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The focus of this thesis is the nature of the interaction between the civic elites and the civic coinage for which they were responsible. The Roman Province of Asia provides the ideal context for the study of local elites and their coinage because of the prevalence and prominence of the names of individual local notables, henceforth known as eponyms, recorded in civic coin legends. By combining the study of the function of coin eponyms and the prosopographical analysis of individual eponyms in the epigraphic record, it is possible to identify and explain the profound changes that affected civic coin production in the first three centuries AD. Local elites perceived coinage not only in terms of a functional means of exchange, but as a medium for personal and civic display. In this way the local elites exploited coin iconography in ways that paralleled other media of monumental display. New coin legends were developed, which identified explicitly the dedicatory nature of the coinage and the iconographic repertoire of coin types was radically expanded to express the cultural agendas and priorities of the civic elites.

The first half of the thesis is devoted to the study of the relationship between office holding and coinage and the development of coin legend formulae during the first three centuries AD. The pattern and distribution of the various legend formulae is analysed in order to determine the extent of the eponym’s involvement in the production of coinage. In particular, this section intends to establish the extent to which coinage production was funded privately. The fourth chapter is arranged into a series of case studies discussing individual cases of personalized coin iconography. The final chapter of the thesis outlines how the civic elite’s conceptualization of coinage changed over the course of this period. It is argued that contact with the Roman monetary tradition affected civic elites’ attitude to coinage and that this manifested itself in the iconography and the fabric of the coins themselves.
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1. Introduction

This thesis is concerned with the relationship between coin ‘eponyms’ and the civic coinages that bore their names. In the context of this thesis the term ‘eponym’ will be defined as the individuals (excluding members of the imperial family) whose names were inscribed as part of the legend on the Roman provincial coinage of the imperial period. The term ‘provincial coinage’ refers to the local base metal coinage (and a few silver issues) produced by the cities of the Eastern portion of the Roman Empire during the course of the first three centuries AD. The same term is also applied to the coinages of client kingdoms and precious metal coinages produced for local circulation according to local denominational standards by the Roman provincial authorities, such as the Asian cistophoros.1 However, this thesis is only concerned with the civic and koina coinages produced in the name of the relevant cities for local circulation. In the republican and early imperial periods such local base metal coinages were also a feature of civic life in many cities of the western provinces, particularly those in Spain and North Africa, but by end of the reign of Tiberius this tradition had all but died out.2 In contrast the number of cities producing base metal coinages in the East continued to increase, before reaching a peak at the end of the second and beginning of the third centuries AD. Thereafter the number of cities producing coinage in these regions went into decline, but significant numbers of cities continued to strike coins until the latter part of the third century AD.3 It is possible to gain an understanding of the number of issuing authorities in this period from the statistics

---

1 Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), i, Heuchert (2005), 30.
compiled by the *RPC* project for the highly urbanized province of Asia. For the Julio-Claudians (44 BC- AD 69) the project recorded (including *koina*) 106 mints, for the Flavians (AD 69-98) the figure was 93, but for the Antonines (AD 138-192) this figure had increased to 146.4

The study of these coinages provides invaluable information for social and economic historians of the eastern Roman provinces. In an economic sense, these local coinages served as small change. Extant references to use of low denomination coinage in the ancient world are rare, but the surviving evidence indicates the crucial role played by such coinages in the type of small scale market exchange necessary for the functioning of urban life.5 This material is also of great interest to the social and cultural historian. The Graeco-Roman cities of the eastern Mediterranean are notable for their rich traditions of local mythology. These traditions were reflected in the elaborate images chosen to adorn their coinage. Civic coins of this period often displayed images depicting important civic deities, scenes of mythological importance, references to civic games and festivals.6 This material constitutes our most complete source for the study of the visual representation of civic ideology during the first three centuries AD. In many cases it is our only source of evidence for civic iconography. The epigraphic and archaeological material provides comparable detail concerning local historical and mythological traditions for only a very limited number of sites, such as Ephesos and Aphrodisias. It is the relationship between these civic images and the local elites that created them that forms the main concern of this thesis. In particular civic coinages will be approached as a product of a specific set of social priorities and values. It is hoped that by adopting this perspective the relationship

---

4 These figures are based on the tables compiled by Heuchert: Heuchert (2005), 32.
5 Howgego (1985), 83-84.
6 Heuchert (2005), 29-58.
between the civic elites and coinage will illuminate the role played by these elites in the formation of civic identity and culture.

Eponyms usually appear on coinage in the form of a single name recorded in the reverse legend. However, numerous cases of multiple eponyms are recorded. In the province of Asia the majority of these names refer to local officials or benefactors drawn from the elite strata of local civic society, although the practice of citing Roman administrative officials in this period is also attested in some cities. In the regions of Bithynia, Thrace and Moesia Inferior the citation of the Roman proconsul was a regular feature of the coinage and the practice is also attested on the civic and koinon coinages of Kappadokia and Galatia, but references to local benefactors and office holders were largely absent in these areas.

Traditionally, the secondary literature employed the term ‘mint magistrates’ to refer to local officials or office holders. This practice was not without some justification. The majority of such legends make specific reference to the civic office of the eponym, particularly from the mid first century AD. However, not all eponyms are explicitly recorded as holding particular magistracies and although it is not improbable that many of these individuals held some unspecified office, the evidence does not permit the formation of firm conclusions regarding their status. Moreover, in respect to the province of Asia the term ‘mint magistrate’ is potentially misleading, since it implies that there was only a single magistracy associated with the production of coinage. In fact the intermittent nature of coin production in this period and the large number of different magistracies cited on

---

7 This practice was relatively common during the late first century BC and early first century BC: for example RPC I 2475-77 (Smyrna).
8 The exception to this pattern is the city of Byzantion, which appears to have adorned its coinage with the names of local office holders: Schöner-Gess (1972), 17-19. The most comprehensive catalogue of the Roman officials cited on the provincial coinages of Asia Minor remains Stumpf (1991), 308-310.
Asian coinage, particularly in the first century AD, indicates that the relationship between eponyms and coin production was more flexible than the term ‘mint magistrate’ would allow. Moreover, the recent work of Peter Weiss has emphasised that the recording of individual names on coins, inscriptions and even weights and measures served an ‘eponymous’ function. Eponyms served as chorological indicators, but any office holder was potentially eponymous. The choice of eponym was related to the administrative relevance of the office holder or individual to the oversight of coinage.9

The function or significance of these eponyms varied according to the position or office of the relevant eponym, the legend formulae employed and the specific traditions of the issuing authority. The analysis of the development and the regional distributions of the various strategies of eponym-citation across time will form the focus of the third chapter of this thesis. Moreover, although Roman provincial coinage was a feature of the eastern Mediterranean as a whole, the practice of adorning coinage with eponyms was far from universal. Eponyms drawn from the ranks of local benefactors and civic officers are most commonly attested within the confines of the province of Asia, although even here the practices employed by the various cities and regions of the province diverged. Eponyms were not a common feature of the civic coinages of the Troas, and were only very infrequently attested on the coinage of Ephesos, perhaps the most prolific civic mint in the province.10 Even so, the bulk of the evidence relating to this phenomenon is derived from cities located within the province of Asia. Outside of this area the practice of adorning civic coinage with the name of local eponyms is attested much more sporadically.

---

9 Weiss (2005), 57-68.
10 From c. AD 41 ten eponyms are known from Ephesos: Kousinios, P. Memmios Regoulos (AD 41-54), Aichmokles, Abiolas (AD 54-68), Loukios Kerreinos Paitos (AD 138-161), Paitos and Phlabios Ioulianos (AD 158-161) and Skopi(?) (imperial period): Leschhorn (2009), 1007.
They occur occasionally in the province of Achaia. For example, the name M. Klaudios Serapion appears on the coinage of Lokris c. AD 68-9, Hostilios Markellos is attested on a coinage dedicated to the Achaian league c. AD 134-138 and numerous eponyms are inscribed on the coinage of the Thessalian league from c. 31 BC to c. 117-138. Elsewhere local coin eponyms are even less frequently attested. From c. AD 102-116 to c. AD 252/3 the coinage of Byzantion was adorned with the names of local office holders or benefactors, occasionally accompanied by the name of their wife. Some of the Roman colonies founded in the eastern Mediterranean struck base metal coinage with Latin inscriptions. During the first century AD such ‘Latin’ coinages often recorded the names of the most senior annual magistrates, the duoviri, on their coinage. Groups of letters, which have been interpreted as abbreviated names and very occasionally full names are recorded on civic coinage from Kilikia and Syria. However, the form of these Syrian and Kilikian ‘eponyms’ differs markedly from those found in Asia and less frequently in Achaia. Most significantly, the majority of names are recorded in abbreviated form, often reduced to monograms of two or three letters. Therefore the ‘names’ are displayed far less prominently. This may indicate that these abbreviated names served a different function,

11 Blum (1914), 35-7 (Hostilios), RPC I 1339-1342 (Serapion).
12 The majority of the names refer to local office holders or benefactors and occasionally their wives: for example the high priest G. Sallios Aristainetos and Ailia Herais. However, the list of coin eponyms at Byzantion also includes deities: Nike, Demeter, Tyche Poleos, Dionysos, Thea Faustina, and even the Emperor Trajan. Since iteration of office is indicated for Trajan, Nike, Demeter and Dionysos, it is probable that these deities were cited as holders of a local civic magistracy: cf. Robert (1946), 51-64. Moreover, Memmios Markos (c. AD 175), Ailios Pontikos (c. AD 178), Aurelios Tatianos (c. AD 219-20) are accorded the title ‘heros’. Since heroic honours were frequently accorded to the dead, it is probable that at least some of these eponyms were deceased at the time of minting, although the extent to which heroic honours were paid to the living is a matter of scholarly debate: Price (1984a), 35 n. 48 contra Hughes (1999), 172 and Sherwin-White (1978), 366-367. For a list and discussion of the eponyms of Byzantion see Schönert-Geiss (1972), 17-19.
13 For a discussion of the duoviri attested on the coinage of Knossos and Korinth see Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 234-250.
14 For a full list of the abbreviated names see Leschhorn (2009), 961 (Aigeai, Kilikia), 1002 (Elaiousa Sebaste, Kilikia), 1010 (Gabala, Syria), 1031 (Laodikeia on the sea, Syria), 1069 (Tarsos, Kilikia), 1061 (Sidon, Phoenicia)
one which did not require the individual to be identified so readily. It is also important to note that abbreviated names and monograms had been a common feature of Greek language coinages since at least the sixth century BC.⁴⁵ Therefore the Syrian and Kilikian abbreviations indicate the continuation of these practices long into the Roman imperial period.⁴⁶

In spite of the long history of ‘eponyms’ on the civic coinages of the Greek speaking cities of the eastern Mediterranean, the chronological parameters of this thesis are limited to the period ranging from the extension of Augustus’ rule over the eastern Mediterranean in 31 BC until the end of the reign of Aurelian in AD 275. This temporal focus is justified by the many important developments and innovations that took place in respect to civic coinage during this period. Not only did coin iconography become more diverse, but also within the province of Asia the citation of civic office became more common and the legend formulae employed to introduce the eponyms were completely transformed. However, where relevant the practices of the pre-imperial period will be discussed in order to provide the necessary context for the interpretation of later developments. The decision to end the investigation with the death of Aurelian is a product of a profound change in the monetary history of the region. By the third quarter of the third century AD the phenomenon of base metal civic coinages was in terminal decline and at the death of Aurelian most civic mints had long ceased production. In fact in most regions of Asia Minor civic minting had come to a halt by the end of the sole reign of Gallienus.

---

⁴⁵ See pages 46-64.
⁴⁶ For a discussion of the geographical distribution of legend formulae and their relationship with local conceptions of time see Howgego (2005), 7-10.
(AD 268), although civic coinages in Pisidia and Pamphylia continued into the reign of Aurelian and even Tacitus (AD 275/6). 17

**Critical Survey**

In the past twenty years the study of Roman provincial coinage has been revolutionised by the publication of the results of the international *RPC* project. For the first time systematic typologies for the output of the provincial mints of the Roman Empire are available for the Augustan to Julio-Claudian 18 and Flavian 19 periods as well as the corpus for the province of Asia in the reign of Gordian III. 20 In addition the database of the material for the Antonine (AD 138-192) portion of the *RPC* project is available online at *rpc.ashmus.ox.ac.uk*. However, the current *RPC* online numbers are temporary. Therefore the Antonine period types referenced in this thesis use V. Heuchert’s doctoral thesis catalogue numbers, on which the print version of *RPC* IV will be based. This material is as yet unpublished, but a concordance of Heuchert numbers with published specimens has been provided in the form of a catalogue. At the time of writing the remainder of the *RPC* series is still in preparation, although the unpublished preliminary research of the late E. Levante for signed and non pseudo-autonomous issues of the reigns of Maximian and Philip the Arab were made available to me by the kind permission of M. Amandry of the *BNF*. Before the publication of the *RPC* series only corpora relating to a small number of

---

17 Heuchert (2005), 33: Howgego linked the relative longevity of the Pamphylian and Pisidian mints to the significance of Perge and Side to the imperial administration of Asia Minor in the third century AD: Howgego (1995), 140.
individual cities were available.\textsuperscript{21} For the periods currently not covered by the \textit{RPC} series, the study of the eponyms of the provincial coinage is facilitated by specialist works on this phenomenon. In a series of articles from 1911-1921, Rudolf Münsterberg attempted to provide a comprehensive list of all the eponyms appearing on the provincial coinage of the imperial period.\textsuperscript{22} However, the work of Münsterberg has now been superseded by the publication of the second volume of Leschhorn’s ‘\textit{Lexikon der Aufschriften auf Griechischen Münzen. Band II Ethnika und Beamtenamen’}, which provides a catalogue of known coin eponyms along with references to published specimens.\textsuperscript{23} However, some caution is required when using this resource, since Leschhorn is writing before the full publication of the relevant \textit{RPC} volumes. In some cases he is forced to follow the unreliable readings of the early 19\textsuperscript{th} century catalogue of Mionnet.

Building on the foundations established by earlier scholars, such as F. Lenormant, F. Imhoof-Blumer, B. Head and L. Robert, the work of the \textit{RPC} project has provided considerable impetus for the analysis of the function and significance of coin eponyms.\textsuperscript{24} The introductory sections of the published \textit{RPC I, RPC II} and \textit{RPC VII}

\textsuperscript{21} The most important of these is Klose’s corpus of the mint of Smyrna during the imperial period: Klose (1987). Relevant corpora are also available for the mints of Byzantion (Schöbert-Giess (1972), Magnesia on the Maiandros (Schultz (1975), and Aphrodisias (MacDonald (1992), although MacDonald’s work on Aphrodisias was the subject of much revision by Johnston: Johnston (1995), 43-100; von Aulock has also published studies of some of the small mints of Phrygia: von Aulock (1980), (1987).

\textsuperscript{22} Münsterberg (1911), 69-132; (1912a), 1-111; (1927), 42-105; however the data compiled by Münsterberg was sometimes flawed. In some cases Münsterberg can be shown to have misread Greek inscriptions, thus inventing ‘phantom magistrates’ and on occasion he failed to notice later retooling. For example Münsterberg invents the phantom \textit{strategos} L. Aurelius for Kyziko and he overlooked completely the eponym Glykon from Perperene: Münsterberg (1914), 66.

\textsuperscript{23} Leschhorn (2009).

\textsuperscript{24} Much of Lenormant’s late 19\textsuperscript{th} century interpretation of the legend formulae of Greek coins remains valid: Lenormant (1879). Imhoof-Blumer produced many important articles on the civic coinages of the Roman Empire, although perhaps his most important works in this field were \textit{Lydische Stadtmünzen} and \textit{Kleinasiatische Münzen}, which established the correct readings of many coin legends: Imhoof-Blumer (1897), (1901). Head’s introductions to the \textit{BMC} catalogues of Lydia and Phrygia in particular contain much important information on the magistracies and names of eponyms, the patterns of minting, the distribution of legend formulae and the iconographic repertoire: \textit{BMC Lydia xxiii-cl} and \textit{BMC Phrygia xx-cvi} and Head (1911), lxvii. Robert’s contribution to numismatics is enormous and he was responsible for numerous articles.
volumes include informative discussions on the spread, development and function of coin
eponyms as well as detailed analysis of the various legend formulae employed throughout
this period. The doctoral thesis of V. Heuchert, which compiled the catalogue for the
civic issues of Asia for the period AD 138-192, covers these issues in the Antonine
context. However, perhaps the most significant recent contribution to the field was made
by Peter Weiss’ 2005 article ‘The Cities and their Money’, which placed the study of
eponyms and legend formulae in the context of the structures of civic administration.
Through this methodology Weiss was not only able to contribute to our understanding of
the function of coin eponyms, but he also illuminated the general principles governing the
relationship between civic office holding and spheres of administrative responsibility.
Other areas, which have benefitted from Weiss’ analysis, include the study of coin types as
a source of cultural history and the significance of the \( \alpha \iota \tau \eta \sigma \alpha \mu \varepsilon \nu \omicron \varsigma \) legend formula. The
function of the \( \alpha \iota \tau \eta \sigma \alpha \mu \varepsilon \nu \omicron \varsigma \) legend formula was also the subject of an important article by
Johannes Nollé, which independently arrived at similar conclusion. Furthermore, the
study of Bernhard Weisser on the relationship between the coinage of Pergamon and Aulus
Iulius Quadratus provided an invaluable model for the analysis of personalised
iconography on civic coinage.

This thesis is also indebted to advances in the study of other areas of provincial
coinage. In particular, A. Johnston’s account of the denominational systems employed in

\[ \text{and two books pertaining to the study of Roman provincial coinage. Of particular importance is his 1967}
\text{book on Greek coins and their types, legends, eponyms and geography: Robert (1967).}
\]  
\[ ^{25} \text{Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 1-5 and Burnett, Amandry and Carradice (1999), 1-7.}
\]  
\[ ^{26} \text{Weiss (2005), 57-68.}
\]  
\text{(2002), 241-254 (legend formulae).}
\]  
\[ ^{28} \text{Nollé (1993), 487-504.}
\]  
\[ ^{29} \text{Weisser (2005), 135-142.}
\]
third century Asia Minor is an indispensable tool for the study of the structure of civic coinages. 30 For the first time it is possible to begin to ascribe monetary values to relative denominational frameworks previously identified. Of similar significance for the study of the coinages of the later second and third centuries AD is the pioneering work of K. Kraft. His painstaking collation of the evidence for external die-links and stylistic affinities demonstrated that from the late second century AD, die production became centralised in a limited number of workshop centres (ateliers). 31 These regional centres provided the dies for an extensive hinterland (supply areas). 32 Different regions were centred on different workshops, although the extent of each workshop could fluctuate over a time as minting was often intermittent and cities appear to change their supplier frequently. 33 The implications of the introduction of this system for our understanding of civic coinage are profound. It is to be bitterly regretted that Kraft’s premature death prevented him from further expanding and refining his theories, although the work of Johnston in particular has done much to continue his legacy. 34 Christopher Howgego’s study on ‘Greek Imperial Countermarks’ made many invaluable contributions to our understanding of the circulation of local bronze coinages. Moreover, his chapter on the context and function of these base metal issues is an essential starting point for any study of the use, motivation and patterns of production of Roman provincial coinage. Finally Harl’s study on the civic coinages of the third century AD provides an invaluable window onto the development of the diverse and complex coin iconography of the third century AD.

31 The evidence of stylistic affinities is inherently more subjective and less reliable than the evidence of die links. For example Johnston has argued that some of Kraft’s stylistic affinities may have been the result of shared artistic models: Johnston (1974), 204.
32 These regionalised patterns do not conform to the political and administrative divisions of the conventus districts imposed by the Roman authorities: Johnston (1974), 203.
33 Johnston (1995), 49.
Structure and Methodology

The aim of this thesis is to analyse and as far as possible to provide answers to the key questions pertaining to the relationship between civic minting and coin eponyms. These questions may be summarised as:

- What was the function of eponyms and how did their role develop over this period?
- How and why did the traditions of coin eponym citation vary between cities and regions?
- Many coin legends make reference to the offices held by the eponym. What was the nature of the interaction between office holding (and particular offices) and the production of coinage?
- What was the extent of the personal involvement of the eponym in the production of coinage? Were all eponyms equally involved in coin production?
- What role, if any, did eponyms play in the financing of civic coin production?
- What was the nature of the relationship between the choice of iconography and the eponym? Who chose the types that adorned civic coins? Were and how often were coin types chosen to reflect the career and interests of the relevant coin eponym?
- How did the eponyms perceive the coinage that bore their name? Were types chosen simply to differentiate between the various denominations or was coinage viewed as a medium for the articulation of civic identity? To what extent were perceptions of coinage influenced by contact with Roman monetary traditions?
- What light can the iconography of civic coin types shed on our understanding of the cultural priorities of the civic elites and the construction of civic identity? What was the significance of eponyms in these processes?
In order to engage with these questions, the main body of this thesis will be arranged into five chapters. Chapter 2 will outline the activities of the local elites and the function of magistrates in the system of local government in operation in the cities of Asia during the first three centuries AD. Eponyms were drawn from the ranks of the wealthy civic elites, who were defined by their participation in civic office holding and their engagement in competitive benefaction. Particular attention will be paid to the magistracies most frequently mentioned on coin legends (the *strategoi* and *archontes*). Chapter 3 will provide an outline of the current state of the debate concerning the meaning and significance of coin eponyms and how they were involved in the production of coinage. This will include a general discussion of how the construction and perception of time in the civic culture of the Graeco-Roman cities affected the citation of office holders in official civic documents. The remaining sections of this chapter will be concerned with what may be learnt from alternative legend formulae regarding the involvement of eponyms in coin production.

