ilias, Apollo Smintheus, and Series 1 Artemis Pergaia coinages therefore appear to have been minting only to meet their own rather modest needs, not those of other cities throughout their region as Nollé supposes.

5.3 Festival Coins and Festival Expenditure

Another possible explanation of the coinage's purpose is that the coins were minted to meet the organization's expenditure, in this case the cost to the koinon of running the festival.¹¹³ Many of these costs are detailed in the epigraphic evidence, while others can be inferred from what we know about the running of festivals more generally. Occasional expenses included things such as the construction of new buildings and diplomatic activity (e.g., Malousios paying for a new theatre and for embassies to be dispatched to Antigonos Monophthalmos).¹¹⁴ Regular expenses partly consisted of costs incurred by the *synedrion* (e.g., publishing decrees, making proclamations, conferring crowns, setting up bronze statues, and attending meetings of the *synedrion*), but mostly came from running the festival itself.¹¹⁵ We are well informed about the nature of these expenses by *I. Ilion* 10 (the decree from 77 discussed in section 4.6), since the inscription's second half lists some of the expenses incurred at the Great and Little Panathenaia and how they will be decreased in order to alleviate the financial pressure on the koinon. These included the procession, sacrifice, victim for sacrifice, provision of oil, and musical, athletic, and horse-racing competitions.¹¹⁶ Further expenses are mentioned in passing elsewhere in the inscriptions, for example the erection

¹¹² I am grateful to Ute Wartenberg for drawing my attention to this point.

¹¹³ On state expenditure and coins see Howgego 1990 and 1995: 33–38.

¹¹⁴ Lefèvre and Pillot 2015: 6–7 and *I. Ilion* 1.

¹¹⁵ Lefèvre and Pillot 2015: 7–8.

¹¹⁶ *I. Ilion* 10.21–31.

of temporary structures during the festival or the extras for which benefactors provided the funds, for example the doctor paid for by a Parian *agoranomos* or the beast fight put on at the expense of Agathes son of Menophilos.¹¹⁷ In addition to all this, Thonemann notes that our evidence for Hellenistic festivals in general shows that hiring theatrical troupes and star athletes to perform at one's festival could be extremely expensive, and so the coins may in part have gone towards their fees and the prize money for which they competed.¹¹⁸ The anonymous athlete whose string of victories at international competitions—including one at the Panathenaia at Ilion—were celebrated at Perge in the first century AD may have been just such an individual.¹¹⁹

The inscriptions make clear that the magistrates responsible for making all these payments were the *agonothetai*. It is therefore entirely appropriate that the president of the board of *agonothetai* should be named on the coins: this was the individual who would ultimately be held accountable for the use of these funds. Presumably, a basic budget existed of the regular expenses always incurred in putting on the festival to which the occasional expenses were added as necessary—we get a sense of what this might have looked like from the savings listed in *I. Ilion* 10. Based on this, the *synedrion* released the relevant funds to the *agonothetai* (the procedure which we see them follow with, for example, Malousios's donation), who then had part or all of this sum minted as high value silver tetradrachms in order to have cash on hand with which to make external payments. The choice to mint only high value coinage is consistent with the fact that many of these expenses will have been large lump-sum payments for which silver tetradrachms were the most convenient method of payment. The *agonothetai* therefore did not bother to mint a wide variety of lower value denominations which would be suited to market exchange because this was never the intended purpose of the coinage (the drachms and didrachm which appear to be an exception to this will be discussed in section 5.5). This explanation has the advantage of accounting for both the salient characteristics of the coinage (i.e., continual production, low die count, the coinage keeping its weight, the choice of a high value denomination) and what we know from the coins and the inscriptions about the procedures and institutions of the koinon.

5.4 The Coinage of Athena Ilias and Regional Dynamics

While this economic explanation of the purpose of the coinage accounts for the physical characteristics of the coins (i.e., size, weight, metal), it cannot be the whole story since it does not also account for the choice to mint a coinage with civic types. The running of all festivals required cash to make payments, but only a small number of festivals are associated with coinages minted specially for that

¹¹⁷ *I. Ilion* 1.4–5 (temporary structures), 3.16–18 (doctor), 12.14–18 (beast fights).

¹¹⁸ Thonemann (2015) 84.

¹¹⁹ See n. 58.

purpose. In the case of the koinon of Athena Ilias, the need for coins in which to make payments was just as great before the Athena Ilias coinage was introduced in the late 180s/early 170s, and it will have continued to be important after the coinage ended in the mid-first century.¹²⁰ Presumably, in the third century the koinon made use of the Attic-weight royal and posthumous coinages which possessed the same key characteristics as the Athena Ilias coinage of being high value and internationally acceptable. Indeed, in third century inscriptions the *agonothetai* use Ἀλεξανδρέαι δραχμαί as their unit of account.¹²¹ As Peter Thonemann has recently emphasized, the koinon was therefore *choosing* to make its payments in its own coinage, which suggests that the koinon was just as concerned with the visual impression these coins would make as with their ability to fulfil their economic function.¹²²

As has long been recognized, the Athena Ilias coinage is typical of a much broader transformation in Greek coinage which took place in the middle decades of the second century and can be seen at more than 40 mints in and around the Aegean basin.¹²³ In terms of types, the obverses are elaborate, often virtuoso portraits of deities, while the reverses feature full-figure depictions of local gods. The reverse figure is framed either with legends or, as in the case of the “stephanephoric” coinages, with wreaths, and the iconography and legends make prominent reference to distinctively local traditions about the deities depicted. In terms of physical characteristics, the coins are typically minted on broad, thin flans and use the Attic weight standard. In addition to the artistic accomplishment of the dies, care for the aesthetic appearance of the coins can also be detected in the rarity of worn dies (suggesting they were being discarded well before reaching this point, something which a low ratio of obverse to reverse dies also points to) and, it has been argued, from the practice of hammering the edges of the flan.¹²⁴ These coins were therefore not just a means of making payments, they were also status symbols which advertised the distinctive civic identity and local traditions of the minting authority.

However, alongside these striking similarities, there are also significant differences, in particular in terms of the overall size of the coinages, the tempo at which they were minted, and the longevity of the series. At one end of the spectrum we have very small issues known from only a handful of specimens: for example, the Athena Nikephoros tetradrachms of Pergamon are only known from

¹²⁰ For discussion of the epigraphic evidence attesting continuity in how the koinon was run from the third–first century see section 4.6.

¹²¹ *I. Iliou* 5 (passim), 6.1, 18.6.

¹²² Thonemann 2015: 84.

¹²³ For recent overviews see Matthaei 2013; Thonemann 2015: 56–64; Meadows (forthcoming).

¹²⁴ Thonemann 2015: 59 (rarity of worn dies); Mørkholm 1991: 12 (development of broad flans); de Callatay 2006: 148–152 (hammering edges).

three specimens preserving two obverse dies.¹²⁵ At the other end of the spectrum, we have extremely large issues which were intensively minted over a period of just a few years: for example, the stephanephoric tetradrachms of Kyme are known from 537 specimens, preserving 79 dies, all of which were minted 155–143.¹²⁶ The Athena Ilias and Apollo Smintheus coinages are therefore of particular interest since they do not fit either model: they were minted continually, over a long period of time, and at a low volume of production. Moreover, as I have argued above, the Athena Ilias series probably began in the late 180s/early 170s and the Apollo Smintheus series in the mid-170s. This makes these two coinages the earliest examples of this new style of autonomous spread-flan coinage, placing them almost a decade earlier than the adopters of the 160s (mostly from mainland Greece and from Thrace, the Propontis, and the Black Sea), and two decades earlier than the stephanephoric coinages of Aiolis, Ionia, and Karia to the south.

It would seem, therefore, that, at some point in the late 180s/early 170s, the member states of the koinon took a collective decision to start making their payments with a coinage which would celebrate Athena Ilias and raise the international profile of the Panathenaia. Reminting the perfectly acceptable coinage already in the koinon's treasury as an artistically beautiful and carefully produced spread-flan series will have incurred extra expense for the koinon. This decision therefore indicates that this coinage was not just a means of payment, but also a status symbol. The Apollo Smintheus coinage which Alexandria Troas began to produce soon afterwards has a strikingly similar numismatic profile: in addition to the visual similarities, it was continually minted from the mid-170s–65, production remained at a low volume throughout, the denominations were limited to high value tetradrachms until late in the series, and great care was taken for the appearance of the coins (e.g. hammered flan edges, a low obverse to reverse die ratio of 1:2.5). I would therefore suggest that Alexandria Troas may have been using the Apollo Smintheus coinage to cover expenditure on the Smintheia, and was therefore producing a coinage which was not just a means of making payments, but also a mark of prestige for the festival which, particularly within the Troad, sent the message that the Smintheia was on a par with the Panathenaia of Athena Ilias. Alain Bresson has recently argued that Hamaxitos, in whose territory the sanctuary of Apollo Smintheus stood, was only synoikized into Alexandria Troas following the Peace of Apameia.¹²⁷ Soon after this, Alexandria began to publish its public decrees in the sanctuary, and in the mid-second century a grand new temple was built there.¹²⁸ The Apollo Smintheus coinage may therefore belong