The focus of Chapters 4-6 will shift from the study of coin legends to the analysis of the interaction between eponyms and coin iconography. Chapter 4 will be structured around a series of case studies representing the phenomenon of personalised iconography on Roman provincial coinage. The following chapter will be devoted to a detailed analysis of the numismatic output of two mints: Laodikeia on the Lykos in Phrygia and Thyateira in Lydia. Eponyms signed not all issues and it is only by analysing the entire output of a mint that it is possible to see this phenomenon in its full context. This section will seek to identify and explain patterns in the citation of eponyms. The iconography and denomination of signed and unsigned types will be compared, in order to determine the effect of eponyms on the nature of local coinage and its iconography. Chapter 6 will
analyse the role of local elites in the production of coinage from the perspective of monumentality. It will argue that coins were another medium for monumental display exploited by the civic elites. In this respect coinage was not so very different from other media utilised for the display of elite beneficence, such as inscriptions, buildings and sculpture. The origins of this mentality will be analysed and it will be determined whether we are dealing with a continuation and development of the Hellenistic tradition or whether we can find evidence for the adaptation of Roman attitudes towards coin iconography in the Greek speaking cities of Asia Minor.

The methodology adopted for this thesis entailed the cross-referencing of known coin eponyms with the names recorded in the relevant city and regional corpora of inscriptions (where they are available). For example, Philadelphian eponyms were sought in *TAM V*. 3 and those from Miletos were researched in the *Milet* and *I.Didyma* corpora. Other more general epigraphic corpora, in particular *SEG, OGIS* and *IGR IV* as well relevant prosopographical works, such as *PIR²* and Campanile’s index of known *asiarches*, were also consulted. In addition the recently published volume of the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names, LGPN Va*, encompassing the relevant regions of Ionia, the Aeolis, Mysia and Lydia was an invaluable synthesis of the epigraphic and numismatic sources. The volume relevant to the inland portions of Asia Minor, in particular Karia and Phrygia, has yet to be published, but I was granted access by Dr. R. Catling to the *LGPN* project’s incomplete database. The results of this research are compiled in the form of a prosopographical catalogue. In some cases, where both the coin legend and inscription record both the *gentilicum* and *cognomen* and where the chronology is consistent, the identification of coin eponyms in the epigraphic record is straightforward. In other cases

---

35 Campanile (1994).
the chronology of the coinage or inscription is uncertain, or the correlation between the nomenclature of the coin legend and epigraphy is not precise, but the balance of probability still favours a positive identification in the epigraphic record. These cases have been identified with a question mark. If a coin eponym can be associated with more than one individual in the local epigraphic record, all possible identifications have been recorded. A minority of eponyms drawn from the upper echelons of the regional and even senatorial aristocracy, for example Klaudia Basilo of Synnada, are already well known from extensive individual prosopographical and epigraphical studies.36 However, most eponyms known from the numismatic material are at present unattested in the epigraphic record. Moreover, the geographical spread of the epigraphically attested coin eponyms is uneven. In general terms the number of eponyms attested in the inscriptive evidence reflects the intensity and volume of the epigraphic studies. In particular, prosopographical research requires the existence of large numbers of long honorific inscriptions, which provide extensive biographical detail. The epigraphic material relating to the eponyms of Thyateira, comprehensively published in TAM V.2, proved to be so rich that they are discussed in detail in chapter 5. Conversely, no Roman imperial period eponym is recorded in the inscriptions known from Magnesia on the Maiandros, a city from which very few first to third century AD inscriptions are published.

---

36 Müller (1980), 457-484.
2. Local Elites

This chapter is not intended as a comprehensive discussion of the social history of civic elite strata in Asia during the Roman imperial period: a topic, which has generated a vast and diverse literature. The primary aim of this chapter is to outline the wider social context, in which the phenomenon of civic coinages took place. Coin eponyms were drawn from a distinct elite status group, who monopolised the avenues of social prestige. Membership of this status group was defined by the forms of political participation in which they engaged. Most notably, elite status became increasingly depended upon membership of the civic council (boule) and on the performance of financially burdensome services and offices for the city. In return for these services the contribution of the elites was recognised by a highly developed system of honours. Entry into this class was achieved by the inheritance of the resources necessary to finance this career.

The role of the boule in elite self-definition

In the Classical and early Hellenistic eras, participation in the civic boule was not especially prestigious. Membership of the boule was temporary. Appointment to this body was usually by sortition, organised according to tribal (phylai) affiliation with little reference to social status. Under Roman rule the nature of the boula of the Greek East underwent a radical transformation. Membership of the boule became a permanent status attained through personal wealth. As successive generations inherited the property of fathers, the wealthiest also inherited the means to acquire membership of the boule, which
by the early second century AD had become the defining characteristic of elite status. We cannot be certain that every coin eponym was a member of their local boule at the time of minting, but since it is clear that coin eponyms were drawn from amongst the ranks of the elite it is probable that the vast majority of known eponyms were also councillors in at least one city at the time of minting. Moreover the act of minting itself probably had to receive the approval of the boule. There is compelling evidence for a movement away from the rotation of council membership towards the creation of a permanent order of elite citizens. At Ephesos the kouretai lists of the prytaneis repeatedly identify the same individuals as councillors, which would indicate that the traditional system of rotating bouleutai had been replaced by a permanent order differentiated from the rest of the citizen body. Epigraphic sources increasingly treat council membership as a mark of social

---

37 The legal rights and privileges enjoyed by the bouleutic class demonstrate the extent to which membership of the boule distinguished the elite from the rest of the citizen population. If a member of the boule was accused of a capital crime, the case had to be referred to the Emperor. This class also could not be executed on the initiative of the proconsul and enjoyed protection from the degrading punishments of flogging and manual labour in the mines: Jones (1940), 180; Dig xlviii, 19. 9, §§ 11-15 (Ulpian), 15 (Hadrian), 27, § 1-2, 28, § 5 (Callistratus), XLIX. vi. 1, L. ii. 2 §2 (Ulpian), 14 (Antoninus Pius). For a more detailed discussion of privileges enjoyed by this status group and the development of the concept of the honestiores see Garnsey (1970).

38 See pages 88-91.

39 Quass’ study cited the repeated appearance of Po. Kornelios Ariston and the father and son Lysimachos Moundikios and Lysimachos ‘γ (the third)’ Moundikios in the kouretai lists recording the members of a prestigious Ephesian priestly college as evidence for the permanent nature of the Ephesian boule: Quass (1993), 388-9. The case of the family of Moundikios is of great interest because the family’s appearance in the lists can be traced for three generations from the late first century AD to the mid second century AD. Each generation of this family bore the same name and so the two latter Moundikioi are differentiated by a γ and δ respectively. This would imply that the first Moundikios to appear on the lists was actually the second to bear this name, although his nomenclature is never modified by a beta. The name Moundikios is first attested on the Ephesian kouretai lists in the year AD 92 (I.Ephesos IV 1010). However, two Moundikioi are recorded in I.Ephesos IV 1028, thereafter only the younger Moundikios is attested until I.Ephesos IV 1038, when once again two Moundikioi appear on the same list. When the name Lysimachos Moundikios appear on I.Ephesos IV 1039 and 1043 it is modified with either a delta or the term tetrakis (fourthly). In eight of ten lists from I.Ephesos IV 1016 to 1026, the first Moundikios is described as bouleutes. The second Moundikios is accorded this same title from I.Ephesos IV 1033 to 1038, with the exception of 1037. Thus the frequency with which the Moundikioi are accorded this title would imply that membership of the council was a permanent distinction and it seems probable that the absence of the title bouleutes in some lists is a result of the omission of the stonecutter. The fourth Moundikios is accorded this status in I.Ephesos IV 1039.
distinction, which separated this group from the mass of the citizen population. Membership of the *boule* was to become such an integral element of elite self-definition that it was recorded on grave inscriptions and the sons of council members, who were themselves council members, proudly emphasised their familial connection to the *boule* in the epigraphic context. Entrance fees for the *boule* are also attested in some Asian cities. The Emperor Hadrian paid the entrance fees of the Ephesian *boule* for the ship-captains L. Erastos and Philokyrios, but the extent of this practice is open to question. Certainly, by the reign of Trajan entrance fees for the *boule* do not seem to have been universal in neighbouring Pontus-Bithynia.

**Elites and Magistracies in Roman Asia**

Participation in the local *boule* was not all that was expected of the local notables. The imperial period witnessed an increasing emphasis on the holding of civic office. The distinction between office holding and the fulfilment of civic liturgies became blurred as the former became an opportunity for the display of personal munificence. Contemporary honorific inscriptions describe the patriotism and generosity of the honorands as ‘having

---

40 For recent discussions of the development of permanent *boulai* during the first century BC see Thonemann (2008), 88-89 and Hamon (2005), 142-145.

41 Quass (1993), 387-8, who cites *I.Ephesus* III 622 (1st century AD); 679 (3rd century AD); *I.Tralleis* 114. For the phrase ‘son of the councillor’ at Ephesos see *I.Ephesus* IV 1044 (Ant. Pius), cf. *I.Ephesus* IV 1033.12; for the phrase ‘son of the prytanis’ (c. AD 130-40).

42 Quass (1993), 387; Dmitriev (2005), 154-6; *I.Ephesus* V 1487.

43 Pliny discusses two practices relating to council entrance fees in Pontos-Bithynia. The first is the practice of charging a fee of around 1000-2000 denarii only to those who were admitted to the *boule* in excess of the legal number. In other cities the proconsul Anicius Maximus introduced the payment of fees for all prospective councillors, but only in a small number of cities. Pliny suggests making this practice universal, but Trajan rejects this proposal (*Ep* X. 80). Furthermore, Pliny emphasises that the *lex Pompeia*, which set out the procedures for civic administration in this province, made no provision for the introduction of entrance fees: *Ep* X. 112. It therefore seems probable that the majority of cities in Pontos-Bithynia did not charge entrance fees at this time. See also Garnsey (1971), 309-325.
fulfilled all the offices and liturgies.\textsuperscript{44} This emphasis on office-holding is reflected in the frequency with which offices are cited on coinage. Not all eponyms cite an office on their coinage and it remains possible that at least some eponyms did not hold a specific office at the time of minting. However, the omission of an office alone cannot be used as evidence for the signing of coinage by non-magistrates, since there are numerous cases of known magistrates omitting their title on some types in the same issue.\textsuperscript{45} It is probable that the coinage was usually produced in the year in which the eponym held the office cited on the coinage. This is implied by the popularity of the \textit{ἐπί} + the genitive legend formula (in the time of) from the mid first century AD.\textsuperscript{46} In cases which omit the \textit{ἐπί} + the genitive formula the meaning of abbreviations such as \textit{stra} or \textit{arch} is more ambiguous. Such abbreviations may refer simply to the offices of the \textit{strategos} and \textit{archon}, but it is not impossible that they refer to the active past participle of the verbs meaning ‘to fulfil a particular office’. The title \textit{arxas} (ex-\textit{archon}) is attested at Keramos from Nero to Caracalla.\textsuperscript{47} However, such titles are rare and in the light of the near ubiquity of the \textit{ἐπί}+ genitive formula from the first century AD onward one is forced to conclude that the citation of office is an indication that the eponym usually signed during their term of office.

Some idea of the variety of the offices found on provincial coinage is provided by brief analysis of the titles appearing on the coinage of the Antonine period. The most

\textsuperscript{44} For example see \textit{I.Aph} 2007 11.508 and \textit{I.Smyrna} 247.

\textsuperscript{45} For example the office of the \textit{strategos} Skribonios Klaros is mentioned on all the types of his issue (\textit{RPC I} 2482-2485), with the exception of 2483.

\textsuperscript{46} This situation is made more confusing by the occasional use of the \textit{ἐπί} + the genitive formula without the addition of an office: for example at Aizanoi under Caligula all eponyms use the \textit{ἐπί} + the genitive formula, but only Nannas gives any indication of office (\textit{RPC I} 3073). Yet, such eponyms could still have been serving magistrates. The proconsul Petronius signs the coinage of Smyrna without indicating his office, but his identity is clear (AD 29-35 \textit{RPC I} 2469).

\textsuperscript{47} Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 676.
commonly attested office is that of the *strategos* (general).\textsuperscript{48} Heuchert noted that the office of *grammateus* (secretary) occurred only in ten cities, seven of which were located in the Maiandros valley: Kolossai, Ephesos, Magnesia by the Maiandros, Mastaura, Neapolis on the Harpasos, Nysa and Tralleis.\textsuperscript{49} The title *agonothetes* (a supervisor of a festival competition) occurs just once at Perperene (788).\textsuperscript{50} Poroselene boasts the only known case of an *agoranomos* (overseer of the market) minting coins (682). *Neokoroi* (temple guardians) mint at Kyzikos (Kl. Hestiaios: 125-7) and Pergamon (Kl. Pardalas: 800-801, 804 and 821). In addition the *archineokoros* Kl. Lepidos is known to have signed coins from Aizanoi. At Synnada and Pergamum the office of *prytanis* is attested (2904-5 and 807). A *stephanephoros* (wreath-bearer) is recorded from Bageis (Apollodoros: 2599-2603) and a female *stephanephora* from Smyrna (1335-7). Ex-archons (*arxas*) are known to have struck coins only at Keramos and *hipparche* occurs on only one type of Kl. Hestiaios at Kyzikos (1988-1990, 1992-3 and 55). Finally, individuals identified as priests are known from Aphrodisias (Ti. Kl. Zelos: 2103-2105), Tabala (Menophrantos: 2557-60, 2564 and L. Markos: 2569-71), Bageis (Apollodoros?: 2599), Synnada (T. Iou. Iouli. Lykinos: 2911-12 and Kl. Basilo (priestess) 2909-10) and Prymnnessos (Herak. Nige: 2926-8).\textsuperscript{51}

However, over the course of the first three centuries AD the number of different offices cited on coinage fell. The diversity of offices is greatest in the Augustan period and then goes into steady decline. The offices of the *strategos*, *grammateus*, *agonotharchon*,

---

\textsuperscript{48} In the Antonine period, out a possible total of 1153 coin types bearing a magisterial title, 598 types were signed by *strategoi*.

\textsuperscript{49} The same title also occurs at Aizanoi and Ephesos in this period. A similar pattern is visible in the period of Gordian III: Heuchert (Thesis), 36, cf. Spoerri-Butcher (2006), 51.

\textsuperscript{50} All Antonine period coin references refer to Heuchert thesis numbers.

\textsuperscript{51} Heuchert (Thesis), 36-37.
epimeletes, episkopos, ephor, gymnasiarches, nomothetes, prytanis, stephanephoros, tamias are all attested on provincial coinage of the first half of the first century AD.\(^{52}\) It is also not unusual at this time for civic coinage to mention more than one office. The city of Pergamum struck coinage signed by a grammateus (RPC I 2358) and an archiereus (high priest, 2366). At Laodikeia the Julio-Claudian coinage was signed by a prytanis (2912) and nomothetes (2919). By the reign of Gordian III only the offices of strategos, archon, grammateus, stephanephoros, archiprytanis and panegyriarches are still attested. Therefore, the remaining part of this section will concentrate on analysing the two most commonly attested titles on coinage: strategoi and archontes. Of these offices, by the second century AD, the strategos (general) had become the most commonly attested on Asian provincial coinage.\(^{53}\) The origin of this office lay in the military sphere, but by the end of the Hellenistic period the influence of the strategos or college of strategoi had expanded into other areas.\(^{54}\) Unfortunately, the function of magistrates in the administration of the Graeco-Roman cities remains a little understood area.\(^{55}\) At present it is impossible to provide a definitive list of the responsibilities inherent in this office. Most of the evidence relating to civic magistracies takes the form of honorific inscriptions, which praised the honorand for their generosity rather than describe the minutiae of the office. In spite of this lack of evidence certain patterns are distinguishable in the remaining evidence. By the second century BC the interests of civic strategoi included such non-military roles as initiating proposals, setting up honorific stelai, making proclamations,

\(^{52}\) Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 3.
\(^{53}\) Spoerri Butcher (2006), 49-52.
\(^{54}\) Dmitriev (2005), 27-9, 87-8; it is clear from the epigraphic evidence that civic strategoi were often organised into boards of officials. For a fuller discussion of the organisation of these boards see Magie (1950), 840-2.
\(^{55}\) The most recent discussion of the relevant evidence is provided by Dmitriev (2005).
participating in sacrifices with the relevant priests and managing religious funds. The same broad trends witnessed in the Hellenistic period continued into the era of Roman domination. The influence of the *strategoi* in non-military spheres had become entrenched. This is not to deny that the nature and speed of this process was affected by the local context. *Strategoi*, in this case a college of five, are not attested at Ephesos until the provincial period. However, the general trend is clear: the role of the *strategoi* continued to expand into non-military areas. In early second century the *strategoi* of Pergamon could be responsible for the erection of honorific statues, although this action is unlikely to have been a regular function of this magistracy. It is probable that in this case the erection of the statues was an *epimelia* (special administrative task, ‘care’) undertaken by the relevant *strategos* in addition to his regular duties. Such additional personal magisterial burdens were not uncommon in the Greek civic system, where notions of the divisions and categorisation of responsibilities appear to have been very fluid.

It is also apparent that the social prestige connected to the *strategoi* was increasing. Holding the ‘generalship’, like the other prestigious civic magistracies was an opportunity for the display of munificence to the community. During his term as *strategos* Artemidoros Pedisas promised to dedicate a marble statue of Eros to his native city of Aphrodisias, which he duly did. Such acts of munificence or the formal promise of acts of munificence to the city could precede the term of office. [Klaudios] Terentios Longeinos

---

56 Dmitriev (2005), 28 n. 67, which cites Olbasa in Pisidia, *SEG* XLIV, 1108. 16-18 (supervising the erection of stele 159 BC). 16-18; *I.Lampsakos* 34. 27-8 (the *strategoi* make proclamation concerning the crowns, 2nd cent. BC); *I.Erythrai* 507. 68-70 (a *psephisma* for Magnesia records that the polemarch, *strategoi* and the *tamias* are to take concern for the treatment of foreign guests, 206 BC); *I.Iliion* 32, 29-30 (*strategoi* take part in sacrificial rites c. 280 BC); *I.Lampsakos* 9. 15-16 (*strategoi* are involved with the management of a religious fund, c. 2nd cent. BC).

57 Dmitriev (2005), 281.

58 *I.Askl* 22. 14-20 (AD 128-9).


60 *I.Aph* 2007 12.204 (1st-2nd cent. AD).
of Laodikeia on the Lykos attained the generalship having already performed or having promised to perform two embassies, one to Aelius Verus in Pannonia (AD 137) and to the Emperor Antoninus Pius. Sons would follow their fathers into the office and in the third century AD the holding of the ‘generalship’ by a relative became a source of familial pride and distinction to be celebrated epigraphically. The prestige enjoyed by the office of strategos may help to explain why it is by far the most commonly attested office on the provincial coinage of Asia. The supervision of coinage may be seen in the context of the appropriation of civilian responsibilities by the strategoi in the Hellenistic and Roman periods and the association of office holding with benefactions to the wider community.