125 Le Rider 1973; Mørkholm 1984: 187–192; Le Rider 1989: 175–176; Marcellesi 2012: 125–127; Meadows 2013: 175.

126 Oakley 1982; de Callatay 1997b: 198–199; Meadows and Houghton 2010: 180–181.

127 Bresson 2007: esp. 154–155.

128 Public decrees published in the Smintheion: *I. Alex. Troas* 4 (early second century) and 5 (c. 165). Temple: Özgünel 2003.

to this broader context of Alexandria laying claim to the sanctuary and vigorously promoting its festival.¹²⁹

5.5 The Coinage of Athena Ilias and the Finances of the Koinon

A further implication of arguing that the Athena Ilias coins were being minted to cover expenditure for the festival is that it should therefore be possible to use the coins as a proxy for the health of the koinon's finances. The assumption here is that during periods of prosperity the koinon will have had more money to spend on the festival and therefore more funds will have been released to the *agonothetai*. Consequently, there will have been more silver to mint and so they will have gone through a larger number of obverse dies. To an extent, the first two-thirds of the series conform to this picture, much as we would expect given the general prosperity of the cities of western Asia Minor in the second century. However, since the only way to track increased expenditure in this way is through the number of obverse dies used and we still lack a truly representative sample of the series (i.e., ideally an n/d of >5), it would be rash to speculate further on this. By contrast, periods of financial difficulty for the koinon should be somewhat easier to identify because this should manifest itself not just in obverse dies lasting longer or remaining in use long after they should have been retired, but also in the minting of smaller denominations to reflect the smaller volumes of silver being minted. This is precisely what we see happening in the last third of the series which dates to the first half of the first century. We know both from the parallel and dated Apollo Smintheus series and from the koinon decree of 77 (*I. Ilios* 10) that it was in precisely this period that the koinon's cities experienced severe financial hardship and that this resulted in decreased expenditure on the festival.

One of the more important pieces of evidence for a slowdown in the koinon's minting activity has instead been misinterpreted as evidence for a spike in minting. With sixteen specimens, the issue of Menephron son of Menephron is by some margin the best attested in the series.¹³⁰ Twelve of these 16 coins have as their control mark a Pegasus facing left and drinking water, a symbol which has naturally been connected to Mithradates VI and the events of 88–85. As Bellinger puts it: "The size of [Menephron's] output shows a substantial effort to convince the Pontic king that Ilios would be of service to him ... These are the sinews of war produced in quantity for a crisis."¹³¹ Even when the connection with Mithradates

129 In light of this argument, Parion's Apollo Aktaios (Group 1: mid-160s; Group 2: 140s/130s?) and Lampsakos's Priapos tetradrachms (last third of the second century) may need to be reinterpreted as short-lived attempts by other members of the koinon to emulate the Athena Ilias and Apollo Smintheus coinages. I will present my die studies of these two short series and my arguments for dating them as I do here in the near future.

130 Others: Agathes son of Menophilos, Metriketes (6); Apemantos, Metrodoros, Zoilos (5); Akkos, Soterides (4).

131 Bellinger 1961: 34. Accepted by (e.g.) Healy (1962: 218) and Kinns (1987: 110).

is doubted, it is still assumed that this is an unusually large issue and that it must therefore be linked to an episode of increased expenditure.¹³²

However, it seems to have been misunderstood that it is not the number of specimens but rather the number of obverse dies which indicates the original size of a coinage.¹³³ The issue of Menephron son of Menephron is represented by only two obverse dies, putting it on a level with Metrodoros, Dionysodoros, and Euboulides and below Akkos, Apollodoros, and Melanippides (on three) and Apemantos (on four). Moreover, Menephron son of Menephron is represented by two to three times as many coins as these other issues, so whereas new obverse dies might well turn up for these and other magistrates, that is much less likely to be the case for Menephron son of Menephron. What is more, the obverse die used for 15 of the 16 Menephron son of Menephron coins is shared with four of the previous magistrates. Worsening die faults allow us to show both that the die was being used well beyond its natural life and that Menephron son of Menephron was the last to use it and did not immediately retire it (he went through three more reverse dies first).¹³⁴

In sum, the inference to draw from this magistrate's issue is not that coin production was speeding up in this period, but rather that it was slowing down. Given that a single reverse die is substantially overrepresented (12 of the 16 coins), that 12 of the coins either certainly or very probably have pre-1900 provenances, and that four have pre-1800 (in one case pre-1750) provenances, it seems likely that a significant number of these Menephron son of Menephron coins came from an early unrecorded hoard find which has led to Menephron son of Menephron being substantially overrepresented within the series.¹³⁵ While the most straightforward explanation of the Pegasus control mark remains that it was a reference to Mithradates, it should perhaps be interpreted simply as a show of support for the Pontic king, since the coins themselves certainly do not support the hypothesis that the issue of Menephron son of Menephron was an especially large issue minted to meet military expenditure. In support of this distinction we

132 E.g., Knoepfler 2010: 56-57.

133 Already observed in this case by de Callataÿ 1997a: 291, esp. n. 79.

134 Bellinger (1961: 33-34) also lists a further reverse die, T 97. On this basis, Knoepfler (2010: 56-57) has argued that Menephron son of Menephron was unusual in issuing tetradrachms not just in the year of the Great Panaethnaia, but also in the three years of the Little Panathenaia. However, of the two coins Bellinger lists, the one at Winterthur does not exist, while "Mionnet II, p. 658, No. 189" is in fact an example of Bellinger's T 96 in Paris (BNF Fonds Général 689).

135 For a comparable argument (proposed with all due caution) regarding the wreathed tetradrachms of Tenedos see de Callataÿ 1998: 109-110, and for an example of such a hoard Seyrig 1973: 49-56 (*IGCH* 1544, Latakia, Syria, 1759). It is perhaps suggestive that the catalogue entry for the Menephron son of Menephron specimen in the Earl of Pembroke's collection (acquired in the first half of the eighteenth century) remarks: "Since the discovery of hoards, which furnished specimens to the principal cabinets of Europe, above a century ago, these coins are scarcely ever seen" (S. Leigh Sotheby [31/7/1848], p. 191).

can compare the appearance of this same control mark on an issue of “New Style” Athenian tetradrachms from 97/6. One of the magistrates, Aristion, was later a partisan of Mithradates at Athens and led the doomed resistance to Sulla in 87/6, so the political interpretation of the control mark seems secure. However, the issue is dated almost a decade before the Mithradatic Wars and so obviously cannot be linked to Mithradates’s military expenditure.¹³⁶

One magistrate later we get the first issue of drachms instead of tetradrachms. As I argued in section 4.6, the Demetrios named on this issue is the Demetrios son of Hippodamas mentioned in the koinon decree of 77 in which the cities refer to αἱ τῶν πόλεων θλίψεις (“the afflictions of the cities”) which have forced them to severely reduce expenditure on the festival.¹³⁷ It has sometimes been argued that the issues of drachms should be grouped together in a period of poverty for the koinon, and Knoepfler has suggested the immediate aftermath of the Mithradatic Wars specifically, which would thus indicate the destitution of the cities in the decade or so after 85 before they began to recover.¹³⁸ However, as I argued in sections 4.2 and 4.5, criteria such as shared monograms and prosopography instead suggest a more complex picture in which, from one magistrate to the next, the koinon went back and forth between tetradrachms, drachms, and, on one occasion, didrachms. We see something similar in the contemporary Apollo Smintheus issues: a didrachm appears in 101 and drachms in 80, 78, and 73.¹³⁹ Another phenomenon worth noting in the Apollo Smintheus coinage is the introduction of the practice, first attested in 93, of coins being issued by two different magistrates in a single year. Given how frequently this is attested after 93 (it occurs again in 92, 85, 80, 79, 78, 71, 68, and 65), this would appear to have been a reform of the magistracy which may reflect the financial pressures of the time.

While the Mithradatic Wars and their aftermath undoubtedly brought enormous hardship on the cities of the koinon, it is worth noting that in the dated Apollo Smintheus coins there are signs of trouble even before 88, for example the didrachm of 101 and the reform of the magistracy in c. 93 in which the job is shared between two men. In the Athena Ilias series, it is just about possible to fit the five magistrates sharing a single obverse die (culminating in Menephron son of Menephron) and Demophon son of Dionys[?] between the beginning of the Mithradatic Wars in 88 and Demetrios son of Hippodamas in 77 and therefore attribute these first signs of financial distress to fallout from the Mithradatic Wars alone. However, it is equally possible, especially in light of the evidence of the Apollo Smintheus series, that these issues stretch back before 88 and well into the 90s, therefore pointing to underlying financial problems in the cities which predate the catastrophes of the 80s.

¹³⁶ Thonemann 2015: 167–168.

¹³⁷ *I. Ilios* 10.14–15.

¹³⁸ Bellinger 1961: 27; Knoepfler 2010: 58.

¹³⁹ Didrachm: CNG EA 235 (23/6/2010), lot 161 (Archagoras; 27 mm, 12h, 6.98 g). Drachms: Bellinger A 160 (80 BC), A 163 (78 BC), A 164 (73 BC).