The second most frequently attested title on Asian coinage is that of the archon or the protos archon. The significance of the latter of these titles in the structures of civic administration is of particular interest. Following Lenormant, some have supposed that the title protos archon, rendered as ἀρχον on coinage often designated the president of the board of strategoi. This proposition is supported by ample numismatic and epigraphic evidence. Moreover, such a flexible use of terminology would provide an ideal context

---

61 I.Laodikeia 65 (after AD 137).
62 For sons following fathers see I.Smyrna 680.5-8 (AD 79-80), for inscriptions mentioning the offices of relatives see I.Ephesos VII. 1. 3059 (early 3rd cent. AD).
63 In the Antonine period the title of archon is found on 253 types from 40 cities across Asia, roughly half the frequency of the office of strategos: Abydos, Aizanoi, Alabanda, Ankyra, Anineta, Apollonis, Apollonoshieron, Attia, Blaundos, Kadi, Keramos, Chios, Kolossai, Kotiaeion, Kyzikos, Daldis, Dokimeion, Germe, Hadrianeia, Hiereokaiseria, Hyllanis, Hyranis, Hygalea, Ioulia Gordos, Maonia, Midaion, Miletopolis, Miletos, Mostene, Myrina, Otros, Philadelphia, Poemanion, Saitai, Sala, Sardeis, Silansos, Synaos, Temenothyrai, Trapezopolis. In the reign of Gordian III of the 22 eponyms recorded as archontes 11 were accorded the title of protos (first) archon: Spoerri-Butcher (2006), 49-52.
64 Lenormant (1879), 96; cf. Ramsey (1895), 600; Levy R.E.G. xii (1899), 268-9; Head, BMC Lydia xxvi: Magie (1950), 644, 1509 n. 37; Dmitriev (2005), 232.
65 The clearest evidence for the equivalence of the two titles comes from the interchangeable use of archon and strategos on the coinage of Aurelius Ainius at Magnesia on the Sipylos, Aur. Papias at Blaundos under Trebonianus Gallus and Kl. Hestiaios at Kyzikos under Antoninus Pius (Imhoof-Blumer (1897) nos. 12-13; BMC Lydia 89-91, Ramsey (1895), 600, Heuchert 49-54). The formula ἵ τοι[ν]τον τοῦ [περὶ] Εὐξενον Ἀπολλωνίου? ἀρχοντον] is attested at Sebaste (CIG 3871; cf. Ramsey (1895) no. 472). The Thyateiran eponym L. Mar. Pollianos is recorded as holding the office of strategos on his coinage (SNG Aul 3235,
for oscillation between the titles of strategos and the protos archon found at some mints.\textsuperscript{66} Thus in the majority of cases, formulae such as ‘ἀρχ ἀ τ ἀ β (protos archon for the second time)’, may be regarded as indicating the president of the board of strategoi.\textsuperscript{67} However, it is unlikely that this explanation accounts for all instances in which an archon is attested signing coinage. This matter is further complicated by the fact that the plural ‘archontes’ could also be used as a collective noun for the civic officers of a city and not just those with the title of archon.\textsuperscript{68} Thus in some cases it is difficult to determine whether we are dealing with a specific college of civic officers or the magistrates of the city in general. Nevertheless, the possibility that some of the archontes attested on the coinage were not strategoi cannot be discounted. Distinct boards of archontes are attested in the epigraphic record. A first century AD inscription from Apameia Kibotos records a list of five names, which are described as ‘ἀρχαντες’.\textsuperscript{69} In the light of the confusing use of this term in the epigraphic record, it is possible that we are dealing some unspecified board of magistrates. Nevertheless, this text cannot refer to the ‘magistrates’ of the city as a collective because it

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{66} This inter-changeability is most clearly apparent from the coinage of Sardeis. The offices of the eponyms of the Sardian coinage from this period are thus: Ti. Kl. Mnaseas (stra), Mindios (stra) (AD 54-68), Phil. Eisigonos (stra), Ti Kl. Phil(e)inos (stra) (AD 69-79), T. Phil. Metrodoros (stra) (AD 81-96), Lo. Io. Libonianos (stra), Ari[zelos ar?] (AD 98-117), M. Kl. Phronton (asiarches and stra) (AD 139-144), G. Len Phrougi (arch) (AD 175-177), Ademtos (stra), An. Roupheos (arch a), An. Hierakos?/Hierax (Mionnet IV 736) (arch), G. Kl. Mithros/Mithres? (arch a), Kor. Ouettenianos (asiarch and stra), G. I. Krispos (arch), T. Phil. Phronton (arch) (AD 193-217), T. Ioul. Alkimachos (arch a) (AD 217-218), G. Sal. Klaudianos (arch a), Soulpiikos Hermophilos (arch a) (AD 218-222), Soulp. Hermophilos (arch a), Roupheos (arch a) Aur. Damianos (stra), G. Asin Neikomachos (arch), Sep. Menestrianos (arch a) (AD 235-238), Aur. Roupheinos (arch a), Iou. Soulpikos Hermophilos (arch a) (AD 238-244), Aur. Hierakleidanos (stra), P. Kor. Akylas (arch a), Dom. Roupheos (asiarches and arch a) (AD 253-268): Leschhorn (2009), 1059 cf. BMC Lydia ci-cvi.
\item \textsuperscript{67} However, in other mints the office attested on the coinage is consistent. At Philadelphia the archontes dominate the production of coinage: BMC Lydia lxxxv-lxxxix cf. Leschhorn (2009), 1052.
\item \textsuperscript{68} For example the term is used to refer to magistrates of Sardeis in a letter of Augustus: I.Sardeis 8, 23.
\item \textsuperscript{69} IGR IV 792, AD 45/6 cf. IGR IV 704 (Synnada).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
only mentions five names. Moreover, since the text must be concerned with a specific board of magistrates, it seems unlikely that their office, if it were not the archonship, would go unmentioned. However, such references appear to be far less numerous than references to boards of *strategoi* and thus one must conclude that in the majority of cases the *first archontes* attested on the coinage were probably presidents of the board of *strategoi*.

**Provincial Offices and Local Coinage**

Further indication of the extent to which eponyms were drawn from elite strata is provided by frequency with which officers of pan-provincial institutions are attested on coinage, in particular the high priest of the imperial cult (*asiarches/ archiereus Asias*) at the provincial *koinon* (league). The cities of the province of Asia were organised into a league structure complete with a provincial assembly under Roman auspices from at least the early first century BC. However, the crucial event in the history of the *koinon* occurred in 29 BC, when Augustus permitted the *koinon* to establish a provincial cult to Rome and Augustus. Henceforth the focus of the provincial *koinon* became the celebration of the imperial cult, a role, which only became more pronounced after the proliferation of provincial cult centres in other leading cities of the province. Provincial cults, *neokoroi*, are attested in the cities of Pergamon, Smyrna, Miletos, Ephesos, Kyzikos, Sardeis, Aizanoi, Laodikeia, Philadelphia, although *asiarchai* were only appointed at the cults of Pergamon, Smyrna,

---

70 The ‘οι ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ δήμοι καὶ τὰ ἔδην’ are recorded as honouring Dionysios and Hierokles the sons of Iason in Aphrodisias c. 80-71 BC: I.Aph 2007 2.503. Since similar terminology is used in the imperial period, it seems reasonable to assume that the *koinon* existed in some form in the early 1st century BC: Campanile (1994), 14-15.

71 Tacitus *Ann* IV, 37; Dio Cassius LI, 20, 7.
Ephesos, Kyzikos, and Sardeis. As a result of the importance of the imperial cult in the activity of the provincial koinon, the priesthoods of the provincial imperial cult became some of the most prestigious offices in Asia. The degree of the social prestige associated with this office is indicated by the lavish games staged by high priests of the imperial cult.

Although the prestige associated with this office in antiquity is not in doubt, the significance of the associated terminology has been the subject of a heated scholarly debate. According to the orthodox position, accepted here, by the second century AD the titles archiereus Asias and asiarches both referred to a high priest of one of the provincial cults of Asia. This view has been challenged by some who argue that we are in fact dealing with two entirely separate offices. This is potentially significant because the term asiarches is more frequently attested on coinage than archiereus Asias. Thus, the disassociation of the asiarches from the archiereis Asias would necessitate a radical reinterpretation of the numismatic material. However, such reinterpretation is unnecessary, since the overall balance of the evidence favours the orthodox interpretation. The terms archiereis Asias and asiarches could clearly be used interchangeably. For example in an honorific inscription from Thyateira, the equestrian M. Aurelios Diadochos is honoured as

---

72 Burrell (2004), 348; (Kyzikos), 86-99; (Pergamon), 17-37; (Ephesos), 59-85; (Smyrna), 38-54; (Sardeis), 100-105. The asiarchai of the various neokoroi appear to have served simultaneously, although only one asiarches served at a time in each city. This was true even in cases such as Pergamon, which by the early third century AD could boast three neokorate temples of Augustus, Trajan and Caracalla.

73 Carter (2002), 41-68.

74 For the arguments in favour of the proposition that the terms asiarches and archiereus Asias were synonymous see Rossner (1974), 101-142: Campanile (1994), 18-25 and Weiss (2002), 241-54.

75 This view has been put forward by Kearsley (1986), 183-92; (1987), 49-56; (1988), 52-65; (1990), 69-80 and Friesen (1993), 100-13; (1999), 275-90.

76 Friesen records 89 references to asiarchai on coins, but just 10 references to high priests of Asia. The high priest Alexander son of Kleon on a coinage in the name of the koinon Asias accounts for two of these ten examples (Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 487-8). The other eight refer to the issues of Ioulios Kleon and M. Kl. Oualerianos at Eumeneia (RPC I 3149-50 and RPC II 1386-7).
‘τὸν ἀρχιερέα τῆς Ἀσίας ναὸν τῶν ἐν Περγάμῳ’ (the high priest of Asia of the temples in Pergamon). Yet, in the honorific decree dedicated to his wife, Aurelia Hermonassa, Diadochos is accorded the title asiarches. Conversely, a coin legend of Stektorion, which reads: ΕΠ ΑΥ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΑΣΙΑΡΧΟΥ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΤΡΙΔΟΣ (in the time of Aurelius Demetrios, asiarches of the fatherland) is known. At first glance this legend would lend credence to the argument of Friesen that the title asiarches was in fact a civic distinction. However Weiss has plausibly argued that this unique legend was a die cutter’s mistake. The usual legend type from the issues of Aurelios Demetrios reads as a variation of ‘ΕΠ ΑΥ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΑΣΙΑΡΧ Κ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΤΡΙ∆. If this is the case, then Weiss has argued that ‘Ι’ was probably an abbreviation of ‘ΚΑΙ’. Thus we may be dealing a variation of the common formula ἀρχιερεύν Ἀσίας καὶ τῆς πατρίδος (high priest of Asia and (high priest) of his fatherland), indicating that Aurelios Demetrios was both high priest of Asia (asiarches) and high priest of his fatherland.

The honorific nature of the title of asiarches and indeed archiereus Asias is further demonstrated by the overwhelming evidence for the retention of the title as an honorific distinction long after their term of office had expired. Gaios Maternos struck two issues of coinage during the joint of reign of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus (Heuchert 2614 and 2616-7). Both these series describe Maternos as asiarches, without indicating any iteration of office. This probably indicates that although Maternos held this office only once, the prestige that accrued from this was such that it became integral to his individual

---

77 TAM V 2 950, 954 (Macrinus and Diadumenianus).
78 Wadd 6505 (Philip the Arab).
79 Friesen (1993), 97, 113.
80 SNG Aul 3961.
81 Weiss (2002), 246-7 cf. TAM V 2 976.
nomenclature. The fact that an individual had once served as *asiarches* is usually unlikely to have had much relevance to the actual production of coinage, but merely served to emphasise the status acquired by the eponym during the course of his career. Coinage struck in the name of *asiarchai* occasionally employed the *ἐπί* formula (*in the time of*). However, in such cases references to the asiarchy are often combined with other offices and thus it is possible that preposition referred only to the civic office. If we take as paradigmatic the *asiarchai* appearing on the Antonine provincial coinage we find that *ἐπί* is paired with the title *asiarches* and its abbreviations on only three occasions. These are the issues of Ailios Themistokles at Miletos, Ses. Seberos at Kidyessos and Klaudios Kalobrotos at Okoklea. However, on each of these occasions a variant legend type is also attested, which while using the *ἐπί* formula bears no indication of office. Thus, it is possible that the *ἐπί* formula on these issues refers not to the asiarchy, which is cited only sporadically, but to some office or liturgy not named explicitly on the coinage. This interpretation is reinforced by the pattern of office citation on the issues of Ail Zoilios of Abydos. Zoilios was responsible for two issues, one c. AD 166-175 and one c. AD 177-180. The title *asiarches* is attested sporadically on both issues, made during his first and second terms as *archon*, yet there is no indication that he held the asiarchy twice.

---

82 Heuchert (Thesis), 34.
83 This conclusion is reinforced by the evidence for the honorific use of ‘*asiarches*’ as a term of social distinction long after the relevant individual had left office. In *I.Kibyra* 63, the title of *asiarches* is accorded to Tiberios Klaudios Polemon and his brother Tiberios Klaudios Deioterianos. Their father is also called twice *asiarches*. It is improbable that the father and siblings could have held office at the same time and thus the title must have simply been intended as an honorific device.
84 Seberos: ΕΠΙ ΣΗΣ ΣΕΒΗΡΟΥ ΑΣΙ ΚΙ∆ΗΣΕΩ (AD 178-182, Heuchert 2887-2888); Themistokles: ΕΠΙ ΑΙΛ ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΑΣΙΑΡΧ ΜΙΛΗΣΩΝ (AD 161-9, Heuchert 1928); Kalobrotos: ΕΠΙ ΚΑ ΚΑΛΩΒΡΟΤΟΥ ΑΣΙΑΡ ΟΚΟΚΛΗΝΩΝ (AD 178-182?, Heuchert 2844).
85 For example the legend ΕΠΙ ΑΙΛ ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΜΙΛΗΣΙ is also known (Heuchert 1931-2).
86 Heuchert 452-453 (AD 166-169 or 175), 455-456 (AD 177-180).
It remains possible that some coinage may have been produced contemporaneously with an eponym’s term of office as *asiarches*. In most cases our knowledge of both the career of the eponym and the coinage is insufficiently accurate to allow such precise dating. However, in certain rare scenarios it is tempting to associate specific issues with the celebration of the attainment of the asiarchy. One such issue was produced in the name Alexandros son of Kleon c. AD 23-6.\(^8\) The obverse of this issue depicted Drusus and Germanicus Caesar sitting on curule chairs with the legend ΝΕΟΙ ΘΕΟΙ ΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ. The reverse legend reads ΕΠΙ ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΩΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΚΛΕΩΝΟΣ ΣΑΡΔΙΑΝΟΥ (*in the time of Alexandros the Sardian, the son of Kleon, high priest (of Asia)). The reverse type was composed of a wreath encircling the words ‘ΚΟΙΝΟΝ ΑΣΙΑΣ’. The mint of origin for this issue is unclear, but Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès have plausibly argued that this issue is best assigned to Sardeis.\(^8\) If this issue was indeed Sardian, then why was it produced in the name of *koinon Asias* and not the city? In this case it possible that we are dealing with a commemorative issue produced at the expense of the eponym possibly for the purpose of a distribution to the populace. Given the relatively high concentration of these issues found in Sardeis (6), such a distribution, if it occurred, would have probably taken place during a local festival or games at Sardeis dedicated to the imperial cult. Another issue in the name of a *koinon* has also been associated with the mint of Sardeis. The *asiarches* and high priest of the *Koinon Ionion* Klaudios Phronton produced two issues in the period c. AD 139-44, one in the name of the

\(^8\) *RPC* I 2994 (Plate XLVIII. 2).

\(^8\) Since this issue was produced in the name of the *koinon Asias* the Sardian Alexander need not have produced this issue in his native city. However, as Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès have made clear, this issue is unlikely to be a product of the cities of Pergamon, Ephesos and Smyrna, which were the main centres for the celebration of the provincial imperial cult at this time. This issue does not conform to the denominational structures of contemporary Ephesos and Pergamon and the die axis is incompatible with Smyrna. However, there are no such difficulties in assigning this issue to Sardeis; indeed six specimens of this type have been excavated at Sardeis, compared with only two at Pergamon: Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 487.
Koinon Ionion (ΓΙ ΠΟΛΕΩΝ) and one in the name of the Sardians. It is possible that here too we are faced with a commemorative issue celebrating the attainment of prestigious religious office and associated cash distribution. In this respect the legend formula is of particular interest. Both the civic and league issues of Phronton use the unique formula προνοηϑέντος (from the verb to foresee/ to provide). If this participle is understood in the sense of ‘to provide’, then it could imply the provision of coinage for distribution at the festivals over which Phronton presided. Since this formula occurs on both the civic and ‘league’ issues it is possible that we are dealing with two distributions, one at Sardeis and the other at the Koinon Ionion.

However, the practice of striking commemorative issues, the iconography of which was intended to memorialise the attainment of provincial office, was relatively rare. In contrast to Alexandros of Sardeis, very few asiarchai who struck coinage made reference to their priestly office through iconography. Detailed analysis of the iconography of the Antonine coinage reveals limited evidence for direct pictorial references to the eponym’s status of asiarches. For example of the types produced in the name of Ailios Zoilos of Abydos, only one can be interpreted as having any relevance to the office of asiarches. This type depicts a temple surrounding the cult image of Artemis Ephesia. This image may be a reference to Zoilos’ service on behalf of the imperial cult at Ephesos. However, the Artemis Ephesia type is very common and Ephesos was only one of several cities that could boast a provincial imperial cult. Furthermore we do not know where Zoilos served as asiarches. Thus it is more likely that the appearance of the Artemis

---

89 Heuchert 2470-2472 (Plate XLVIII. 3, XLIX 1-2) and 1516-1528 The legends of these issues are variations of the formula ΚΟΙΝΟΝ ΓΙ ΠΡΟΝ(Ο Μ) ΚΑ ΦΡΟΝΤΩΝ ΑΣΙΑΡΧ ΚΑΙ ΑΡΧ ΓΙ ΠΟΛΕΩΝ (1517) or ΕΠΙ ΚΑ ΦΡΟΝΤΩΝΟΣ ΑΣΙΑΡΧ ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟ Α ΣΑΡ∆ΙΑΝΩΝ (2472).
90 For further discussion of Phronton’s coinage see pages 122-125.
91 Heuchert 453.
Ephesia had no connection with Zoilos’ term of office as *asiarches*. Of course, the absence of specific iconography cannot itself prove that these issues were not intended for distributions, but it does indicate that the primary function of the issue was not to commemorate the eponym’s term of priestly office. Thus, although the asiarchy was one of the most prestigious offices within the province of Asia, it seems that it was often sufficient to express the fulfilment of this office by means of the legend alone.

**Roman citizenship and Equestrian Status**

Since coin eponyms were drawn from among the elite strata of society, it is unsurprising that many possessed the distinction of Roman citizenship. The rate at which the local elites acquired citizenship varied from region to region and city to city, depending on the local historical circumstances. However, the general pattern is clear. The proportion of eponyms that possessed Roman citizenship began at a relatively low level in the reign of Augustus, but rose steadily as Roman citizenship became disseminated among the provincial elites. Finally in AD 212 Roman citizenship was extended to the entire freeborn population of the Empire by the *constitutio Antoniniana*.92 Thus, of the four eponyms attested at Pergamon in the reign of Augustus, only one, A. Phourios, bears the Latin *gentilicium* indicative of Roman citizenship.93 By the Antonine period the majority of Pergamene eponyms possessed a *gentilicium*, with the exception of Diodoros and Pollion.94 However, the

---

92 For a full discussion of the spread of Roman citizenship amongst the elite of Asia see Holtheide (1983).
93 *RPC* I 2360-1 (c. 10 BC).
94 The known Pergamene eponyms from the Antonine period are Kl. Aisimos (AD 137-8), I. Pollion (AD 139-144), Nymphidia Beronike, Kl. Pardalas (AD 144-158), A. Tullios Kratippos (AD 166-180), T. Kl. Aristeas (c. AD 166), Kl. Nikomedes (AD 175-7), I. Poli? (AD 175-7), M. Ai. Glykonianos (AD 180-2), P. Ai. Pios (c. AD 182-4) and Diodoros (AD 182-4): Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 251-259. The *strategos* ‘Pollion’ is also known from the Antonine coinage of Pergamon, but Heuchert has speculated that this Pollion (c. AD 180-2) is the son of the earlier I. Pollion. If this is the case he would have shared the *nomen* ‘Ioulios’ and Roman citizen status of his father: Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 253. Moreover, the single
absence of a *gentilicum* is not definitive evidence for non-citizen status. The ancestors of the great early second century AD Smyranean sophist Polemon received citizenship at a very early date from Marcus Antonius, as befitted one of the foremost families of Asia.\(^95\) Yet, Polemon appears on his coinage simply as Polemon with no mention of a *gentilicum*. Similarly, the names Epaphroditos (Hadraneia), Menekrates (Dioshieron), Eirenaios (Nysa), Philetos (Tralleis), Amarantos Moschion, Antiochos, Demes, Demokrates, Hermeros, Pammenes, Philoumenos, Photoinos (all Magnesia on the Maiandros), Metrophanes (Hydisos), Bakchios Kalikles (Apameia Kibotos), Attikos (Dorylaion), Alexandros (Synnada), Hermokrates, Kaikina B, Klearchos Theodor[os]) all appear on the provincial coinage of Asia during the reign of Gordian III.\(^96\) All of these eponyms must have held Roman citizenship, since they post-date the mass enfranchisement of the freeborn population of the Empire instituted by the *constitutio Antoniniana*. Thus, we may conclude that during the second century AD a majority of coin eponyms enjoyed Roman citizen status, even if around half of the attested coin eponyms from this period do not bear a *gentilicum*, because of the frequency with which known Roman citizens do not emphasise this element of their nomenclature.

From the early third century the connection of the Asian elite to Roman power was further demonstrated by the emergence of the title of *hippikos*, indicating equestrian status, on coinage. The earliest instance of this practice occurred at Thyateira c. AD 217-28, but the term is also attested at the mints of Prymnessos, Saitta, Apameia, Kotiaeion.

---

\(^95\) Holtheide (1983), 241, 245: *PIR*\(^2\) A 862. The gentilician Antonius was used by the ancestors of Polemon at the mint of Laodikeia: *RPC* I 2912-16, 2928.

\(^96\) Spoerri-Butcher (2006), 49-52.
Synnada, Ioulia Gordos, Magnesia on the Sipylus, Aphrodisias, Pergamon and Smyrna.  

The timing of the appearance of this term on the coinage of Thyateira is significant because it is roughly contemporary with the emergence of this title in the local epigraphic record, although such terminology is found significantly earlier elsewhere.  

Indeed, elites of the province of Asia had been acquiring equestrian and even senatorial status since at least the Augustan period. The case of Aulus Iulius Quadratus (Aulos Ioulios Kouadratos) of Pergamon demonstrates the heights to which the native elites of Asia could rise in the Roman governmental system. Adlected into the Senate by Vespasian, Quadratus was made proconsul of Krete and Kyrene c. AD 85/6, suffect consul from May until August AD 94, *consul ordinarius* in AD 105, proconsul in Syria in AD 105 and finally proconsul of Asia in AD 109/10. The career of Quadratus was clearly exceptional, but it provides a

---


98 At Thyateira the title is used in conjunction with G. Arountios Antoneinos Phlabianos (Severus Alexander, *TAM* V 2 915, 11-12) and M. Aur. Diadochos (Severus Alexander, *TAM* V 2 950, 2; 952, 4; 954, 12). The first known equestrian of Thyateirian origin was Ant. Kl. Alphenios Arignotos, who pursued a successful military equestrian career at the end of the second/beginning of the third century AD (*PIR*2 A 821).

99 Demougin records that two citizens of Pergamon (T. Aufidius Spinter and T. Aufidius Balbus) held military equestrian posts under Augustus: Demougin (1999), 604, nos. 110-111. First and second century AD equestrians are also attested in some of the less significant cities of the province. The Phrygian cities of Synnada and Kolossai had produced equestrian procurators by the first half of the second century AD: Demougin (1999), 606, nos. 148 and 155. Q. Pompeius Macer of Mytilene (Halfmann no. 1) became a senator under Augustus and under Nero even the Phrygian city of Akmoeia produced the senator L. Servienius Cornuts (Halfmann no. 5); Halfmann (1979), 78. Similarly, Gnaeus Pompeius Theophanes of Mytilene held equestrian status in the first century BC. For a full discussion of the equestrians of Asia see Demougin (1999), 579-612.