6. CONCLUSIONS

In discussing the coinage of the koinon of Athena Ilios I have argued for the following four claims: 1) the coinage was minted continually from the late 180s/early 170s down to the 60s/50s (sections 4.1–5); 2) the magistrate named on the reverse is the Ilian president of the board of *agonothetai* who could in theory be in office for an entire penteteric cycle of up to four years, but who on average was in office for closer to two years (section 4.6); 3) the coins were minted for the double purpose of covering festival expenditure, which accounts for their physical characteristics, and as a status symbol, which explains their aesthetic characteristics (sections 5.1–4); 4) the variations in output we see in issues dating to the first half of the first century independently attest the financial difficulties which we already knew about from *I. Ilios* 10 that the member cities were experiencing following the Mithradatic Wars, but also point to the existence of problems even before 88–85 (section 5.5).

As the die study has made clear by revealing an *n/d* which barely reaches 3 even with the help of an overrepresented obverse die, the large number of obverse dies only attested by a single example, and the underrepresentation of the series in the second half of the second century, we should expect new examples of this series to continue to appear. As they do, the four main claims I have argued for will become testable hypotheses and may need to be revisited. However, if for the moment we accept these conclusions, then perhaps the most striking finding to emerge from this study is the longevity of the series, matched only by the Apollo Smintheus series of Alexandria Troas, and its resilience in the face of the Mithradatic Wars, severe economic pressures on the region's cities, and, in particular, the sack of Ilios at the hands of Fimbria in 85.¹⁴⁰ This resilience should certainly be attributed in part to the member states' enthusiasm for the Panathenaia festival, evidenced by their desire in 77 to organize it "just as it had also been in the past" (καθότι καὶ πρότερον) even at a time of financial crisis.¹⁴¹ Equally important, however, was the effectiveness of the koinon's communally-run institutions which helped share the burden of running this major festival in a way which seemed equitable to the member states and was therefore politically sustainable.

¹⁴⁰ Liv. *Per.* 83; Julius Obsequens, *Liber de prodigiis* 56b (epitome of Livy's lost *De prodigiis*); Strabo 13.1.27; App. *Mithr.* 53; Dio 30–35.104.7. For evidence of the Ilians clearing out the treasures of Temple A in the West Sanctuary in advance of Fimbria's sack see Rose 1994: 76–80 and 1997: 92.

¹⁴¹ καθότι καὶ πρότερον: *I. Ilios* 10.22, 37, 39.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to Andrew Meadows, Ute Wartenberg, Peter Thonemann, Simon Glenn, and Ben Raynor for their help with this paper. Late in the publication process François de Callataÿ alerted me to a number of new references and suggested several counterarguments to the reconstruction proposed here which helpfully prompted me to tighten up the argument in a number of places.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arslan, M. and C. Lightfoot. 1999. *Greek coin hoards in Turkey: The Antalya Archaeological Museum and the C. S. Okray Collection with additional material from the Burdur, Fethiye and Sinop Museums*. Ankara.
- Bellinger, A. R. 1958. "The first civic tetradrachms of Ilium." *ANSMN* 8: 11–24.
- . 1961. *Troy: The Coins*. Princeton.
- Boehringer, C. 1972. *Zur Chronologie mittelhellenistischer Münzserien, 220–160 v. Chr.* Berlin.
- . 1975. "Hellenistischer Münzschatz aus Trapezunt 1970." *SNR* 54: 37–64.
- Bresson, A. 2007. "Hamaxitos en Troade." In *Espaces et pouvoirs dans l'Antiquité de l'Anatolie à la Gaule. Hommages à Bernard Rémy*, edited by J. Dalaison, pp. 139–158. Grenoble.
- Brückner, A. 1902. "Geschichte von Troja und Ilion." In *Troja und Ilion: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen in den vorhistorischen und historischen Schichten von Ilion, 1870–1894*, edited by W. Dörpfeld, vol. 2, 549–600. Athens.
- Callataÿ, F. de. 1997a. *L'Histoire des guerres mithridatiques vue par les monnaies*. Louvain.
- . 1997b. *Recueil quantitatif des émissions monétaires hellénistiques*. Wetteren.
- . 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.
- . 2006. *Quantifications et numismatique antique: choix d'articles (1984–2004)*. Wetteren.
- . 2013. "The coinages of the Attalids and their neighbours: a quantified overview." In *Attalid Asia Minor: Money, international relations, and the state*, edited by in P. Thonemann, pp. 207–244. Oxford.
- Carter, G. F. 1983. "A simplified method for calculating the original number of dies from die link statistics." *ANSMN* 28: 195–206.
- Colin, H. J. 1996. *Die Münzen von Perge in Pamphylien aus hellenistischer Zeit*. Cologne.
- 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. Bari.