100 For a full discussion of the career of Quadratus see Weisser (2005), 137-141.
paradigm for the process by which the civic elites of Asia began to acquire equestrian and even senatorial status during this period.\textsuperscript{101} We know of at least one case of a provincial equestrian appearing as a coin eponym before the early third century AD: Klaudia Basilo of Synnada (AD 164-169). However, her equestrian status was not emphasised. Basilo was the wife of a senator, yet she signs her civic coinage with the simple legend ‘ΕΠΙ ΙΕΡΑ Κ ΒΑΣΙΛΟΥΣ’ (in the time of the priestess K(laudia) Basilo).\textsuperscript{102} Thus, the factors behind the sudden emergence of this title in the early third century AD are difficult to discern. At Thyateira the rarity of the term \textit{hippikos} in the epigraphic record may indicate that equestrian status was a rare distinction in this city in the preceding period. M. Aur. Diadochos and G. Arountios Antoneinos may simply have been the first equestrian coin eponyms from Thyateira. Similarly, the \textit{hippikoi} attested elsewhere may have been the first equestrians involved in the production of coinage in their respective cities, although, particularly in the major centres of Pergamon and Smyrna, one would expect equestrian status to have been more common amongst the local civic elite in the preceding centuries. Therefore, either the first and second century equestrians of Asia were uninterested in the production of coinage or this aspect of their career was ignored in this context. If the latter is correct, which is far from certain, then the greater emphasis on equestrian status in the third century may been the result of the elite’s desire to further differentiate themselves from the mass of the citizen population in the wake of the \textit{constitutio Antoniniana} granting Roman citizen status to all free born individuals.

\textsuperscript{101} See also the case of Celsus Polemaenus, another Asian senator contemporary with Quadratus: Magie (1950), 578.
\textsuperscript{102} \textit{I.Ephesos} III 891: Heuchert 2909-2910. For a discussion of Basilo and her family see Müller (1980), 457-484.
Honorific Titles on Provincial Coins

The contemporary social and cultural context of Roman Asia was the catalyst for the addition of new titles and adjectives, which were not the names of specific offices, to describe the achievements and personal qualities of the eponym. Such titles are unknown in respect to pre-Imperial period coinages. In the Hellenistic era, even the citation of office was very rare. Only one office is mentioned on the entire Hellenistic coinage of Lydia.103 However, from the reign of Augustus it not only became more common for eponyms to be identified with a particular office, but eponyms were occasionally accorded honorific titles. Zosimos IV of Kolossai (Antonine period) was even accorded the title of *philopator* (*father-loving*).104 Several of these titles referred to the personal devotion displayed by the eponym to his community. This public spiritedness is perhaps most clearly demonstrated by the title *euergetes* (‘benefactor [of his/her city]’) accorded to a single eponym, Ioulios Andronikos, from the mid first century AD from the mint of Laodikeia.105 Also in Phrygia, the grand honorific title of *soteira* (female saviour) is attested once on the coinage of Eumeneia.106 From the reign of Augustus a minority of eponyms were distinguished with the title ‘*philopatris*’ (‘friend of the fatherland’).107 Similar sentiments were expressed

---

104 Heuchert 2291-2292.
105 Ioulios Andronikos was responsible for two series of coinage at Laodikeia, under Nero c. AD 62 and under Vespasian: *RPC I* 2920-2923, *RPC II* 1269-1270. For a discussion of the significance of this title in the Hellenistic period see Gauthier (1985), 18-28.
106 Kastoris *soteira*: Augustan *RPC I* 3143 (name in a wreath).
107 This title appears on the obverse legend of an Augustan silver drachm of Chios (ΦΟΥΠ[ ]ΣΣΙΦΑΥΟΣ ΦΙΛΟΠΑΤΡΙΣ *RPC I* 2413). The significance of this legend is unclear. The reverse legend names the eponyms Diogenes and Eudemos, who are attested on another Chian issue (2412). Thus it is likely that the obverse legend does not refer to the coin eponyms, but the fragmentary state of the legend precludes a clear reading. Other examples of this title include: Dionysopolis *RPC I* 3122; (Idomeneus, Tiberian?) Eumeneia *RPC I* 3142 (Epigonos, Augustan); Hierapolis (in the *conventus* of Kibyra) *RPC I* 2929 (Zosimos 10-9 BC); Kotiaion 69-79 *RPC II* 1399, 1401; Laodikeia *RPC I* 2898 (Anto[nios] Polemon c. 5 BC); Philadelphia *RPC I* 3024 (unknown eponym from reign of Caligula); Philomelion *RPC I* 3244; Phokaia *RPC I* 2444 (Demosthenes, who was responsible for three types 2443-2445, of which only 2444 records the
by a group of titles designating the eponym as the ‘son’ of the community. Various forms of this title are attested epigraphically, but only the titles \( \upsilon \text{ιὸς/θυγάτηρ τῆς πόλεως} \), and \( \upsilon \text{ιὸς} \) with the genitive plural of the community and (once) son of the demos are attested on coinage.\(^{108}\) The title of philalethes (friend of the truth), which occurs at the Phrygian cities of Laodikeia and Akmoneia in the reign of Augustus, may have had a very specific significance.\(^{109}\) Strabo mentions this title as the epithet of two of the heads of the medical school of Laodikeia: Zeuxis and Alexandros (the former was responsible for an issue of Laodikeian coinage).\(^{110}\) Galen also uses this term to describe Demosthenes, one of the successors of Alexandros as head of the school.\(^{111}\) Therefore, Münsterberg’s opinion that this title had a particular resonance with the Laodikeian medical school and that Menemachos was also probably also connected to this institution is attractive.\(^{112}\) Conversely, Akmoneia, although still in the region of Phrygia, is situated far to the north of Laodikeia. Moreover, the same epithet is probably attested in a brief inscription from

---

\(^{108}\) The title ‘the son of the city’ occurs twice at the city of Attouda: Menippos (BMC Karia 27, Trajanic) and M. Oulpios Karminios Klaudianos, who is also accorded the title of ‘son of the demos’ (Heuchert 2151, 2154-2155, AD 161-9). At Temnos the strategos Zolios is also identified by the title ‘son of the city’: RPC II 982. The Aphrodisian eponym Apollonios was accorded both the equivalent titles ‘the son of the Aphrodisians’ (RPC I 2840-2843) and ‘the son of the city’ (RPC I 2839): reign of Tiberius? Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 466. Several individuals with this name are attested at Aphrodisias during this period, however the eponym has yet to be definitively identified with any one of these (Canali de Rossi (2007), 10). At Kotiaeion, the titles ‘the son of the city’ and ‘the son of Kotiaeians’ appears just once, for the eponym Varus (RPC I 3220-1 c. AD 50-54). The eponym Antonios Zenon of Laodikeia produced homonoia an issue with Smyrna with the confusing legend: ANTΩ ΖΗΝΟΝΟΣ ΖΗΝΟΝ ΥΙΟΣ ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΩΝ ΖΥΜΡΝΙΩΝ ΟΜΗΡΟΣ. Thonemann has rightly dismissed the restoration of either ‘Homer’ or hostage suggested by Klose: Thonemann (2004), 145. Canali De Rossi has argued persuasively that Zenon was only ‘the son of the Laodikeians’ and that ‘ΖΥΜΡΝΙΩΝ ΟΜΗΡΟΣ’ was an acclamation signifying the alliance of the two communities: Canali De Rossi (2007), 140 (for a discussion of the later homonoia coinages, which celebrated civic alliances between cities see Franke and Nollé (1997)). The feminine form of this title, ‘the daughter of the people’ occurs once at the mint of Smyrna for Myrto AD 83: RPC II 101. For a full discussion of the use of this terminology in the epigraphic record see Canali De Rossi (2007).

\(^{109}\) Menemachos at Akmoneia (RPC I 3167) and Zeuxis at Laodikeia (RPC I 2894).

\(^{110}\) Strabo XII. 8. 20.

\(^{111}\) Galen VIII. 726.

\(^{112}\) Münsterberg (1912b), 112.
Eumeneia relating to a priest of Apollo Prophylaxis. There is no indication of any connection between the priest Tiberios Klaudios Athenodotos and the medical school of Laodikeia. Consequently, it is possible that *philalethes* was a Phrygian honorific title popular with, but not exclusive to, the medical school of Laodikeia.

Other titles celebrated personal devotion to the Roman order through the Imperial house. The most notable of these were the titles *philokaisar* (*friend of the Caesar*) and *philosebastos* (*friend of the Augustus*). Titles on coinage could also reflect the status enjoyed by the eponym on account of their athletic and intellectual prowess. There are several cases of winners of major Pan-Hellenic games recording their achievement. Furthermore, the title of *sophist* is attested on three separate occasions at

---

113 Τιβέριον Κλαύδιον Τρύφωνος νιόν, Κυρίνα, Λαθηνόστοιν [Φ]ιλ[α]λήθη, ιερεύς Προπύλαιον Ἀπόλλωνος: IGR IV 742: for further analysis of this text see Labarre (2007), 283-296.

114 Canali de Rossi has linked the variant forms of ‘son of the city’ with participation in the imperial cult: Canali De Rossi (2007), 15. Participation in these cults by the elite was so ubiquitous that such a correlation reflects the pervasive ideological climate of the time and not a concrete link between this title and the Imperial cult. The terminology of the title would rather imply a civic basis for the honour.

115 *Philokaisar*: At Philadelphia in the reign of Caligula all the eponyms of this group are distinguished with this title; Moschion (*RPC* I 3027, Attalikos (3025), Kleandros (3026), Antiochos (3029), Zenon (3030), Makedon (3031). Why this title should only occur at this mint in relation to this group is unclear. The extent of the die-linking between the different issues of this group indicates that they were contemporary and that the eponyms may have been working together (Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 492). *Philokaisar* occurs on two occasions at the mint of Synnada, Klaudios Andragathos under Claudius (*RPC* I 3179, 3190, 3185) and Ti. K. Pison under Nero (3190), and just once c. AD 14-37 at Tripolis (Lydia *RPC* I 3054). *Philosebastos*: Tryphon and T. Aur. Apollonidos use this title minting for the Kilbianoi in AD 198-222 (*SNG* Aul 2991) and AD 218-222 respectively (*SNG* Aul 2995); Stratonikeia in Karia also adopted this epithet as a civic title on an issue c. AD 79-81 (*RPC* II 1196). This title also appears six times on a late Roman census list from Magnesia on the Maiandros, which Jones interpreted as signifying the equivalence between the terms *philosebastos* and *bouleutes* in this context. This is not impossible. The *boule* of Magnesia did hold this title: Jones (1953), 53. If this is correct then the title could have been used on the coinage to indicate membership of the *boule*, although absence of any reference to the title *bouleutes* on coins perhaps undermines this argument.

116 The title *nemeonikes* (winner of the Nemean games) appears at Aigai (*RPC* II 965) for Apollonios. In the Hadrianic period an Olympic winner signed an issue at the same mint: ΑΙΓΑΙΟΝ ΕΠΙ ΔΕΙΦΙΛΑΟΥ ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΝΕΙ (AD 117-138 Imhoof-Blumer *SNR* 19 (1913), p. 31 no 85). The same title is attested at Philadelphia in the name of Hermogenes (group 1, from the reign of Caligula, *RPC* I 3023). At Daldis in Lydia during the mid 3rd century AD the reverse legend ΕΠΙ ΠΕΙΟΥ ΟΑΥΜ is attested: Winterthur II 3727; Robert interpreted this legend as referring to M. Aur. Peios Socrates, an agonistic victor from Daldis commemorated in an inscription from Philadelphia (*TAM* V. 3 1511): Robert (1967), 51 note 5. It is possible that victories of Hermogenes and Apollonios were commemorated on their coinage. The reverse type of Hermogenes is the jugate bust of the Dioskuri common at Philadelphia.
the mint of Smyrna (σοφιστής), twice during the Antonine period.¹¹⁷ The last occasion on which a Smyrnean eponym carried the title of sophist on their coinage was Klaudios Rouphinos (c. AD 198-200).¹¹⁸ The motivation behind this last example is of particular interest. We know epigraphically that Rouphinos was in dispute with his city over his sophist status.¹¹⁹ Rouphinos had apparently voluntarily performed the office of the *strategos*, the office cited on his coinage, from which his sophistic status had granted him immunity.¹²⁰ Subsequently, the city had interpreted this action as a renunciation of the privileges of sophistic status and had pursued him for the liturgies expected of a member of the local elite. The dispute was only brought to an end by a ruling of the Emperor Septimius Severus in favour of the sophist. Thus, it seems reasonable to conclude that Rouphinos was keen to assert and reiterate his claim to sophist status and the associated privileges by means of his coin legends at a time in which he was voluntarily performing a civic magistracy. Outside Smyrna the use of this title was significantly more restricted. Indeed, I am aware of only one other occurrence of this title. Attalos, the son of the famous sophist Antonios Polemon, signed a series of coins commemorating his relationships with the cities of Smyrna and Laodikeia on the Lykos: ΑΤΤΑΛΟΣ ΣΟΦΙΣΤΗΣ ΤΑΙΣ ΠΑΤΡΙΣΙ ΣΜΥΡΑ ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΙΑ (‘Attalos (the) sophist to his fatherlands Smyrna and Laodikeia’: Heuchert 1365-1372). The concentration of this title among the elites of Smyrna is unsurprising.

Smyrna, along with Athens and Ephesos, was one of the three great centres of Sophistic
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¹¹⁷ Attalos (c. AD175-7 Heuchert 1365-72) and Kl. Proklos (c. AD 161-9 1349-64).
¹²⁰ The privileges granted to sophists were strictly regulated. Antoninus Pius limited small cities to three immunities for sophists, four for rhetors and four for grammarians. Large cities were limited to five rhetors and five grammarians: *Dig* xxvii, 1. 6. 7. For a full discussion of the privileges associated with sophist status see Bowersock (1969), 30-42.
activity. Consequently, Smyrna would have enjoyed a usual concentration of sophists, from whose ranks coin eponyms could be drawn. Moreover, of the two cities in Asia, Smyrna is the only one to regularly inscribe the name of an eponym on its civic coinage.

It is best to interpret the use of honorific titles in the wider context of civic euergetism and relationship between the civic munificence and competitive self-promotion among the elite. None of the honorific titles discussed in this section were confined to coinage. The bestowal of honorific titles was an integral part of the process of euergetism and one of the means by which the status and role of the elite in the city was articulated. The small size of the coins may have precluded long honorific inscriptions, but coinage was such an integral aspect of everyday life that eponyms on coins were just as visible as the honorific inscriptions in the theatres and agorai of the city. However, in comparison to the hundreds of eponyms found on the imperial coinage of Asia, such titles cannot be said to be common. Moreover, most of titles are not attested on coinage beyond the end of the first century AD. Not all eponyms eligible for honorific titles displayed them on their coinage. The most famous of the Smyrnean sophists, Antonios Polemon, is simply identified with the office of the strategos, although his son Attalos does use the title sophist.

**Conclusion**

---

121 Bowersock (1969), 17.
122 It is clear that in spite of their legal immunities sophists could still make significant contributions to local civic life from their private resources. For example, in the third century AD Damian of Ephesos was reputed to have made contributions for the maintenance of the poor Ephesians and spent lavishly on public building, including a portico connecting the Artemision with the Magnesia gate: Bowersock (1969), 28; cf. Philostratos VS 605. In contrast, relatively few post-Augustan Ephesian coins carry eponyms and so the absence of the sophist title is readily comprehensible.
This chapter has sought to emphasise that eponyms were drawn from a particular elite stratum of provincial society. This stratum was defined politically by its monopolisation of political office and membership of the boule and economically by its possession the resources necessary to fulfil these political obligations. However, it would be wrong to characterise the local elites of Asia as being entirely focused on their position in the local civic structures. In fact the Roman period is notable for the expansion in the political horizons of the ruling classes. On a provincial level participation in the koinon of Asia, particularly in the provincial cult, gave the most prominent families an opportunity to achieve renown on a regional scale. Moreover, the civic notables of Asia soon began to acquire Roman citizenship and eventually some of the wealthiest and most prominent families were able to leave the confines of the province and embark on equestrian and even senatorial careers, although not all of those who acquired equestrian status chose to engage in the imperial administration. The great Polemon of Smyrna, despite his great wealth and ancestry, chose to pursue the study of philosophy at Smyrna, one of the great local intellectual centres of the second sophistic movement. Moreover, later sophists of Smyrna also sought to emphasise their cultural interests by signing their issues with this title. It is unsurprising that the legends of civic coins, which were products of elite culture, reflected this and the other profound social developments of this period.
3.

Eponyms and the Production of Coinage

In order to assess the impact of individual influence on coin iconography it is important to address the question of who was actually in control of coin production. This can only be achieved through an analysis of the form and meaning of the legend formulae appearing on coinage from the origins of coinage in Anatolia to the end of civic coinage in the final decades of the third century AD. In terms of structure this chapter will be divided into three main parts. The first part will be devoted to the general discussion of the conception of time in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor and how local constructions of chronology should inform our understanding of coin eponyms. The second part will deal with the form and significance of coin eponyms in the pre-Roman period. It will concentrate on coinage from the regions that would later make up the province of Asia. Nevertheless, the evidence of other areas will be considered if it is helpful to our understanding of this phenomenon. The third part dealing with the Roman period will be divided into four sub-sections. The first sub-section, A, will analyse the Augustan eponyms and continuity and change from the Hellenistic period. Sub-section B will be concerned with factors behind the rise of the ἐπί formula and the implications of this formula for our understanding of the function of local coin eponyms. The final two sub-sections will examine the epigraphic and numismatic evidence for the involvement of coin eponyms in the financing of coin production.
Eponyms in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor

Before discussing in detail the function of coin eponyms in different chronological contexts, it is important to set out the wider historical debates surrounding magistrates and time in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds. The significance of many eponyms in local conceptions of the structure of time is clear. This conclusion is apparent from the geographical distribution of coin eponyms. In regions where ‘civic eras’ or regnal years are employed as the primary dating mechanism, the names of individuals are not inscribed on coins. Such mutual exclusivity indicates the parallel function of the two systems.  

The area ranging from Pontus in the North, to the Euphrates in the East, to Egypt in the South and Kilikia in the West tended to date their coinage by civic era or regnal year. Likewise, regions in which eponyms are commonly attested display little evidence for the use of ‘civic eras’ or regnal years to date their coinages. The geographical distribution of these two chronological systems may be explained in geo-political terms. The cities of these eastern regions were steeped in the chronological traditions of the Hellenistic kingdoms and their Near-Eastern precursors. The extent of Hellenistic royal influence on the construction of time in the civic context may be seen in the example of the coastal cities of Palestine and the Dekapolis. Post c. 200 BC the area of Palestine was annexed to the Seleucid kingdom by Antiochos III and the local chronology was assimilated into royal time by means of the Seleukid era, which began in 312 BC.

123 Howgego (2005), 8.
124 Kushnir-Stein (2005), 161.
125 Civic eras on are not unknown on the coinages of Western Asia Minor, but they are rare. See Leschhorn for the evidence of eras on the Republican Cistophori of Ephesos, Tralleis, Nysa, Smyrna and Sardes: Leschhorn (1993), 204-14.
126 Kushnir-Stein (2005), 157: the chronological systems of the Hellenistic kingdoms were themselves the product of Greek contact with the ancient chronological traditions of Egypt, Mesopotamia and the Achaemenid Empire: Leschhorn (1993), 9.
century BC the cities of Askalon, Gaza and Ptolemais instituted their own civic eras as a chronological fixed point, an innovation probably related to grants of civic autonomy by the Seleukid authorities. After the collapse of the Seleukid kingdom and incorporation into the Roman Empire, the Seleucid era was abandoned by the remaining cities. The tradition of calculating time from a fixed point was retained, but the Seleucid era was replaced by a local civic era.

The practice of dating official documents by office holders was a long established tradition in the Greek cities of the western coast of Anatolia. Here local chronological systems were so well entrenched that the rise of the Persian Empire and Hellenistic kingdoms did not totally eradicate the local practices for the organisation of time.

However, eras were still used as a dating mechanism inside the borders of the province of Asia. Such eras are frequently attested in inscriptions from Asia during the Imperial
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127 At Askalon and Ptolemais coins dated by the new era are marked by the addition of the title autonomous: Kushnir-Stein (2005), 157.
128 The impetus for the initiation of a new civic era varied according to individual circumstance. In the city of Tiberias founded by the Jewish King Antipas the civic era was based upon its foundation year c. AD 17-20. The city of Gaza commenced a new civic era in 61 BC, the year in which the Romans re-founded the city after its destruction at the hands of the Hasmoneans in 95/4 BC. Seven cities of Nabataea initiated a civic era from the year in which they were incorporated into the Province of Arabia: Kushnir-Stein (2005), 157-9.
129 Eponyms had been a feature of the coinage of Ephesos since c. 394 BC: Head BMC Ionia 51. However in other regions of Asia where civic constitutions of the Greek style were unknown until the Hellenistic era different chronological systems were prevalent. In mid fourth century BC documents from Mylasa in Karia, which was under the control of the Dynast Maussollos, were dated by the regnal year of the Great King: I.Mylasa 1 (367/6 BC). Even in the Hellenistic period documents from royal colonial foundations used eras or regnal years as dating mechanisms: I.Laodikeia 1; I.Stratonikeia 4, 501. As the constitutions of these communities became organised according to the Greek model, dating by civic magistrate became the norm: I.Stratonikeia 9. This process was aided by the decline of the Seleukid dominance of western Asia. The victorious Attalid dynasty made no use of eras or regnal years for dating: I.Pergamon 157, 249.
130 For example, cistophori and some of the gold staters produced at Ephesos from the late second until mid first century BC were dated by a civic era lasting for 86 years. The absolute chronology for the beginning of the era is indicated by the chronology of the proconsuls occasionally attested on the coinage. Leschhorn calculated that the era began in BC 134/3: Leschhorn (1993), 204-8. For the civic eras on the cistophori of Tralleis, Nysa, Smyrna and Sardeis see Leschhorn (1993), 208-14. Eras are also attested on the third century coinage of Laodikeia on the Lykos, Hyrgaleis and Dionysopolis. Laodikeia and Dionysopolis dated issues of coinage by local civic eras, which began in AD 128/9 and AD 152/3 respectively. The Laodikeian era probably commemorated the visit of Hadrian to the city and was used to date an issue of AD 215/6 (year 88): BMC Phrygia lvi, lxii, lxxx. The same era is attested on a series of countermarks from the years AD 235/6, 248/9 and 254/5: Leschhorn (1993), 382-5: Howgego (1985), cmk. 631, 638.
period, but they did not supplant the long-standing tradition of naming individuals on coins.\textsuperscript{131}

In this way the names of individual office holders were used as a dating mechanism on Asian coins. It is now necessary to examine how this system worked in practice. Were all office holders able to fulfil this function or was dating limited to a specific office? According to the traditional model of eponymous magistracies, each city possessed a specific annual eponymous office.\textsuperscript{132} Only the name of this office holder could be used to date all relevant administrative documents in the city. Other names may be cited in a document, but it was argued that these either ‘authenticated’ the document or they were named as a result of their involvement in the procedure that brought about the document.\textsuperscript{133} Recently Weiss has put forward a thesis, based on Dmitriev’s examination of selected epigraphic material, according to which the false notion of a single ‘eponymous’ magistrate is a misconception emanating from modern misinterpretation of the evidence.\textsuperscript{134} All epigraphic references to particular magistracies may be explained by recourse to “relevant spheres of (often magisterial) responsibility.”\textsuperscript{135} Weiss has further argued that the formulae commonly used on coin inscriptions conformed to the ‘usual repertoire’ of titulature found in other media. For Weiss the heterogeneous nature of the coin inscription formulae is best explained by the abandonment of the traditional view of the single

\textsuperscript{131} Some eras were of pan-regional significance. The Sullan era began in 85/4 BC and continued to be used into the imperial period: Leschhorn (1993) 216-21. The Pharsalian era, beginning 49/8 BC, and the Aktian era, beginning from Augustus’ victory over Antony in 31 BC, are also occasionally attested in inscriptions from Asia: Leschhorn (1993), 221-228. Hyrgaleis dated an issue from the reign of Severus Alexander (AD 240/1) by the Sullan era: Leschhorn (1993), 283; Head \textit{BMC Phrygia lxxx. For a full catalogue of epigraphic references to eras see Leschhorn (1993), 490-537. Nevertheless, this dating device is used far less frequently in Asia than in provinces of Macedonia and Syria: Leschhorn (1993), 225-228. Office holding remained the predominant dating mechanism for coinages and inscriptions in the province.

\textsuperscript{132} Sherk (1990), 249-88.

\textsuperscript{133} Sherk (1990), 256; cf. Robert \textit{OMS VI}, 606, n. 8.

\textsuperscript{134} Dmitriev (1997), 525- 34.

\textsuperscript{135} Weiss (2005), 63-7.
‘eponymous’ magistrate theory, in favour of a model based on spheres of responsibility. The name adorning the coinage was chosen on the grounds that this particular individual possessed some interest in the production of the coinage. Weiss contended that the formulae employed to date Bithynian weights provides parallels to the numismatic evidence. The inscriptions recorded on these artefacts tend to record a list of several officials. The first name given was usually that of the Emperor, followed by the legatus Augusti, the city logistes and finally the agoranomos. It was probably the last of these magistrates, the overseer of the agora (the locus of commercial activity), who was directly responsible for the production of the weights. The references to the emperor and legatus Augusti are likely to have been intended as formalised expressions of loyalty to the central authority and there is no reason to assume that they were involved in weight production.136

The logistes was the official in charge of the civic finances and therefore the immediate superior of the agoranomos.137 Weiss’ argued that this case study demonstrated how ‘dating’ in terms of magisterial responsibility worked in practice for media other than coinage. The weights were signed by the relevant local magistrates, under whose sphere of operation the supervision of weights and measures in the agora fell. The nomenclature recorded on coinage functioned in the same way. The coin eponym was both a date and the individual, in whose sphere of interest the production of coinage fell.

The work of Weiss has served to emphasise the importance of analysing evidence in the wider context of the language of civic administration in inscriptions. Local coins were a product of the political and administrative structures of the city and so the comprehension of these structures is a pre-requisite for any analysis of ancient coin

136 Weiss (2005), 61.
137 Weiss (2005), 60-1, 67.
production. Weiss’ thesis also seems to accord with the evidence of the coin legends themselves, which often do not fit neatly into traditional interpretations of eponymous magistrates. However, we must also be aware that Dmitriev’s model of civic dating in Hellenistic and Roman Asia still acknowledges the existence of a ‘city eponym’, who could be used to date ‘the activity of city offices who personally supervised different branches.’ As evidence for the ‘city eponym’ Dmitriev cites the frequency with which the *stephanephoros* was used to date the various city officials and documents of Priene. However, the ‘city eponym’ was not the only official who could fulfil a dating function:

> ‘The officials dated by him could themselves be eponyms for their subordinates, and later, in their turn, for those who stood on the lower steps in this branch of city administration’

Thus there were no ‘real’ and ‘false’ eponyms. If a particular document held relevance for several branches of civic administration, several eponyms could be used simultaneously, each being relevant to their particular administrative sphere. One particular office, the ‘city eponym’ often held the predominant position in a hierarchy of eponyms, but it was not necessary to mention this office holder on every document. The office most relevant to the relevant administrative level often dictated the choice of eponym; for example a wide
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139 *I.Priene* 19. 4-7 (3rd century BC), 44. 30-32 (2nd century BC), 108. 212-13 (after 129 BC), 109. 1-3 and 140. 141(c. 120 BC) and 112. 20-21. *Stephanephori* were also frequently used to date other civic officials in Roman Smyrna: *I.Smyrna* 731, 775-9. For a discussion of the chronology and development of the term and function of the ἥ ἐπώνυμος ἀρχή (the eponymous magistracy) during the first and second centuries AD see Dmitriev (1997), 533.
140 Dmitriev (1997), 534.
141 Dmitriev (1997), 525.
range of the most relevant office holders date the κόρος ἀγνεία inscriptions from Ephesos.142

**Eponyms in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods**

Coin eponyms were not an innovation of the imperial period. They formed part of a long-standing tradition of inscribing names on coinage. In the following section I will provide a brief survey of the current state of modern scholarship into this meaning of pre-Roman eponyms. The earliest examples of this phenomenon are found on the mysterious electrum coinage of Anatolia. Perhaps most famous of all these inscribed electrum issues is the stater, and its fractions, depicting the stag, which declares itself to be the seal of Phanes. The reverse incuse type of this issue is similar in character to those found with the obverse types of a bee and the forepart of a stag and thus the Phanes type is generally attributed to Ephesus.143 Nevertheless, the interpretation of this coin and legend is fraught with uncertainties. We simply do not know who or what Phanes was. Phanes could have been a private individual minting coinage in his own name, a local official at Ephesus who was in charge of the coinage or even an otherwise unattested local tyrant or dynast.144 Without further prosopographical evidence it is futile to speculate on the significance of the Phanes legend. Phanes is not the only individual explicitly names on the early electrum coinage.

142 For example I.Εφέσος III 923 and 930 are dated by the formula: ἐπί (name) ἀγορανόμου καὶ πανηγύραρχον τῶν μεγάλων Πασινθέων κόρος ἀγνεία, but 929 is dated by the grammateus of the κόρος ἀγνεία and 936 is dated by the ephebarches. Inscriptions from Didyma are often dated according both to the civic stephanephoros and the prophetes, the chief religious official of the sanctuary I.Didmya 229. II, 308. III, 340 and 390.B.II: Dmitriev (1997), 525.
143 The stag and bee types are both symbols associated with Artemis and appear on the later coinage of the Ephesos: Weidauer (1975), 18-20, 68-9. The legend of Phanes type reads Φάνος ἐμί σήμα (‘I am the seal of Phanes’).
144 For a brief outline of the various theories on the identity of Phanes see Fürtwängler (1982), 5, 23-4 Alternatively, Kastner read the ‘Σ’ as a ‘Ν’ and thus transliterated the legend as a genitive plural of Phanai: Kastner (1986), 5-11. Thus he associated the ‘Phanes’ coin with the mint of Chios.
The legends WALWET and KUKALIM (Kukas) appear on the famous early Lydian coinage depicting the foreparts of a lion. It is probable that these legends refer to personal names. Were these individuals mint officials analogous to the eponyms found on later coinage? The answer to this question is probably unknowable. WALWET has been plausibly identified with Alyattes, king of Lydia (c. 619-560 BC), thus this legend could have little significance in respect to mint supervision. However, die links between the two series reveal that Kukas and WALWET must have been roughly contemporary. Thus the legend KUKALIM cannot refer to the Lydian King Gyges c. 680-644 BC, as had previously been suggested. Who then was Kukas? Wallace has recently argued that the KUKALIM coins represent a small issue minted in the name of a minor Lydian royal at a subsidiary mint. Such a hypothesis is superficially attractive, but almost impossible to prove. If the lion’s head were the royal seal of the ruling dynasty, attributing royal status to Kukas would explain the use of this motif in this context. According to Nikolaos of Damascus, Kroisos was governor of Adramytion before becoming king and so the presence of a minor royal at a secondary mint may not have been so unusual. However we know so little about the administration of the Lydian kingdom and the production of coinage that any conclusions about the meaning of these eponyms must be speculative. The identification of the legends WALWET and KUKALIM as the signatures of the Lydian
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145 The form KUKALIM is interesting in that it translates as ‘I am of Kukas’, a form which parallels the legend formula of the Phanes issues and an inscription of possession from a Lydian incense burner: Özgen (1996), 114-5, no. 71.
147 This argument is based on the linguistic similarity between the names Alyattes and WALWET and the fact that the lion is commonly believed to have been the dynastic symbol of the Lydian kings: Browne (2000), 178-179. However, some have rejected the identification of WALWET with Alyattes, arguing that there is no linguistic connection between the two names and that the legends KUKALIM and WALWET must refer to moneyers: Kraay (1976), 24-5 and Kagan (1982), 358. Alternatively Wallace translates the legend WALWET as ‘lion’: Wallace (1988), 204-207. The question must therefore remain open.
149 FGrH 90 F 65: Wallace (2007), 43-44.
moneyers cannot be definitively ruled out, although there is little evidence to recommend it. It might seem strange for a royal coinage to mention a moneyer without any reference to the king, but electrum is so early in the history of coinage that it is methodologically unsound to assume later norms pertain to this period.

The first compelling evidence for the use of symbols as the signs of individual eponyms is to be found on the coinage of Abdera. The early coinage of this city was organised into ten periods by May, the first period of which he dated to c. 540/35-520/15 BC, but the cessation of which has since been down dated to c. 500 BC.\textsuperscript{150} This phase of coinage production was distinguished by the depiction of eight ancillary symbols in addition to the main griffin obverse type.\textsuperscript{151} The association of these symbols with individual eponyms is indicated by the practice employed on later series. For example, occasionally in period II (May c.520/515-492 BC/ Price and Waggoner c. 500-480 BC) and in the vast majority of cases in periods III and IV, the name of a eponym, either in full or in an abbreviated form, is combined with a particular symbol. In one case in period III both the eponyms Hero- and Hikes- use the symbol of the scallop shell with pellet. It is tempting to suggest that the reason behind this re-use of the same symbol for different individuals is that they were related, possibly brothers. However, in the absence of any evidence it is impossible to confirm this hypothesis. Abdera was not the only mint to combine names and symbols on its coinage. The second century BC “New Style” coinage of Athens is distinguished by the combination of names or monograms with pictorial symbols. Occasionally a firm connection between the symbol and one of the eponyms can be established. The symbols on the coinage of NAYKPA[Σ] and HPA can be seen as ‘puns’

\textsuperscript{150} May (1966), 45-8; cf. Price and Waggoner (1975), 37.
\textsuperscript{151} These symbols were a hare, lotos, flying eagle, Kantharos, dog, rosette, goose on a nest and ‘A’ with six pellets: May (1966), 45.
on the names of the eponyms. The monogram of Naukrates is accompanied by the maritime symbol of a rudder and the lion skin and bow of Herakles was the symbol employed on the coinage of HPA, a name that is likely to have been derived from the god Herakles.\textsuperscript{152}

The practice of combining names with symbols on coinage is not the most common form of recording eponyms. Such individuals are far more frequently cited by their names alone. These names could be written in abbreviated form or in full. The earliest Rhodian-weight issues of fourth century Samos record the names of eponyms only in their abbreviated form: ΠΡΩ, ΠΡΩΤΗΣ, ΑΜΦΙ, ΑΛΤΗΣ and ΗΓΗΣΙ (dated by Barron to 398/7-394/ BC). But, from the subsequent coinage of Hegesianax the names of eponyms were usually inscribed in full in the nominative case.\textsuperscript{153} This is not unusual as most full names on Hellenistic and Classical coinages are in the nominative case, but examples in the genitive case are also known.\textsuperscript{154} In some cases patronymics are also recorded in coin legends.\textsuperscript{155} Monograms also frequently appear on the Classical and Hellenistic civic coinages, but their brevity often renders them difficult to interpret. At Athens monograms are found on the very earliest issues of the New Style coinage and they are universally accepted as being eponyms.\textsuperscript{156} Monograms are also found in addition to the names of eponyms on some of the fourth century coins of Samos. Barron identified the same monogram on the coins of several different eponyms of the early fourth century BC: Hegesianax, Leos, Aristeides and Peirandrides. Yet Barron identified the monograms with

\textsuperscript{152} Detailed prosopographical analysis has revealed several other instances of personalised iconography on the symbols of the New Style coinage. These symbols will be discussed in greater detail in chapter 4: Thompson (1961), 603.
\textsuperscript{153} Barron (1966), 44-48.
\textsuperscript{154} Robert (1966), 68-78.
\textsuperscript{155} For example the case of Theokles, son of Pausanias at Chalceis: Knoepfler (1979), 165-188; cf. Meadows’ discussion of the symbols at Stratonikeia in Karia in the Hellenistic period: Meadows (2002), 130-131.
\textsuperscript{156} Thompson (1961), 546-556.
moneyers rather than die engravers, on the grounds that not all the dies marked with this symbol were produced by the same artist.\textsuperscript{157}

The recording of full and abbreviated names on Classical and Hellenistic coinages provides many opportunities for detailed prosopographical studies. Such work has provided invaluable insight for our understanding of the function of Hellenistic eponyms. For the sake of geographical continuity with the rest of this thesis I will concentrate on coinages from the cities which would later form part of the Province of Asia: the civic coinage of Priene, the coinage of the confederacy of Athena Illias and the wreathed tetradrachms of western Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{158} However, Thompson’s work on the New Style Athenian coinage remains the most comprehensive discussion of this topic and therefore this important coinage cannot be ignored. These studies suggest that in most cases the best explanation for the pattern of eponym citation was the existence of a monetary liturgy. There are alternative, but less satisfactory, theories regarding this phenomenon. Eponyms have been viewed as control marks indicating individual responsibility for the coinage in case of fraud.\textsuperscript{159} It has also been suggested that these names refer to the ‘eponymous magistrate’ of the city and thus they were nothing more than an elaborate dating formula, although the traditional model of eponymous magistracies must now be modified in the light of the work of Dmitriev and Weiss.\textsuperscript{160} Therefore in the rest of this section I will first examine the evidence for the rival theories and discuss their flaws as explanations for the

\textsuperscript{157} Barron (1966), 107.
\textsuperscript{158} The term wreathed tetradrachm is used to describe Attic weight tetradrachms distinguished by the wreaths of oak, ivy, olive or laurel surrounding the reverse type. Such coinages were struck at the mints of Athens, Chalcis, Eretria, Syros, Kyzikos, Abidos, Tenedos, Mytilene, Myrina, Aigai, Kyme, Smyrna, Lebedos, Kolophon, Magnesia, Herakleia under Latmos and Myndos during the second century BC. For a fuller discussion of the function and relationship between these issues see Le Rider (1999), 1318-1335.
\textsuperscript{159} Lenormant (1879), 38.
\textsuperscript{160} Robert (1966), 89; cf. Dmitriev (1997), 525-534; Weiss (2005), 57-68.
appearance of eponyms on contemporary coinage. Thereafter, I will set out the evidence for the liturgy model.

First, I will discuss the thesis of Robert that the eponyms on Hellenistic coinage played no part in coin production. In the case of the coinage of Athena Ilia Robert proposed that the eponyms referred to the ‘eponymous official’ of the confederation of Athena, the *agonothetes*. This led him to the flawed assumption that their function as a dating mechanism precluded the active involvement of the eponyms in the production of the coinage. None of Robert’s three main arguments in favour of his reconstruction can withstand careful scrutiny. The first is that coinage was a symbol of civic sovereignty and collective identity and therefore it would have been financed out of public rather than private funds.\(^{161}\) The second is that the formulae used in the imperial period to denote private contributions for the financing of coinage are absent in the Hellenistic period.\(^{162}\) The third is that there is significant agreement between the names of the eponyms, usually inscribed in full in the genitive case, and the names of those serving as *agonothetai*.\(^{163}\)

The argument that coinage was such an integral element of civic independence and autonomy that it could not possibly be financed by private donation is now to be firmly rejected. The prominent role played by liturgies in the financing of civic activity contradicts any notion that private financing was inimical to civic identity. The work of Martin on the coinages of the Thessalian cities under Macedonian domination has questioned the link between coinage and sovereignty and few would now argue as Robert

---

161 For example we know that Agathes was *agonothetes* for three years in a row and Robert, probably correctly, associates his coinage with his tenure. Theokydes is also known to have signed a coinage and served as *agonothetes* Robert (1966), 92-93. For a full prosopographical survey of these eponyms see Robert (1966), 67-82.

162 These formulae will be discussed in greater detail later in the chapter, but those cited by Robert as denoting private expenditure are παρά plus the genitive, διά plus the genitive, and the verb ἀνέδηκε: Robert (1966), 86. None of these formulae are found on the coinage of the Hellenistic period.

163 Robert (1966), 68-78.
did that coinage was a defining characteristic of the collective identity of the Hellenistic city.\textsuperscript{164} Robert’s second argument, namely that the formulae used to denote personal expenditure on imperial period coinage are absent in the Hellenistic period, cannot be dismissed so lightly, but it is still far from convincing. The details of the legend formula in use during the Roman period will be discussed in greater detail in the third section of this chapter. Nevertheless, if we look at the Roman evidence in detail we find that even eponyms signed in the genitive with preposition \textit{ἐπί (in the time of)} could be the result of private benefactions. Thus, it is unsafe to assume that Hellenistic coins without these formulae were not also the result of private munificence.

Not even Robert’s third argument based on the nature of eponymous magistracies can save his thesis. As Robert himself was at pains to emphasise, the coinage of Athena Ilias was not strictly a civic coinage. It was the coinage of a confederacy founded upon a shared cult.\textsuperscript{165} In this respect the prominence of these officials on the coinage is unsurprising. The \textit{agonothetes} was the official responsible for the organisation of the agonistic competitions that took place as part of the annual religious festival of Athena Ilias. Thus it was logical for the \textit{agonothetes}, the individual holding this position of responsibility in the confederacy to have frequently taken a particular interest in the production of the coinage in the name of the confederacy. The name of the office holder would have also provided the chronological context for the production of the coinage. Yet, this dating function would not have precluded the \textit{agonothetes} from having a role in

\textsuperscript{164}Martin (1985); the mint of Askalon in the southern Levant provides an excellent case study of the complex relationship between coinage and sovereignty in the Hellenistic period. On gaining its independence from Seleucid control Askalon produced a coinage in 104/3 BC with the legend ΑΣΚΑΛΩΝΤΩΝ ΙΕΡΑΣ ΑΣΥ ΑΥΤΟ (\textit{of the Askalonians, holy inviolate and autonomous}). Thus the legend of the coinage celebrated Askalon’s civic status. However, this change in civic status did not prevent the city from placing a Seleucid royal portrait on the obverse, probably to facilitate acceptability in the region: Meadows (2001), 53-63.

\textsuperscript{165}Robert (1966), 88.
supervision or even paying for the production of the coinage, although in this case their precise role in coin production must remain obscure. The prominence of the agonothetes is therefore to be explained in terms of their particular importance within the religious structures of the confederacy as well as in chronological terms. Moreover, as Gauthier has rightly emphasised, a significant number of these coins give two names in the genitive. In such cases it is possible that we are dealing with two agonothetai sharing the same office, but there is no evidence to support this supposition. These names could represent a single eponym with a patronymic or even two separate eponyms. If these names do represent two separate individuals, it is probable that we are dealing with non-agonothetai signing the coinage. Thus, we cannot be certain that all the eponyms on these tetradrachms were actually agonothetai or even magistrates.