- Fröhlich, P. 2004. *Les cités grecques et le contrôle des magistrats (IVe–Ier siècle avant J.-C.)*. Geneva.
- Gauthier, P. 2011. *Études d'histoire et d'institutions grecques: choix décrits*. Geneva.
- Gerasimov, T. 1979. "Trésors monétaires trouvés en Bulgaire au cours de 1968, 1969 et 1970." *Bulletin de l'Institut archéologique bulgare* 35: 134–141.
- Guépin, J. P. 1969. "De novis libris iudicia [Robert (1966)]." *Mnemosyne* 22: 207–212.
- Healy, J. F. 1962. "Troy: The Coins by Alfred Bellinger." *Gnomon* 34.2: 218–219.
- Howgego, C. J. 1990. "Why did ancient states strike coins?" *NC* 150: 1–25.
- . 1995. *Ancient history from coins*. London.
- Imhoof-Blumer, F. 1913. "Antike griechische Münzen." *SNR* 19: 5–134.
- Kienast, D. 1959–1960. "Buchbesprechungen [Bellinger (1958)]." *JNG* 10: 239–240.
- Kinns, P. 1987. "Asia Minor." In *The coinage of the Roman world in the Late Republic*, edited by A. M. Burnett and M. H. Crawford, pp. 105–119. Oxford.
- . 1999. "The Attic weight drachms of Ephesus: a preliminary study in the light of recent hoards." *NC* 159: 47–97.
- Knoepfler, D. 2010. "Les agonothètes de la Confédération d'Athéna Ilias: une interprétation nouvelle des données épigraphiques et ses conséquences pour la chronologie des émissions monétaires du Koinon." *Studi Ellenistici* 24: 33–62.
- Kraft, K. 1962. "Buchbesprechungen [Bellinger (1961)]." *JNG* 12: 239–240.
- Lacroix, L. 1949. *Les reproductions de statues sur les monnaies grecques: la statuaire archaïque et classique*. Liège.
- Le Rider, G. 1973. "Un tétradrachme d'Athéna Niképhoros." *RN*⁶ 15: 66–79.
- . 1989. "La politique monétaire du royaume de Pergame après 188." *Journal des savants*: 163–189.
- Lefèvre, F. and Pillot, W. 2015. "La confederation d'Athéna Ilias: administration et pratiques financières." *REG* 128.1: 1–27.
- Leschhorn, W. 2002–2009. *Lexikon der Aufschriften auf griechischen Münzen*. 22 vols. Vienna.
- Lorber, C. C. 2010. "Commerce ('Demetrius I' Hoard), 2003 (CH 10.301)." In *Coin Hoards X: Greek Hoards*, edited by in O. Hoover, A. R. Meadows, and U. Wartenberg, pp. 153–172. New York.
- Ma, J. 2007. "Dating the new decree of the Confederation of Athena Ilias." *EA* 40: 55–57.
- Marcellesi, M.-C. 2012. *Pergame: de la fin du Ve au début du Ier siècle avant J.-C.: pratiques monétaires et histoire*. *Studi Ellenistici* 26. Pisa.
- Marinescu, C. A. 1996. *Making and spending money along the Bosphorus: The Lysimachi coinages minted by Byzantium and Calchedon and their socio-cultural context*. PhD diss. Columbia University, New York.
- Matthaei, A. 2013. *Münzbild und Polisbild: Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung kleinasiatischer Poleis im Hellenismus*. Munich.