Involvement in the production of coinage by non-magistrates may not have been unusual in the Hellenistic period. In the case of the stephanephoric coinage of Magnesia on the Maiandros Jones was able to discount the possibility that coinage was an extraordinary extension of the duties of one of the regular civic magistracies. Some of the eponyms mentioned on these coins did reoccur in the epigraphic record of the city. Yet Jones was unable to find instances where the paired eponyms held a dual magistracy contemporaneously. Thus Jones felt compelled to explain the eponyms in terms of a monetary liturgy (a task completed on behalf of the city by a wealthy citizen at his own expense). Regling had reached a similar conclusion about the eponyms of Priene from 330 BC to Augustus. Regling identified sixty eponyms for this period. Yet, when he compared

166 Gauthier (1975), 174.
167 Apollodoros is recorded as holding the office of eponymous stephanephoros and Euphemos Pausaniou was neokoros of Artemis Leukophryene: Jones (1979), 81.
168 Jones’ die-study of these issues revealed the extent of concurrent obverse die sharing between the paired magistrates: Jones (1979), 81-2.
this list with the list of sixty known contemporary stephanephoroi, the ‘eponymous’ magistrate of the city, he could find only fourteen matches.\textsuperscript{169} Moreover many of these homonyms could not have been the same person.\textsuperscript{170} As coin production at Priene was irregular, eponyms cannot be explained in terms of a regular monetary magistrate. Regling reluctantly concluded that names on the coinage of Priene must refer to a liturgy or epimeleia.\textsuperscript{171} If we look at the other wreathed coinages from Ionia and the Aeolis we find that the number of eponyms per annum is too high for a model based upon a annual magistracy.\textsuperscript{172}

However the most detailed prosopographical study of eponyms remains Thompson’s work on the Athenian New Style coinage. The eponyms of the Athenian New Style coinage are of particular interest because of their particularly complex organisation. In the period from 168/7 to 121/0 BC (according to Thompson’s chronology) three eponyms are mentioned on each coin.\textsuperscript{173} The first two names are the so-called annual ‘magistrates’, whose names are found in first and second positions on the dies of a single year’s emission.\textsuperscript{174} In addition to these there is often, but not always, a third eponym.\textsuperscript{175} The third eponym differs from the first two eponyms in that more than one served per annum, but the number of third eponyms varied from year to year. According to Thompson

\textsuperscript{169} Regling (1927), 156-8.
\textsuperscript{170} For example the name of a third century stephanephoros appears on a coin dated to the first century BC: Regling (1927), 166.
\textsuperscript{171} Regling (1927), 165-166.
\textsuperscript{172} The stephanephoric coinages of Myrina, Kyme, Magnesia on the Maiandros and Lebedos have all been dated to the period 160-140 BC. In the case of Myrina, Sacks dated the wreathed issues of Myrina, which bears at least 46 different monograms, to the period c. 155- c. 145 BC; on average this represents five monograms per year. Furthermore from the evidence of his die study, Sacks concluded that the number of monograms varied from year to year: Sacks (1985), 17-18.
\textsuperscript{173} For objections to Thompson’s absolute chronology see Lewis (1962), 275-333.
\textsuperscript{174} Thompson (1961), 547-584.
\textsuperscript{175} For example the magistrates Demetrios and Agathippos coin without a third magistrate for six months and Xenokles and Harmoxenos never coin with a third magistrate: Thompson (1961), 592-593 (Plate XIII. 6).
between the years 168/7 and 142/1 it was normal for 10-14 third eponyms to be employed per year, while between the years 141/0 and 121/0 there were usually between 3 and 9 third eponyms.\textsuperscript{176} We know also that the duration of office for the third eponyms was subject to significant variation.\textsuperscript{177} How does one explain this seemingly random assortment of names? The pattern for third eponyms is so erratic that it cannot be rationalized into a system of regular rotation of specific magistrates. Thompson is surely correct to argue that this apparent chaos is best understood in terms of a liturgy. The varying number of eponyms may be explained as reflecting the number of individuals sharing the financial burden for the production of the coinage.\textsuperscript{178} In this scenario the permanent annual eponyms would have carried most of the financial burden, and the number of third eponyms would reflect the number of supplementary contributions by other individuals during that year.\textsuperscript{179} In this case the ‘annual’ eponyms may have served to provide a chronological reference point for the issue, but in cases where the citations of liturgists was less regular the primary purpose of the liturgist could not have been chronological.\textsuperscript{180}

The scale of the financial burden associated with individual issues may have varied between mints. In some places liturgists may have assumed the full cost of coin production, including sourcing the bullion. In other cases liturgists may have only defrayed part of the production costs. Recent work on the wreathed coinages emphasises the extent of Attalid influence, thus raising the possibility that at least part of the bullion may have

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{176} Thompson (1961), 590.
\item \textsuperscript{177} Thompson (1961), 591-592.
\item \textsuperscript{178} Kroll came to the same conclusion in his study of the tetrobols of Kos: Kroll (1964), 81-117.
\item \textsuperscript{179} Thompson (1961), 594-5.
\item \textsuperscript{180} This is certainly the case for Myrina, which produced 46 monograms at irregular intervals in a ten-year period (c. 155- c. 145 BC): Sacks (1985), 17-18.
\end{itemize}
been sourced from royal reserves.\textsuperscript{181} Even so the free status of the Anatolian cities striking wreathed issues and the number and scale of the eponyms indicates that we are dealing with local liturgists rather than royal officials and therefore it is not impossible that these individuals absorbed at least some of the production costs.\textsuperscript{182}

Prosopographical analysis offers invaluable evidence for our understanding of the relationship between and eponyms and liturgists in Hellenistic Athens. However, since Thompson’s absolute dating has been questioned, it is unsafe to follow her prosopographical conclusions uncritically. Lewis has argued convincingly that Thompson’s absolute dating of the New Style coinage, from 196/5 to 88/7 BC, is thirty years too high.\textsuperscript{183} Lewis’ prosopographical arguments for the revised chronology are compelling.\textsuperscript{184} To give just one example Thompson dates the issues of king Mithradates

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{181} The arguments for the association of the wreathed coinages with Attalid financial support for the usurper Alexander Balas in Syria have been set out by Hoover and MacDonald: Hoover and MacDonald (1999-2000), 115-116. More recently the association of the wreathed coinages with specific need to finance the campaigns of Alexander Balas has been challenged by Meadows. However, De Callatay’s (forthcoming) study of the scale of the wreathed coinages in comparison to contemporary royal minting indicated that production was too large for civic mints. Thus Meadows felt compelled to conclude that the bullion was primarily drawn from royal supplies: Meadows (forthcoming).

\textsuperscript{182} The scale of the cost of silver coin production in this period is unclear and our only significant evidence in this area relates to the fourth and fifth centuries. In 336 BC the Delphic Amphictyon paid the argyroko\(\underline{\text{p}}\)os (mint master) 2 talents, 15 minas and 25 staters (c. 2 % of the total material coined) for re-striking silver from the treasury into new coin: Melville-Jones (1993, 2007), no. 212, Kroll (forthcoming). The fifth century Athenian coinage decree outlined a charge for the re-striking old coin and bullion. However, the section of the decree relating to the size of the fee per one hundred drachma is damaged: for the restoration of a 3 % fee see Meiggs and Lewis (1969), 113 and Figueira (1998), 242-244, 359-362), for the figure of 5% see Melville-Jones (2007), 69. Moreover, we cannot be sure whether these Athenian charges simply reflected the production costs or were intended to provide a profit for the Athenian treasury. Therefore it is unprofitable to speculate on the extent of the financial contribution of each individual liturgist.

\textsuperscript{183} The date of the beginning of the Athenian New Style coinage has been the subject of a long running controversy. For a non-exhaustive list of the literature on this subject see Lewis (1962), 275-333, Mattingly (1971), 26-46 and (1990), 67-78. For the arguments in favour of the high chronology see Thompson (1962) for the defence of the high chronology and Mørkholm (1984) 29-42 for an attempt to resolve the two chronologies. For concerns about elements of Thompson’s relative chronology see De Callatay (1992), 12.

\textsuperscript{184} In the past the most potent obstacle to total acceptance of Lewis’ chronology is that it involved the re-dating of the coinage of Aesillas, who over-struck an Athenian New Style type of Demeas/ Kallikratides. The Aesillas coinage was itself dated by its relationship to the three other Roman silver types of Macedonia. One type has the obverse legend CAE. PR. MAKEAUNQ and the reverse legend: AESILLAS Q. The second type is identical to the first type, except that it has no obverse legend. The third type is die-linked to the second type and has the reverse legend SVVRA LEG. PRO Q. This Sura has been identified with the Q.
and Aristion (with the addition of the Pontic star between two crescents symbol) to c.121 BC, while Lewis attributes the issue to 87 BC. The latter dating is by far the more convincing of the two. There is no supporting evidence for a benefaction to Athens by King Mithradates V of Pontus during the late second century, but the coin fits the historical circumstances of 87 BC perfectly. In this year Aristion served as tyrant of Athens on behalf of Mithradates VI, and so the production of a coinage in the name of Mithradates and his tyrant is readily comprehensible. Nevertheless, Lewis’ new chronology does not seriously undermine Thompson’s thesis that the eponyms of Athens were in fact liturgists. At no point does Lewis call into question the existence of a monetary liturgy at Athens. His alternative prosopographical suggestions certainly provide no shortage of wealthy men able to fulfil such a role.

Gauthier has proposed a slight modification to Thompson’s thesis. He is content that the full names on the New Style coins represent liturgists, but during the first fifteen years of the Athenian New Style coinage the names of the eponyms are not given in full, but are in fact represented by monograms. He argued that these early monograms could not

---

185 Lewis (1962), 276.
186 For example Euagion appears on the coins of 106/5 BC. He was epimeletes of Delos 135/4 BC and contributed to a theatre repair fund on behalf of his family. Timostratos, the son of Aristion was a member of the great dramatic family of Phaleron IG II², 2452. 42 and is recorded on the coins of c. 101 BC, along with Poses, who was gymnasiarches on Delos at around the turn of second and first centuries BC. Dionysios was in charge of the Delian market in 98/7 BC and was a coin eponym in 96/7 BC: Lewis (1962), 292-293, 289-290. For further evidence of the wealth and prominence of the eponyms on Athenian New Style coinage see Mattingly (1971b), 34-43.
represent a monetary liturgy, because the meaning of monograms is difficult to decipher and if people were unable to identify the liturgists, what prestige could be derived from this ‘honour’?\textsuperscript{187} Thus for Gauthier the use of monograms on coinage is more consistent with the indication of supervision of production, as opposed to any expenditure on the part of the eponym. Gauthier cited the monograms so common on Seleucid and Ptolemaic royal coinages as evidence for his argument. The individuals represented by these monograms are usually thought to be officials charged by the royal authorities to organise and supervise the production of coinage.\textsuperscript{188} Nevertheless Thompson has provided a perfectly adequate explanation for the change from monograms to full or abbreviated names. She sees the change to full names as evidence for the desire for the liturgists to have their contribution to the state recognised.\textsuperscript{189} In this way the monetary liturgy shifted from being a responsibility to being an honour. Yet Gauthier was not totally convinced by this explanation and insisted that if the legends on the New Style Athenian coinage were honorific, then the eponyms would have been named in full from the beginning.\textsuperscript{190} He saw this change in terms of a subtle shift in the nature of the production of coinage from an informal responsibility to a financial burden, as over time it became common for these officials to contribute towards the cost of the coinage; thus the supervision of the coinage

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{187} Gauthier (1975), 177-8.
\item\textsuperscript{188} Gauthier (1975), 175.
\item\textsuperscript{189} Thompson (1961), 595.
\item\textsuperscript{190} Gauthier (1975), 178; some indication of the function of monograms on royal coinages is provided by the case of Soloi in Kilikia. In 197 BC the mint of Soloi was wrested from Ptolemaic control by the Seleukid King Antiochos III. Many of the same monograms found on the final Ptolemaic issues appear on the first Seleucid coins from this mint, indicating that some of the officials responsible for the Ptolemaic coinage must have been retained by the incoming Seleucid authorities: Lorber and Kovacs (1997), 92-9. However the precise function of the monograms on the Hellenistic royal coinages is a complicated topic and so cannot be discussed in greater detail in this thesis, for a fuller discussion of this field see Le Rider and De Callataÿ (2006), 58-60.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
evolved into a full liturgy. However Gauthier’s explanation requires that eponyms meant different things in different periods of coin production. It is surely a more attractive to assert that the eponyms had a consistent meaning throughout the lifespan of the New Style coinage and that the only change was in the honour associated with the liturgy. Moreover the assumption that a monogram could not denote a liturgy is undermined by the random distribution of the third eponyms on the New Style coinage. If these names and monograms represented mint officials, one would expect the citation of officials to have been more regular.

The suggestion that coin eponyms functioned as marks of quality control of the may also be refuted. According to this theory the signature of the eponym would act as a mark of purity, certifying that the silver content of the coin had not been adulterated. The adulteration of coinage was certainly a concern in the Graeco-Roman world. The famous treaty between Mytilene and Phokaia stipulated that the individual responsible for the mixing of the electrum coinage was to be held legally responsible in both cities (IG XII 2, 1). Moreover Diogenes Laertius account of the life of Diogenes of Sinope records that Diogenes was forced to go into exile because either he or his father had adulterated the coinage: ‘παραχαράξαντος τὸν νόμισμα’ (VI. 20-21). Bellinger has rightly questioned the extent to which the inclusion of eponyms on coins would have been an effective countermeasure to fraud. He argues that in any case it would have been too risky for a civic official to tamper with the coinage; either adulterating the metal, manufacturing

---

191 Gauthier justifies this argument by emphasising the extent to which the boundary between ‘magistracies’ and ‘liturgies’ was blurred. It is certainly true that by the Hellenistic period magistrates often benefited their city by performing their duties ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων (from their own funds) and thus magistracies began to resemble liturgies more closely; Gauthier (1979), 178.
192 Lenormant (1879), 38.
underweight flans or producing silver coated copper coins instead of pure silver. All of these potential frauds would have required the connivance of the mint workmen, as was allegedly the case with Diogenes ἀναπείσῃναι ὑπὸ τῶν τεχνιτῶν (VI. 20). Two further compelling objections to the quality-control hypothesis also present themselves. The first is that it cannot satisfactorily explain the extremely complicated system of naming eponyms found on the New Style coinage of Athens. If individuals were to be held to account for the quality of coinage produced in their name one would expect that fewer eponyms would be named and that each eponym would serve a set term of office. Thompson’s liturgy theory is a far more satisfactory explanation of this phenomenon. The second and more compelling reason is that mint eponyms are also found on contemporary bronze coinage. Bronze denominations were fiduciary by nature and so their metal content was completely unrelated to their monetary value. The adulteration of such coins would have served no purpose. In addition it is likely that the case of Mytilene and Phokaia was exceptional. The manufacture of an artificially produced alloy of gold and silver would have provided greater opportunity for fraud by reducing the gold content. It must also be emphasised that the electrum coinage of Mytilene and Phokaia did not carry the names of eponyms.

The evidence from Priene, Athens, Myrina and Magnesia would indicate that many Hellenistic eponyms were liturgists honoured for their role in the production of coinage. However both the Athenian New Style coinage and the wreathed tetradrachms of Magnesia were silver denominations. Indeed all the types hitherto discussed in this section were precious metal pieces in either silver or electrum. Were the names of eponyms

---

194 Bellinger (1958), 16.
195 *BMC* Ionia 1-77, *BMC* Lesbos 1-22: however, the fifth and fourth century electrum coins of Mytilene and Phokaia are noticeable for frequently changing obverse and reverse types, thus it is possible that individual eponyms were distinguished by their types rather than their signatures: Kroll (1981), 4.
inscribed on the contemporary bronze coinage intended to convey the same message or
were these names simply intended to act as a dating formula? For Mørkholm the
proliferation of names is best explained as a dating mechanism.\textsuperscript{196} However, Mørkholm’s
reasoning that the provision of a fiduciary low value coinage, which may have been
profitable for the city, could not have constituted a liturgy is surely untenable.\textsuperscript{197} There is
compelling epigraphic evidence indicating that the production of bronze coinage was not
managed significantly differently than precious metal coinage. The famous inscription
from Sestos, honouring Menas for his many services for his city, records that he was
personally responsible for the production of a bronze coinage (OGIS 399). Menas and his
colleague completed this \textit{epimeleia} and are described as having discharged this and other
benefactions with justice (\textit{dikiosunes}) and love of honour (\textit{philotimian}) (Il 48-9). What this
phraseology actually means in terms of the production of coinage has been the subject of a
lively scholarly debate. Von Fritz placed particular emphasis on the sentence \textit{την καθήκονσαν... ἐπιμέλειαν} (Il. 47). He argued that that term \textit{epimeleia} carried technical
significance and should be related to the occasional appearance of the participle
\textit{ἐπιμεληθείς} on the provincial coinage of Asia in the Roman period. Thus this term
\textit{epimeleia} should be understood as “\textit{die sorge für das Münzwesen als Kommissorium ohne Titel}”(The concern for the coins as commissioner without title).\textsuperscript{198}

However, Jones has argued that in this context the term \textit{epimeleia} had no
particular technical resonance and should therefore be translated as “care” or
\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Mørkholm (1991), 32-33.
\item Mørkholm (1991), 32.
\item von Fritz (1907), 1-3.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
“diligence”. For Jones Menas’ involvement with the coinage can only be understood in terms of being a liturgy, because in line 49, immediately after the inscription has finished discussing the coinage, the phrase ἐν τε ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀρχαῖς καὶ λειτουργαῖς (in the other magistracies and liturgies). For Jones the position of this clause within the inscription must refer to the contents of the preceding clauses. Since Menas’ involvement with the coinage cannot be characterised in terms of magistracies, he must have performed this task as a liturgy. Of the two interpretations, that of Jones is marginally more convincing on textual grounds. However, such debates about semantics fail to further our understanding of what Menas actually did in respect to the coinage. Whether the actions of Menas were officially termed a liturgy or an epiemeleia is likely to have had no influence on the practicalities of producing coinage. The phrase τὴν καθήκουσαν.... ἐπιμέλειαν is vague and contributes little to the analysis of Menas’ exact involvement in the process of the production of coinage. In particular, this phrasing does not mention whether Menas and his colleague’s contribution to the production of coinage extended to the complete or partial financing of the coinage from his personal funds. Robert used this silence to argue that Menas and his colleague did not contribute financially to coinage production. For Robert the absence of concrete evidence for this practice in the case is proof that the concept of a ‘monetary liturgy’ is a modern fallacy. Nevertheless, this very literal reading of the text is unsatisfactory. Menas’ service in supervising the coinage should be read in the context of his entire civic career. Menas was a wealthy member of Sestian society and undertook many services and benefactions on behalf of the state. The list of his financial contributions

---

199 Jones (1979), 85.
200 Jones (1975), 85.
201 Robert (1973), 52.
to the welfare of his homeland are numerous and a non-exhaustive list includes remitting hardships on embassies (lines 5-6), paying his own expenses as a priest of Attalos (lines 27-30), remitting the cost of a crown dedicated to him by the ephebes and neoi (line 42) and paying for a bronze dedicatory statue (line 104). Menas is also described as ‘having spared no expense’ in his service for his state οὐτε δαπάνης καὶ χορηγίας οὐδεμιᾶς φειδόμενος (line 4). Thus Menas certainly possessed the means to pay for the production of coinage. In addition Jones’ careful analysis of the text demonstrates that Robert’s argument from silence cannot be conclusive. In the course of his first gymnasiarchy Menas spent liberally, for example Menas paid for some construction work on the gymnasium and staged sumptuous games and sacrifices, but these are not mentioned in the lines dealing with his first gymnasiarchy (lines 30ff). In fact these benefactions are only mentioned in connection with Menas’ association with a crown and the dedication of τὰ ὀπλα (lines 42 ff).202 In this context it is unlikely that a benefactor as generous as Menas would have used state funds to furnish a coinage for the Sestians, which, in comparison to his other benefactions, is unlikely to have represented a heavy financial burden. Certainly the formula καθήκουσαν.... ἐπιμέλειαν does not preclude the possibility that Menas paid at least in part for the production of the coinage.

The irony of the Sestos inscription is that no Sestian coins signed by Menas are known. This in itself is not problematic. Jones has argued convincingly that OGIS 399 itself holds the key to understanding this paradox. In other cities the inscription of the name of the eponym so prominently on the coins themselves may have been considered a sufficient honour. The coinage of Sestos did not carry the names of eponyms and therefore

202 Jones (1979), 87.
some alternative means to record Menas benefaction was sought. In this case his role in respect to the coinage was included in an honorific inscription recording his many services for the state.  

203

The Meaning and Significance of Coin Eponyms in the Roman Imperial Period

A) The form of early Julio-Claudian coin legend formulae

Many of the practices of eponym citation dominant in the pre-imperial period continued into the Augustan epoch. The names of the majority of eponyms are rendered in the nominative, often augmented by a patronymic. If we take the example of the cities of the conventus of Pergamum listed in RPC I, we find that of the five cities who minted during the Augustan period, Methymna, Mytilene, Chios, Pergamon and Elaia, all but one, Elaia, has coins signed by an eponym in the nominative case.  

204 In some cities there are so many nominative eponyms that it is likely that they represent boards of officials associated with the production of coinage. In some cases it can be established that issues carrying the names of several different eponyms were struck at the same time. The Augustan coinage of Hierapolis (in the conventus of Kibyra) may be divided into a series of short issues bearing the names of a large number of eponyms. The first group carrying the obverse portrait types of Augustus and Fabius Maximus, the proconsul of Asia may be dated to c. 10-9

203 Jones (1979), 88.

204 Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 396-409; however the coinage of Elaia already used the ἔπι + genitive formula in the Augustan period (RPC I 2398-2400).
The second group, dating to c. 5 BC, displayed six eponyms. Group III was signed by five eponyms c. 5 AD. The number of die-links confirms that these three groups constitute three separate and short-lived issues. All the eponyms of group II share the same obverse die and seven of the five issues of group I share the same obverse die. Who were these individuals and why were they striking coinage at the same time? Two possibilities present themselves. The first is that these eponyms represent the boards of magistrates, who were charged with supervising the coinage. However, while such an explanation remains plausible, the evidence does not prevent the identification of these eponyms with boards of liturgists as suggested by Harl. It is known that more than one grammateus held office in Hierapolis simultaneously and that several eponyms of the Claudian and Neronian periods were grammateis (M. Suillios Antiochos AD 50-4 RPC I 2969-2970 and Pereitas c. AD 55 RPC I 2974), but only two of the Augustan eponyms are recorded as holding this office on the coinage (Dryas RPC I 2940 and Lollas Lollou RPC I 2954) and one eponym of group III is described as being archon for the second time (Diphilos Diphilou RPC I 2955).