- Mattingly, H. B. 1993. "The Ma'aret En-Nu'man Hoard, 1980." In *Essays in Honour of Robert Carson and Kenneth Jenkins*, edited by M. Price, A. Burnett, and R. Bland, pp. 69–86. London.
- Meadows, A. R. 2009. "The eras of Pamphylia and the Seleucid invasions of Asia Minor." *AJN* 21: 51–88.
- . 2013. "The closed currency system of the Attalid kingdom." In *Attalid Asia Minor: Money, international relations, and the state*, edited by P. Thone-mann, pp. 149–205. Oxford.
- . 2014. "Imitative coinage in first-century Pamphylia." In *Proceedings of the First International Congress of the Anatolian Monetary History and Numismatics*, edited by K. Dörtlük, pp. 409–422. Istanbul.
- . Forthcoming. "The Great Transformation. Civic coin design in the second century BC." In *TYPOI: Greek Coins and their Images*.
- Meadows, A. R. and A. Houghton. 2010. "The Gaziantep Hoard, 1994 (*CH* 9.537; 10.308)." In *Coin Hoards X: Greek Hoards*, edited by O. Hoover, A. R. Meadows, and U. Wartenberg, pp. 173–223. New York.
- Mørkholm, O. 1984. "Some Pergamene coins in Copenhagen." In *Festschrift für Leo Mildenberg: Numismatik, Kunstgeschichte, Archäologie*, edited by A. Houghton et al., pp. 181–192. Wetteren.
- . 1991. *Early Hellenistic coinage: From the accession of Alexander to the Peace of Apamea (336–188 BC)*. Cambridge.
- Nollé, J. 2014. "«Panegyris coinages»—eine moderne Geisterprägung." *Chiron* 44: 285–323.
- Oakley, J. H. 1982. "The autonomous wreathed tetradrachms of Kyme, Aeolis." *ANSMN* 27: 1–38.
- Özgünel, C. A. 2003. "Das Heiligtum des Apollon Smintheus und die Ilias." *Studia Troica* 13: 261–291.
- Paunov, E. I. 2013. "Georgi Dobrevo/2000 reconsidered: note on a first century BC coin hoard from Thrace." *Ancient West and East* 12: 281–294.
- Psoma, S. 2007. "Profitable networks: coinages, panegyris and Dionysiac artists." *Mediterranean Historical Review* 22.2: 237–255.
- . 2008. "Panegyris coinages." *AJN* 20: 227–55.
- Regling, K. 1928. "Hellenistischer Münzschatz aus Babylon." *ZfN* 38: 92–132.
- Robert, L. 1966. *Monnaies antiques en Troade*. Geneva.
- . 1967. *Monnaies grecques: types, légendes, magistrats monétaires et géographie*. Geneva.
- Rose, C. B. 1994. "The 1993 Post-Bronze Age Excavations at Troia." *Studia Troica* 4: 75–104.
- . 1997. "The 1996 Post-Bronze Age excavations at Troia." *Studia Troica* 7: 73–110.

- . 2014. *The Archaeology of Greek and Roman Troy*. Cambridge.
- Seyrig, H. 1963. “Monnaies hellénistiques. VIII: Pergé; IX: Aspendos; X: Sidé.” *RN*⁶ 5: 38–64.
- . 1973. *Trésors du Levant anciens et nouveaux*. Paris.
- Thompson, M. 1968. “The mints of Lysimachus.” In *Essays in Greek coinage presented to Stanley Robinson*, edited by C. M. Kraay and G. K. Jenkins, pp. 163–182. Oxford.
- Thonemann, P. 2011. *The Maeander Valley: A historical geography from antiquity to Byzantium*. Cambridge.
- . 2015. *The Hellenistic world: Using coins as sources*. Cambridge.
- Von Fritze, H. 1902. “Die Münzen von Ilion.” In *Troja und Ilion: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen in den vorhistorischen und historischen Schichten von Ilion, 1870–1894*, edited by W. Dörpfeld, vol. 2, 477–534. Athens.
- Wallrodt, S. J. 2002. “Ritual activity in late Classical Ilion: the evidence from a fourth century BC deposit of loomweights and spindlewhorls.” *Studia Troica* 12: 179–196.
- Yakunovich, M. 1909. *Neizdannye i redkie drevne-grecheskie monety* (St. Petersburg).

KEY TO PLATES

Athena Ilias (Koinon of Athena Ilias)

Plate 35

1. O1: Hegesidemos (1). GM 207 (15/10/2012), lot 289.
2. O2: Antiphanes (1). Ashmolean Museum of Art and Archaeology.
3. O2: Athenokles. Trustees of the British Museum.
4. O2: Iphiades. Universität Tübingen, ZNr. 16248. Photo: Thomas Zachmann.
5. O2: Thersandros. Adolph Hess 253 (8/3/1983), lot 224.
6. O2: Xanthippos. Bibliothèque nationale de France.

Plate 36

7. O2: Metriketes. Bibliothèque nationale de France.
8. O3: Metriketes. Gemini 11 (12/1/2014), lot 165.
9. O3: Akkos. GM 224 (13/10/2014), lot 229.
10. O4: Akkos. CNG 53 (15/3/2000), lot 434 (www.cngcoins.com).
11. O5: Akkos. H. A. Troxell, *The Norman Davis Collection* (New York 1969), no. 202.
12. O6: Metrodoros. NAC 54 (24/3/2010), lot 109.

Plate 37

13. O6: Eudemos. Lanz 158 (5/6/2014), lot 239.
14. O6: Phoinix. Künker 236 (7/10/2013), lot 81.
15. O7: Dionysodoros. Münzkabinett, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Photo by Reinhard Saczewski.