206 Featuring the eponyms; Papias Apellidou, Kokos Pollidos, Diphilos, Heras Epaemetou, Attalos Meiichios and Lynkeos.

207 Iollas Iollou, Diphilos Diphilou, Meniskos Diphilou, Charopides Sostratou, Matron Apolloniou.

208 Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 481-482.

209 Boards of magistrates could play a role in the production of coinage during the Imperial period. The Augustan legends of the coinage of Antiocheia on the Maiandros bears the term ‘ΣΥΝΑΡΧΙΑ’ with the name of the eponym in the genitive (RPC I 2829-2836). Such a term should be translated as signifying the existence of a board of magistrates, but this legend is unique to Antiocheia and so it is very difficult to determine which magistracy is specified by this legend. However, other boards of magistrates are found minting together later in the imperial period. The city of Magnesia on the Maiandros named twelve grammateis on its coinage during the reign of Gordian III. A similar state of affairs was apparent at Magnesia under Elagabalus and Maximinus Thrax. Spoerri Butcher concluded that these issues were the result of relatively intense phase of minting and thus constituted simultaneous production by the individual members of the college of grammateis: Spoerri Butcher (2006), 47.


211 Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 481-482.
citation employed during the Hellenistic period are strong. Thus, although it is obvious that there must have been a high degree of cooperation between the individuals named on the coinage, the official capacity in which this cooperation took place is unclear.

A similarly complex pattern of eponym citation is visible on the Augustan coinage of Ephesos. This coinage displays the name of two eponyms in the nominative case. The first eponym may be paired with as many as six secondary eponyms, although some eponyms appear on their own. For example the *grammateus* Memnon is paired with Charixenos, Zopyrion, Theophilos, Theydas, and Nicholaos.\(^{212}\) Three of the first eponyms are described as being *grammateis*, Aristeas, Memnon and Aristion, but seven Augustan first eponyms mention no magistracies and Aschlas is described as being a high priest.\(^{213}\) Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès concluded that the first eponym was invariably the serving *grammateus*, who might also hold some other office: for example the *archiereus*. The eponym Alexandros on the Tiberian coinage is recorded as being *archiereus* and *grammateus* and so it was possible for one individual to hold both offices simultaneously (*RPC* I 2618-2619). The fact that some coins do not associate the eponym with the office of *grammateus* does not necessarily harm to Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès’ thesis. Several issues of Alexandros make no mention of the office of *grammateus* (*RPC* I 2613-2617). Even so, the absence of any indication of office for the majority of the first eponyms is possibly significant. The eponyms without any indication of office are the same denomination as those that do. Thus the difference in the legends cannot be ascribed to a lack of space. It remains possible to suppose that eponyms with no indication of office were not necessarily *grammateis*, but were non-magistrates often liturgists. In this scenario

\(^{212}\) Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 432.

\(^{213}\) Philon, Tryphon, Artemidoros, Heras, Konon, Apollonios and Artemas: Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 432.
the secondary eponyms would have been secondary contributors to the monetary liturgy. In cases where there are first eponyms, but no secondary eponyms, the former may have carried the full cost of the liturgy on their own.\textsuperscript{214} However, until further evidence comes to light no definitive identification of these individuals as boards of magistrates or liturgists is possible.

**B) The development and meaning of the \( \dot{e} \pi \dot{i} + \) genitive formula**

Over the course of the prevalence of Julio-Claudian era nominative legend formula went into decline and the \( \dot{e} \pi \dot{i} + \) genitive formula rose to prominence. The nature and speed of this change varied according to region and the process was not always uniform. The Sardian coins in the name of Augustus and Tiberius were signed by an eponym in the nominative case.\textsuperscript{215} From the reign of Nero Sardian eponyms tend to use the \( \dot{e} \pi \dot{i} + \) genitive formula (\textit{RPC I} 2997-3010). At the mint of Smyrna during the reigns of Augustus and Caligula all eponyms were rendered in the nominative case, usually with a patronymic.\textsuperscript{216} By the Claudian period the coins of Philistos and Eikadios were signed using the \( \dot{e} \pi \dot{i} + \) genitive formula (\textit{RPC I} 2475-77). Under Nero the coinage of Aulos Gessios Philopatris sees a return to the nominative (\textit{RPC I} 2478-2485 c. AD 54-9), but the later pseudo-

\textsuperscript{214} Such arrangements appear to have been short lived. The latest issue by a board of officials at Ephesos has been tentatively dated to the Tiberian period: Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 432. Thereafter eponyms are infrequently attested on the coinage of Ephesos. The evidence for boards of eponyms after the Julio-Claudian period is limited until the third century. One possible exception is the case of the Flavian coinage of Kotiaeion in which three eponyms sign coins under Galba and again under Vespasian, along with a new eponym Ti Klaudios Papylos (\textit{RPC I} 3222-3227 and \textit{RPC II} 1399-1409). The limited chronology of this series may indicate joint production. Moreover, the collective production of coinage appears to undergo a limited revival in the later third century, a revival limited to the Maiandros valley cities of Magnesia, Tralleis and Nysa. However, these eponyms were clearly members of a college of a specific magistracy, the grammateis: Harl (1981), 173-5.

\textsuperscript{215} Diodoros Hermophilou (\textit{RPC I} 2986), Damas (\textit{RPC I} 2987), Mousios (\textit{RPC I} 2988), Ioulios Kleon (\textit{RPC I} 2991).

\textsuperscript{216} \textit{RPC I} 2463-2473.
autonomous coins of Hermogenes and Scribonios Klaros use the \( \epsilon\pi\iota \) formula for Hermogenes (RPC I 2482-2485, AD 62-65). Moreover nominative eponyms were still found on later coinage. The Flavian eponym Aigaianos signed three denominations at Lebedos. The two largest were signed using the \( \epsilon\pi\iota + \) genitive formula, but the smallest denomination uses a plain nominative (RPC II 1049-1051). The mint of Kolossai continued to use nominative eponyms throughout the lifespan of the mint.\(^{217}\)

Nevertheless, by the Antonine period the \( \epsilon\pi\iota + \) the genitive formula was by far the most common legend formula, accounting for more than 90% of all such coin inscriptions.\(^{218}\) In addition to the name of the eponym it became increasingly common for coin legends to make reference to his or her civic office. Of the ninety-three eponyms from the reign of Gordian III only three do not provide any indication of office.\(^{219}\) What did the \( \epsilon\pi\iota + \) genitive formula actually signify and does this change offer valuable information relating to the evolution of the management of the production of coinage? The combination of this preposition with the genitive had temporal connotations and so it is clear that eponyms often fulfilled a dating function.\(^{220}\) However, as Weiss has recently demonstrated dating did not have to be the only function of coin eponyms.\(^{221}\) Any office could serve an eponymous function, particularly those relevant to the document being dated. This reconstruction is greatly strengthened by the numismatic evidence. In the short reign of Galba the city of Kotiaeion produced an issue of coinage bearing three eponyms in the \( \epsilon\pi\iota \)

\(^{217}\) BMC Phrygia il-li.
\(^{218}\) Heuchert (Thesis), 31 cf. Howgego (1985), 87 and Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 3 for the possibility that on occasion \( \epsilon\pi\iota \) may in fact be an abbreviation of the verb \( \epsilon\pi\iota\mu\iota\lambda\iota\eta\theta\iota\kappa\iota\alpha\varsigma\). 
\(^{219}\) Spoerri-Butcher (2006), 48-52.
\(^{220}\) See Heuchert for a discussion of cases where the signing magistrate does hold the ‘eponymous’ magistracy: Heuchert (Thesis), 24-26.
\(^{221}\) Weiss (2005), 57-68.
Moreover, these same eponyms reappear on the city’s coinage in the name of Vespasian (RPC I 1399-1406). This pattern is inconsistent with the model of a single annual eponymous magistrate.

Moreover in many cases the magistracy named on the coinage does not conform to the ‘eponymous magistracy’ traditionally assigned to the city. For example, during the Antonine period the coinage of Aizanoi is signed by a strategos, archineokoros, grammateus or a protos archon, all of whom were preceded by the preposition ἐπί. Thus, in this case ἐπί was used in conjunction with a wide range of offices and was not only used to denote the single eponymous official. If we take the recently catalogued provincial coinage of the years AD 238-44 as paradigmatic, we find that the eponyms from the cities of Kyzikos, Kolophon, Kyme, Pergamon, Phokaia, Stratonikeia on the Kaikos and Magnesia on the Sipylos all held the office of the strategos. Yet the strategos was not the magistracy traditionally considered to have been the local eponymous office in any one of these cities; epigraphers have long acknowledged such inconsistencies. In his catalogue of the eponymous officials of the Greek cities R. Sherk ignored numismatic evidence, because eponyms could also refer to ‘the man in charge of the mint or the local liturgist’. These individuals could not have been the official eponymous magistrate of the city and were therefore ‘false eponyms’. However, the fact that the ἐπί formula is so common on the provincial coinage of Asia must imply that coin eponyms served some chronological purpose. It is methodologically unsound to dismiss a valuable source of evidence because it does not fit our preconceived model. Of course, there are occasions

---

223 Heuchert (Thesis), 25.
224 Sherk (1990), 256.
were the office of the eponym does coincide with the ‘city eponym’. It has also been suggested that the primary motivation for the appearance of the archiprytanis on the coinage of Miletos was chronological.\(^{225}\) The archiprytanis was the office traditionally regarded as eponymous in the city. In the short reign of Gordian III Miletos is the only city to mention the office of the archiprytanis on its coinage and so the appearance of this magistracy cannot be explained in terms of a regional pattern.\(^{226}\) Thus it is pertinent to inquire whether we now have a case of a coinage dated by the ‘city eponym’, who had little to do with the production of coinage. Such a scenario is not impossible, but it is equally possible that the production of coinage at Miletus fell into the branch of government relevant to this particular magistracy.

On occasion two eponyms are found on a single issue. As we have seen the use of multiple eponyms in other media was not unusual. In such cases we see the hierarchy of eponyms formulated by Dmitriev in practice. According to this model each city possessed a ‘city eponym’, who could be used to date ‘the activity of city offices, who personally supervised different branches’. However, these other offices could be eponymous in the own right in their relevant sphere of administration.\(^{227}\) In most cases, where a single eponym is attested, it is probable that the eponym chosen was the one with most relevance to the coinage. Nevertheless, the co-existence of the ‘city eponym’ with other more specialised eponyms may help to explain the peculiar pattern of eponym citation found on the imperial coinage of Smyrna. Two local eponyms often sign the pseudo-autonomous coinage of the second half of the first century AD. One is usually cited using the ἐπὶ + genitive formula, the other is rendered in the genitive with no preposition, but with an

\(^{225}\) Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 3.
\(^{226}\) Spoerri-Butcher (2006), 51.
\(^{227}\) Dmitriev (1997), 534.
abbreviation of the office of *strategos*. It has been suggested that this unusual system may be explained by assuming that the ἐπί + genitive formula refers to the ‘city eponym’ (in this case the *stephanophoros*), while the *strategos* was the magistrate actually responsible of the production of the coinage. At first glance this reconstruction is quite attractive, because it would explain why the two eponyms are identified by different formula on the same coin. However, there is some cause for caution. Few of the eponyms prefaced by ἐπί are ever explicitly identified as *stephanophoroi*. The formula employed is simply ἐπί + the name of the eponym inscribed in the genitive, although comparison with the epigraphic record would indicate that the *stephanophoros* is still the most likely candidate for the office held by these eponyms.

The case of the issues in the names of Ti. Kl. Hieronymos and Ti. Kl. Sosandros indicates that the interaction between the two magistrates inscribed on the coinage was potentially complex. Series A, group a. is adorned with a wreath surrounding either ΕΠΙ ΤΙ ΚΛΑΥΔΙΟΥ ΙΕΡΩΝΥΜΟΥ or ΣΤΡΑ ΤΙ ΚΛΑΥΔΙΟΣ ΣΩΣΑΝΔΡΟΣ. The name adorning the obverse and reverse alternate so as to ensure that both eponyms are displayed equally prominently within the wreath. The fact that this series is carefully arranged to ensure that both the names of Hieronymos and Sosandros appear in the wreath reverse type would suggest some degree of equivalence between the two eponyms. However, in other cases the link between the production of

---

228 Klose (1987), 131-139.
230 *I. Smyrna* 731 (AD 80 and 82) and 775-9 all use the formula ἐπί στεφανηφόρου: a formula not used in the context of other magistracies. Moreover, the issues of the *stephanophoros* Kl. Proklos and *strategos* Kl. Bion, c. AD 100-105, use the abbreviation ‘ΣΤΕ’ for *stephanophoros*.
231 The variant legend ΕΠΕΙ is also known: Klose (1987), 131.
232 Conversely, Klose’s group b of these eponyms always mention the name of Hieronymous (with the ἐπί + genitive formula) on the obverse legend and the name of the *strategos Sosandros* on the reverse: Klose (1987), 135.
coinage and the ‘stephanephoros’ may have been more tenuous. The ‘stephanephoros’ Hermogenes and the strategos Skribonios Klaros are named on a series of coins struck between AD 62 and 65. On most of the reverse types of series B both eponyms are mentioned, but types 13 and 14 name only Klaros.\textsuperscript{233} This would indicate that Hermogenes was of secondary importance in respect to the coinage and his name could be easily omitted. The case of the gramma
teus Kouron from early first century Mylasa is very similar. This gramma
teus is mentioned on one of the issues in the name of Thlastos: ὉΛΛΑΣΣΟΣ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕΝ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΥΟΝΤΟΣ ΚΟΥΡΩΝΟΣ (RPC I 2793). Two other variants of this type are known which do not mention Kouron (2792 and 2794) and so Kouron’s actual contribution to the production of coinage must have been minimal. Indeed, the use of the term ἀνέθηκεν to describe the activity of Thlastos is indicative of a personal dedication on behalf of this individual. Kouron’s name is probably in the genitive absolute and therefore indicates the date of Thlastos’ benefaction: ‘when Kouron was gramma
teus.’

The evidence discussed hitherto demonstrates the complexity of provincial coin eponyms. Moreover, there is much surrounding this phenomenon remains mysterious, particularly in relation to the early part of our period. However, it is possible to draw several important conclusions from the evidence. Legends which mention the office of the eponym or used the ἐπὶ + genitive formula served a dating function. However, since all ‘magistrates’ could serve a ‘eponymous’ function, this need not preclude active involvement in the production of coinage. The evidence taken as whole would suggest that from the mid first century AD in most cases the eponyms cited on civic coinage were drawn from the relevant sphere of civic administration. The vast majority of coins cite just

\textsuperscript{233} Klose (1987), 227.
one eponym. In such circumstances it seems more likely that the eponym was the relevant
civic official, rather than the ‘city eponym’. This assumption is strengthened by the great
plethora of offices cited on the provincial coinage of the early first century AD. This level
of variety is indicative of a system whereby no particular magistracy incorporated the
responsibility for the production of local coinage, but rather the supervision of minting was
appointed on an *ad hoc* basis.\(^{234}\) From the Flavian period onward there is a clear trend for
the office of the *strategos* to supplant the other offices mentioned on the coinage.\(^{235}\) This
trend continued up until the end of provincial coinage in the latter part of the third century
AD.\(^{236}\) Furthermore, many of the cities, which cite offices other than the *strategos*, display
marked regional distribution. In the reign of Gordian III all but one of the cities located in
the *conventus* of Sardeis produced coinage signed by the *archon* or *protos archon*.\(^{237}\) As
we have seen the regional distribution of civic offices attested on coins often does not
coincide with the traditional ‘eponymous magistrate’ of the cities. Thus, it would appear
that coin eponyms were chosen according to localised structures of magisterial
organisation and responsibility. Not all the individuals cited on the civic coin legends of
the imperial period may have been magistrates, particularly in the early Julio-Claudians.
However, the pattern eponym citation in the Roman imperial period displays an increasing
emphasis on the link between eponyms and magistracies.\(^{238}\) These magistrates were
usually introduced by the *ἐπί* + genitive formula.

\(^{234}\) Howgego (1985), 85; such *ad hoc* appointments are hardly surprising given that Roman provincial
coinage was produced only sporadically.
\(^{235}\) Burnett, Amandry and Carradice (1999), 4-5.
\(^{236}\) See pages 18-20.
\(^{237}\) The cities of Daldis, Kadoi, Saittai, Sardeis, Tabala, Temenothyrai, Trajanopolis, the issue of Trajanopolis
is signed by the *grammateus*: Spoerri-Butcher (2006), 50.
\(^{238}\) Harl (1987), 28.
Why did the connection between the holding of civic offices and the production of coinage become so intimate? Harl has explained this change in terms of rising production leading to a need for superior mint organisation. It is true that from first century AD to the early third century AD there is marked increase in the number of active mints and the denominational and artistic complexity of the issues.\textsuperscript{239} However, the liturgical system was able to cope adequately with the large and complex wreathed silver coinages of Athens and Asia Minor. The reasons for the shift from liturgists to magistrates must lie elsewhere. In practical terms the repercussions of the change may have been minimal. By the late Hellenistic period the distinction between magistracies and liturgies had blurred as office holders began to defray the costs of their offices from their own funds.\textsuperscript{240} The absorption of an irregular \textit{leitourgios} into the sphere of a particular magistracy should be seen as part of this wider historical process. In the Julio-Claudian period office holders began to supervise the production of coinage as a liturgy, but over the course of this period certain offices holders became more frequently engaged in this task than others. According to this model the holders of particular offices eventually became more closely associated with coinage. This created the expectation that if a coinage was to be produced, the holder of this office, usually the \textit{strategos} or \textit{archon}, should supervise production. Local ties and connection would have also played a significant part in this process. The regionalised distribution of certain offices, particularly the \textit{grammateus}, suggests that arrangements for coin production could be influenced by the practice in neighbouring communities.

\textsuperscript{239} Harl (1987), 28.
\textsuperscript{240} Dmitriev (2005), 17-18; Jones (1940), 339-40; Quass (1993), 270.
C) Eponyms and the financing of coin production: the evidence of epigraphy and the ἄνεθηκεν formula

In the preceding section it has been argued that in most cases the eponym had some level of involvement in the management of the production of coinage as well as providing a date. Now we must ask ourselves whether this oversight extended to financing coin production from private resources. The difficulty in answering this question lies in the complete absence for evidence relating to the costs incurred by coin production. Such costs need not have been very great, but it remains impossible to express the cost of coin production in monetary terms. The production of coinage would have necessitated the financing of the bullion, dies and mint staff. Much of the work could have been done by unskilled public slaves and any forge could have served as the mint: Centralised workshops were in operation from the late second century, which would have provided a central source of dies and may even have struck coinage on request. This may have reduced production costs significantly. The level of obverse die sharing indicates that cost of obverse die production would have been reduced, although new reverse dies with individual ethnics would need to be cut for each city. It is entirely unclear how much, if any, of a new coin issue would have been made from fresh bullion. In many cases large

241 Harl has suggested that there is epigraphic evidence for the costs accrued for the withdrawal and replacement of an old local coinage: Harl (1987), 29. Opramaos, the early second century benefactor of the Lykian city of Rhodiaopolis was commended by the governor for providing 5,000 denarii ‘for the exchange of the coinage’ (‘εἰς τὴν καταλλαγὴν τοῦ νομίσματος’, TAM II 905, V E, 7-9). For Harl, the exchange of coinage refers to replacement of a worn coinage with new issues. However, the wording of this inscription does not support this interpretation. The term καταλλαγὴ is generally employed to refer to the exchange between different currencies, not a re-coinage: therefore, it is more likely that Opramaos’ benefaction was related to the temporary suspension of charges for money changing, although this situation is further confused by the fact that the funds promised for the coinage ‘exchange’ were soon diverted to help provide for annual distributions to the officials and members of the provincial assembly: TAM II 905 V H 5-13, VI B 10-15, VI E, 1-5.

242 Howgego (1985), 86.

243 Kraft (1972), 90-93.
quantities of old and worn coinage are likely to have been melted down and re-struck into new coin, a process which leaves no trace in the archaeological record. Bullion-processing costs may have been kept to a minimum by the re-striking of old flans.244

Slightly more may be said concerning the extent of private coin financing, although explicit references to private financing of coinage remain rare. In one instance the unusual legend of a Trajanic series from Lydian Tripolis (ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ Β ΕΧΑΡΑ(ΞΕΝ) ΤΡΙΠΟΛ, ‘Theodoros for the second time minted’) emphasises the personal involvement of the eponym so emphatically that it is difficult to imagine that he played no part in financing of coinage, but such explicit are very rare in comparison to the vast output of civic mints.245 In a limited number of cases epigraphy provides compelling evidence for private financing of coinage. Moschion, the Julio-Claudian period benefactor of the city of Magnesia on the Maiandros is recorded as striking bronze coins in the context of an honorific inscription dealing with his benefactions to the city (κατασταθείς δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς χαράξεως τοῦ λεπτοῦ χάλκου: I.Magnesia 164. 12-13).246 Since this inscription seems to treat the production coinage as just another (minor) benefaction of this prominent citizen, it seems likely that Moschion bore many of the costs associated with minting.247 Similarly, the case of Apollodotos Diodorou provides epigraphic evidence that eponyms could be responsible for the production of coinage and could also play some role in the financing of coinage (IGR IV.

245 BMC Lydia 56-59.
246 Schultz (1975), 22-25: of equal significance is the fact that at the time of Moschion (Julio-Claudian period) eponyms are rare on the coinage of Magnesia. Only the Augustan eponyms Mandrogenes (RPC I 2693-2694) and Euphemos (RPC I 2690-2692) are attested at Magnesia during this period.
247 For the nature and scale of these burdens see Howgego (1985), 86.
This inscription states explicitly that Apollodotos, as strategos, dedicated a monument at his own expense and that at the same time he struck coinage. The juxtaposition of these activities in the same commemorative inscription indicates that they both formed part of the same benefaction and it is therefore probable that Apollodotos covered the cost of coin production from his own resources. Yet when Apollodotos appears as an eponym on the coinage of Hyrgaleis, he is represented by the simple ἐπὶ + genitive formula.