16. O8: Dionysodoros. Münzkabinett, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Photo by Reinhard Saczewski.
17. O8: Apemantos. A. R. Bellinger, *Troy: The Coins* (Princeton 1961), p. 24, T 43, Plate 2.
18. O9: Apemantos. Alpha Bank Numismatic Collection.

Plate 38

19. O10: Apemantos. UBS 55 (16/9/2002), lot 1731.
20. O11: Apemantos. MM Basel Liste 525 (Sep. 1989), lot 16.
21. O12: Antiphanes (2). Künker 262 (13/3/2015), lot 7168.
22. O12: Zoilos. CNG 91 (19/9/2012), lot 249 (www.cngcoins.com).
23. O13: Soterides. Trustees of the British Museum.
24. O14: Apollodoros. Private collection.

Plate 39

25. O15: Apollodoros. Münzkabinett, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Photo by Reinhard Saczewski.
26. O16: Apollodoros. Bank Leu 36 (7/5/1985), lot 148.
27. O17: Demetrios (1). CGB.fr 47 (19/3/2011), lot 103.
28. O18: Euboulides. American Numismatic Society.
29. O19: Euboulides. Triton 1 (2/12/1997), lot 523 (www.cngcoins.com).
30. O20: Lysikles. Bibliothèque nationale de France.

Plate 40

31. O20: Protokleides. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
32. O21: Dionysios. Bibliothèque nationale de France.
33. O22: Hermokreon. UBS 33 (20/9/1993), lot 284.
34. O23: Melantas. Trustees of the British Museum.
35. O24: Prytanis. Peus 332 (23/10/1991), lot 187.
36. O25: Menephron. Münzkabinett, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Photo by Reinhard Saczewski.

Plate 41

37. O25: Melanippides. Münzkabinett der Stadt Winterthur.
38. O26: Melanippides. Münzkabinett, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Photo by Reinhard Saczewski.
39. O27: Melanippides. Bibliothèque nationale de France.
40. O27: Diopethes son of Zenis. Münzkabinett, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Photo by Reinhard Saczewski.
41. O28: Kallisthenes. GM 97 (11/10/1999), lot 350.
42. O29: Metronax son of Hippodamas. CNG 97 (17/9/2014), lot 163 (www.cngcoins.com).

Plate 42

- 43. O29: Sostratos. Bibliothèque nationale de France.
- 44. O29: Hermippos son of Menophanes. *Hesperia Art Bulletin* 16 (June 1961), lot 35.
- 45. O29: Theokydes. American Numismatic Society.
- 46. O29, R60: Menophron son of Menophron. Bibliothèque nationale de France.
- 47. O29, R62: Menophron son of Menophron. Bibliothèque nationale de France.
- 48. O29, R63: Menophron son of Menophron. National Museum of Denmark. Photo by Helle Horsnæs.

Plate 43

- 49. O30: Demophon son of Dionys[?]. Münzkabinett, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Photo by Reinhard Saczewski.
- 50. oA: Demetrios (2). Münzkabinett, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Photo by Reinhard Saczewski.
- 51. O32: Philokles and Philon. American Numismatic Society.
- 52. O32: Hegesidemus (2) son of Diophanes. American Numismatic Society.
- 53. oB: Hippodamas. Münzkabinett, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. Photo by Reinhard Saczewski.
- 54. O33: Philodromos son of Tychandros. © Bibliothèque nationale de France.

Plate 44

- 55. O34: Mnaseas son of Demetrios. *Auctiones Basel* 6 (1/10/1976), lot 204.
- 56. oC: Hermias. A. R. Bellinger, *Troy: The Coins* (Princeton 1961), p. 26, T 57, Plate 4.
- 57. ooAA: Opsigonos. American Numismatic Society.
- 58. oD: Pylades. Bibliothèque nationale de France.
- 59. O35: Agathes son of Menophilos. Trustees of the British Museum.
- 60. oE: Euthydikos. Ashmolean Museum of Art and Archaeology.
- 61. Forgery. *MM Basel* 41 (18/6/1970), lot 159.

Apollo Smintheus (Alexandria Troas)**Plate 45**

- 62. O1: Earliest Issue 1. *MM DE* 40 (4/6/2014), lot 221.
- 63. O1: Year 130. *NAC* 29 (11/5/2005), lot 198.
- 64. O2: Year 137. Bibliothèque nationale de France.
- 65. O2: Year 137. *Lanz* 158 (5/6/2014), lot 235. 66. Forgery. *Elsen* 92 (9/6/2007), lot 125.
- 66. Forgery. *Elsen* 92 (9/6/2007), lot 125.