Explicit epigraphic references to the production of coinage are rare and the evidence of the coin inscriptions themselves is often difficult to interpret. Nevertheless, the limited evidence available to us would indicate the vital role played by private munificence in the production of coinage. The Neronian silver coinage of Chios bears the legend ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ ΔΩΡΟΝ (gift of King Antiochos: RPC I 2415-2416). It is clear that this coinage was produced as a gift of King Antiochos IV of Commagene and was therefore financed with royal resources. Indeed, the unique ΔΩΡΟΝ legend may suggest that the issue formed part of a distribution of coinage made by the king to the people of Chios. Other eponyms are accorded honorific titles commemorating their munificence to

249 von Aulock (1980), 115-6 nos. 358-60.
250 Antiochos IV of Commagene is attested in several places on fragmentary inscription from Chios: Fraser (1978), 359-374. One fragment of this text reveals that the king made a donation of fifteen talents to the city during his tenure as stephanephoros on Chios (IGR IV 954). A second lesser gift of between 1000- 9000 denarii is also attested as coming from Antiochos (SEG XVI 490). It is possible that part of this first gift financed the silver coinage of Chios struck in his name. Even if this coinage was not connected with any of the recorded financial benefactions by Antiochos, his history of euergetism and the legend of the coinage implies that the coinage was financed by royal patronage.
251 Alternatively, Robert has suggested that the coinage could be associated with the summa honoraria payable by the stephanephoroi to the city on their elevation to office: Robert (1938), 138-141. However, the unique legend of the issue is more indicative of an act of unprecedented generosity.
their community. Such titles may have been earned in fields other than the production of coinage, but the contribution of a coinage would be consistent with their status as civic benefactors.

**The ἀνέθηκεν Formula**

Further indication of the significance of euergetism for coinage is provided by the development of the ἀνέθηκεν (x has endowed or dedicated) + the name of the dedicator (in the nominative case) formula. Alternatively, the same concept could be expressed by recording the name of the recipient of the dedication in the dative case, usually the relevant demos or a specific sub-set of the citizen body. The use of this particular verb to describe an act of civic munificence is not confined to coinage, but it is the standard formula in the epigraphic record for the dedication of public buildings and statutes, which were often financed by the munificence of wealthy benefactors. Therefore it is probable that ἀνέθηκεν possessed connotations of personal generosity. This formula was new to the coinage of the imperial period. The earliest examples appear on the coinage of Mylasa in Karia. The first instance is that of Thlastos, which RPC I dates to the period shortly after the death of Augustus. The second case is that of Klaudios Melas, who produced two large denominations, both of which bear the unusual legend: ΨΗΦΙΣΑΜΕΝΟC

---

252 In the Julio-Claudian period the titles son of the city (Aphrodisias), philopatris (lover of the fatherland, Dionysopolis, Prymnnessos) and euergetes (benefactor, Laodikeia) are attested on coinage: Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 3.
254 Weiss (2005), 63.
255 Weiss (2005), 62.
256 The obverse type is Augustus holding a wreath and sceptre in a quadriga, while the reverse type is the legend ΘΛΑΣΤΟΣ ἈΝΕΘΗΚΕΝ surrounded by a wreath. The fine obverse type helps to reinforce the impression of a dedicatory issue.
ΚΛΑΥΔΙΟC ΜΕΛΑC ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕΝ (Klaudios Melas having proposed dedicated: RPC I 2792). The same dedicatory formula is employed without a wreath on RPC I 2792 and 2794. Why Mylasa should be the first city to use this formula on its coinage is impossible to ascertain. It is possibly significant that eponyms are very rare on the subsequent issues of Mylasa. Thus when eponyms do appear on coinage of Mylasa they may have been intended to emphasise the unusual degree of personal responsibility for the coinage on behalf of the eponym. In such a context it is logical that the verb ἀνέθηκεν would be chosen to describe the activities of the eponym. Certainly Klaudios Melas not only dedicated the coinage, but he is also recorded as putting the proposal for the production of coinage before the boule.

Prior to the Hadrianic period the ἀνέθηκεν formula appears to have been confined to Mylasa. However, the reign of Hadrian witnessed a marked increase in the frequency and distribution of this legend. Under Hadrian ἀνέθηκεν is found on issues of the cities of Laodikeia, Adramytion, Hydrela, Smyrna, Kolossai, and Brouzos in Asia and is even attested in the province of Achaia on the coinages of Delphi and the koinon Achaion at Korinth. Why ἀνέθηκεν should enjoy such a marked increase in distribution

---

257 A variant of this legend is also known: ΘΛΑΣΤΟΣ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕΝ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΥΟΝΤΟΣ ΚΟΥΡΩΝΟΣ (RPC I 2793).
258 RPC II 1197-1198.
259 Akarca’s catalogue of the coinage of Mylasa records only one other eponym from the imperial period, Hybreas: Akarca (1959), 66-84. The reverse type of this issue was the legend ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΥΟΝΤΟΣ ΚΟΥΡΩΝΟΣ surround by a wreath (RPC I 2791). The prominence of the eponym on this type may indicate that, like the issues of Thlastos and Kl Melas, Hybreas was honoured for his role in the production of coinage.
during this period is difficult to determine. It is possible that in some contexts this process was related to the extraordinary honours paid to Antinoos, the favourite of Hadrian, after his death in AD 130. One of the types of Hostilios Markellos was not only dedicated to the Achaians by a priest of the deified Antinoos, but the coin itself depicted Antinoos on both its obverse and reverse types (ΟΣΤΙΛΙΟΣ ΜΑΡΚΕΛΛΟΣ ΙΕΡΕΥΣ ΑΝΤΙΝΟΟΥ ΤΟΙΣ ΑΧΑΙΟΙΣ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕΝ). These issues were clearly intended as a dedication commemorating the cult of Antinoos, which was served by the eponym himself in his capacity as priest. The combination of the legend and religious imagery communicated a coherent and very specific religious program relevant to the personal interest of the eponym. Other, but not all of the reverse types signed by Markellos shared the specific focus on the cult of Antinoos. Conversely, although Antinoos was also depicted on the obverse types of Aristotimos of Delphi and Gesios of Adramytion, the majority of these issues do not seem to have shared the specific religious focus of the issue of Hostilios Markellos. The sole exception is a reverse type of Aristotimos, which depicts a standing Antinoos. The reverse type of Gesios’ coinage at Adramytion was a seated Demeter

261 Blum (1914), 35-6 no. 1.

262 All the obverse types of Hostilios Markellos depicted a bust of Antinoos. The reverse types of Markellos displayed more varied iconographic motifs, but the theme of Antinoos was still prominent. Blum’s reverse type no. 1 depicted Antinoos standing to the right against a bearded ithyphallic herm holding a caduceus in his left hand. Blum no. 2 depicted an indistinct figure possibly Antinoos. Blum 3 (in the name of Korinth) depicted Helios riding in a biga wearing a radiate crown and holding a whip, A depicted Hermes holding Pegasus, B depicted a frontal temple with decorated facade, which is divided into two floors. Underneath the temple a crocodile is shown consuming a bird. C resembles B, but with the addition of two torches flanking the temple. D, E and F display rams: Blum (1914), 35-7. Markellos is also known to have dedicated an issue with an Antinoos obverse type to the Korinthians using the ἀνέθηκεν formula. The reverse type depicts Bellerophon restraining Pegasus, while holding a hoplon: CNG 69 June 8th 2005 lot 951.

263 The depiction of a base beneath the feet of Antinoos implies that the type depicted an actual statue, possibly one dedicated by Aristotimos himself. Thus it has been suggested that the ἀνέθηκεν on the coin referred to the object depicted on the coin and not the coin itself: Blum (1914), 62 cf. Howgego (1985), 86. However, the Bellerophon type uses the same formula and there is no indication that Hostilios was responsible for the dedication of a related sculpture. In general many of the types represented on coins using ἀνέθηκεν were drawn from the standard repertoire of local coin types; for instance the type showing two branches emerging from a lattice structure appears on the coinage ‘dedicated’ by Tiberios Klaudios Zelos at
with sceptre. Moreover the iconography of the *ἀνέθηκεν* issues from the cities of Laodikeia, Hydrela, Kolossai, and Brouzos are unrelated to the Antinoos cult. Therefore the desire to commemorate the deification of the Emperor’s favourite cannot have been the only impetus for the development and spread of the *ἀνέθηκεν* formula. The use of this specific terminology was undoubtedly linked to the concept of civic euergetism, but euergetism as a social phenomenon was certainly not an innovation of the Hadrianic period.

The relative popularity of the *ἀνέθηκεν* formula continued into the second half of the second century AD. During the Antonine period *ἀνέθηκεν* is attested in fifteen cities throughout the province of Asia: Alioi, Anineta, Aphrodisias, Attouda, Kolossai, Kyme, Hadrianoi, Laodikeia on the Lykos, Metropolis (Ionia), Philadelphia, Phokaia, Smyrna, Tabala, Temenothyrai and Tmolos Aureliopolis. Subsequently *ἀνέθηκεν* is attested at the cities of Brouzos, Otros, Apollonia Salbake, Dionysopolis, Kolossai, Tmolos Aureliopolis, Attouda and Laodikeia on the Lykos during the reigns of Septimius Severus and Caracalla. However, the use of *ἀνέθηκεν* appears to go into decline after the reign of Aphrodisias. Therefore the balance of evidence favours the interpretation that on most occasions it is the coinage itself being dedicated, although in some cases a coinage may have been part of a larger dedication. For example, an inscription from Hyrgaleis mentions that a certain Apollodotos set up a monument at his own expense as well as strike coinage. The fact that the two activities are mentioned in the same dedicatory text indicates that they were part of the same dedication: *IGR IV 769*.

265 For a discussion of the origins of euergetism see Veyne (1992), 85-156.
Caracalla. Under Severus Alexander ἀνέθηκεν occurs on the coinage of Neapolis by the Harpasos in Karia. Aurelios Makrianos uses this formula on an issue of Kolossai in the reign of Trebonianus Gallus, but this is the last known occasion in which this formula is attested.²⁶⁸ I am unaware of any other examples of this formula that post date the later third century AD, although the equivalent dative ethnic formula appears on an issue of Kyme from the reign of Valerian and Gallienus.²⁶⁹ The wider context for this decline was the general decline in Roman Provincial coinage during the last decades of the third century, which was itself the result of a change in the political and cultural outlook of the civic elites. Local notables were less willing to undertake expensive civic offices and benefactions on behalf of the wider community.²⁷⁰ As acts of euergetism became less common among the civic elites so did the practice of dedicating coinages at private expense.²⁷¹ In this way the dedicatory formula on coinage became obsolete.

The distribution of ἀνέθηκεν contrasts with other legend formulae, excluding the ubiquitous ἐπί + genitive, which tend to display limited geographical distribution, although such legends are still comparatively rare in respect to the total number of recorded coin inscriptions.²⁷² Since the majority of Asian coins did not incorporate this formula, it is necessary to analyse whether ἀνέθηκεν issues were financed and managed by means of exceptional procedures. In this respect the mints of Kolossai and Temenothyrai in Phrygia are of particular interest. Here the ἐπί + genitive formula never came to dominate. All the

²⁶⁹ For a case of the dative ethnic at Kyme, ΑΙΛ ΕΡΜΕΙΑΣ ΠΡΥΤ ΚΥΜΑΙΟΙΣ, see BMC Aeolis 154-160.
²⁷⁰ Jones (1940), 182-191.
eponyms were rendered in the nominative case throughout the imperial period and many eponyms also signed their coinage with the ἀνέθηκεν formula.\textsuperscript{273} This raises the possibility that the nominative case implied ἀνέθηκεν, even when the actual verb is omitted.\textsuperscript{274} The role played by private financing and euergetism in the production of coinage at these mints is clearly visible. Yet, in respect to most mints the ἀνέθηκεν formula was relatively rare and more often than not totally absent. Therefore must we conclude that private financing for coinage was correspondingly rare? It is apparent that in some contexts the practical differences between the ἐπὶ and ἀνέθηκεν formulae could be negligible. The name of Menophantos, a priest of Lydian Tabala, usually appears in the genitive with ἐπὶ, but one type renders the name in nominative with ἀνέθηκεν.\textsuperscript{275} The same is true of the Severan coinage of Ailios Pigres from Laodikeia, who uses the both the ἐπὶ and ἀνέθηκεν formulae in the same issue.\textsuperscript{276} In one instance at Tmolos Aureliopolis both the ἐπὶ and ἀνέθηκεν formulae are used in conjunction, but the Greek is confused, since ἀνέθηκεν requires a nominative subject. Thus no conclusions may be drawn from this example: ΕΠΙ ΣΤΡΑ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΟΥ ΜΕΝΕΚΡΑΤΟ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕΝ.\textsuperscript{277}

At other mints the situation may have been more ambiguous. At Smyrna two different eponyms use this formula, the sophist Polemon under Hadrian and Theudianos under Antoninus Pius. Yet the vast majority of the second and early third century coin

\textsuperscript{273} BMC Phrygia xlix, Heuchert (Thesis), 28.
\textsuperscript{274} The first two types in the name of Ktestikles from Kolossai (Heuchert 2282-3) employ ἀνέθηκεν whereas is it absent from the third (2284): Heuchert (Thesis), 27.
\textsuperscript{275} Heuchert 2557-60, 2654.
\textsuperscript{276} Head, BMC Phrygia lxx.
\textsuperscript{277} Heuchert 2461; the misspelling was probably a mistake on the part of the die cutter: Heuchert (Thesis), 27. The Apollonides the son of Menekrates (ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΟΣ ΜΕΝΕΚΡΑΤΟΣ), honoured in this legend may be synonymous with the Apollonides who appears under Commodus: ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΟΥ ΣΤΡΑ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ ΑΥΡΗΛΙΟΠΟΛΙΣ (Apollonidos strategos dedicated to the Aurelipolitans: Heuchert 2462-4).
eponyms of Smyrna are rendered in the ἐπί + genitive formula. Thus, it seems likely that in the specific context of Smyrna the ἀνέθηκεν formula had different connotations to the ἐπί + genitive formula, indicating an exceptional degree of interest on behalf of the eponym. At other mints Heuchert has noticed that few eponyms using the ἀνέθηκεν formula specify a particular magistracy. In such cases the ἀνέθηκεν formula may have been used to describe the supervision and funding of a coinage by a non-magistrate, when the ἐπί + genitive formula was commonly used to describe the activities of serving magistrates. However, this explanation cannot explain the pattern from Smyrna because both Polemon and Theudianos are described as strategoi on their coins, the strategos being the office of the vast majority of eponyms recorded from Smyrna. It remains probable that the precise connotations of each formula varied according to the political and social context of each city.

D) Eponyms and the financing of coin production: the evidence of the alternative formulae

Other formulae offer insight into the role of eponyms in the production of coinage. Such formulae often took the form of participles modifying the name of the eponym: εἰσαγείλαντος, ψηφισμένου, προνοηκέντος, ἐπιμελήκέντος and αἰτησέμενος are all attested on the Roman Provincial coinage of Asia. ἐπιμελήκέντος, which is best interpreted as ‘under the management of x’, and its synonyms appear very infrequently on the coinage.

---

278 For a full catalogue of the eponyms of Smyrna see Klose (1987), 73-4.
279 Heuchert (Thesis), 27.
280 Klose (1987), 64-75.
of Hellenistic and Julio-Claudian periods. At Chalcis in Euboea the eponym Kleonikos is augmented by the abbreviation ΕΠΙΜΕΛ and at Mastaura the legend ΑΘΗΝΑΓΟΡΑΣ ΧΑΙΡΕΟΥ Ο ΕΠΙΜΕΛΑΗΤΗΣ ΤΩΝ ΠΑΝ ΤΩΝ is attested (RPC I 1349-51 and 2673).\textsuperscript{281} The Mostene example is of particular interest because it refers to an office rather than a participle. Epimeletes denotes either a specially appointed commissioner with responsibility over a particular field or a regular magistrate.\textsuperscript{282} Thus in some cases the abbreviations of ΕΠΙΜΕΛ may in fact refer to the office of epimeletes. However, the linguistic affinities between the title of the office and the participle, particularly if the title refers to an ad hoc commission, indicates that both terms possessed connotations of the management of production. This is in marked contrast to the practice employed at the Roman mint in the Republican epoch, which possessed specific magistrates (the triumviri monetales) with oversight over the production of coinage. By the Flavian period the use of this participle and its cognates had become slightly more widespread. It is attested at four cities: Antiocheia on the Maiandros, Aphrodisias, Philadelphia and Kotiaeion, (RPC II 1217-20, 1222-4, 1328-9, 1337-9 and 1410-11). By the Antonine period it is possible to determine some regionalised patterns in the distribution of this formula. Attouda may have adopted ἐπιμελητός from the neighbouring cities of Antiocheia on the Maiandros and Aphrodisias. Similarly, G. Kl. Phlakkos of Eukarpeia (c. AD 147-61 Heuchert 2864-5) and the asiarches Kl. Pol(l)ion of Hierapolis (in the conventus of Apameia) (Heuchert 2855-2859 AD 161-9) may have followed the example of M. Ail. Apollinarios of Apameia Kibotos (their conventus centre: 2827-9 AD 138-41) in utilising the ἐπιμελητός

\textsuperscript{281} The reading of this legend has been a matter of dispute. Imhoof-Blumer read [Ἡ?]ΡΑΣ ΧΑΙΡΕΟΥ ΟΕΠΙΜΕΛΑΗΤΗΣ ΤΩΝ ΠΑΝΑΘΗΝ (AIΩΝ): Imhoof-Blumer (1897), 96 no. 3. However, the editors of RPC I followed the reading suggested by Head: BMC Lydia lxii.

\textsuperscript{282} For a discussion of epimeletai see Dmitriev (2005), 120.
This formula also continued into the Antonine period at Kotiaeion.\textsuperscript{283} The regionalised distributions of this formula are instructive. If this participle was intended to emphasise the role of the eponym as being something extraordinary, then one would expect that its distribution would be more widespread and random.\textsuperscript{284} Instead the pattern of distribution indicates the development of local traditions of legend formulation. Other formulae are attested at these cities during this period. At Philadelphia a Domitianic issue is signed with the legend ΕΠΙ ΛΑΓΕΤΑ ΤΟ Β, however the subsequent issue is signed by Phl. Praxeas with an abbreviation of ἑπιμεληθέντος (RPC II 1332-1339).\textsuperscript{285} In the Antonine Period the eponym Markos Oulpios Karminios Klaudianos of Attouda signed issues with at least three different legend formulae: ἀνέθηκεν, ἑπιμεληθέντος and διά + the genitive (διά is found on Heuchert 2150, 2152, 2154-2159, ἀνέθηκεν, 2151 and ἑπιμεληθέντος 2153). Karminios was responsible for at least two different issues, but in the first issue he signs with the ἀνέθηκεν and the διά + genitive formula. In the second issue both the

\textsuperscript{283} This formula is used on a pseudo-autonomous issue of Hermos II: Heuchert 2960.

\textsuperscript{284} It has been suggested that exceptional formulae such as ἑπιμεληθέντος and αἰτησαμένος may have been used in scenarios when the eponym did not hold a civic magistracy at the time of minting: Heuchert (Thesis), 31. In the Antonine period the coins from Hierapolis in the conventus of Apameia of the asiarches Kl. Pol(l)ion (Heuchert nos. 2855-9) bear the ἑπιμεληθέντος formula. However, the asiarchy was not a civic office, but the priesthood of the provincial imperial cult. The case of Ti. Basillaos from Phrygian Ankyra is more problematic in this respect, although these issues use the αἰτησαμένος formula: ΑΙΤΗΣΑΜΕΝΟΥ ΤΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΑΛΟΥ ΕΦ ΟΥΟΛΑΣΕΝ ΑΝΘΥΠΑΤΩ. It is possible that the ΕΦ in this formula signifies some otherwise unattested civic office, possibly ephebarches (magistrate of the youths: Weiss (1992), 169-70). However, it is disputed whether the ‘ΕΦ’ belongs to either the eponym (Basillaos) or the pro-consul (P. Volasenna). Howege suggested that the signified ‘Ephesos’ the principal residents of the Roman governor of Asia: Howege (1993), 202. More recently Weiss argued that the’ΕΦ’ cannot refer to the residence of the proconsul because the verb αἰτεσθαι does not take a dative object. Therefore the proconsular name in the dative must be a separate clause, possibly analogous to the Latin ablative absolute: Weiss (2000), 241. In the light of Weiss’ linguistic objections it seems likely that the ΕΦ does refer to the eponym, but it is still unclear which office is meant. Consequently it is impossible to rule out the use of such formulae by serving magistrates.

\textsuperscript{285} The Vespasianic issues of Kotiaeion all use the ἑπι + genitive formula, but in this case several eponyms were producing simultaneously: Burnett, Amandry and Carradice (1999), 214. Thus in the Domitianic issues of T. F. Sosthenes, ἑπιμεληθέντος could indicate a change from a board to a single eponym.
ἐπιμεληθέντος and διὰ formula are attested. It is difficult to imagine that the coins signed by the same person in the same issue would have been managed any differently depending on the formula. Thus, in this case the different legends either signify the same thing or each describes a different element of the same process. There is also reason to suspect that in some rare cases at mints where both the ἐπιμεληθέντος and ἐπί + genitive formula appear, the meaning of the two formulae may have become blurred. Therefore the preposition ἐπί may in some cases have been interpreted as an abbreviated form of the participle ἐπιμεληθέντος, thus such a formula would be impossible to distinguish from the standard preposition.286 This is possible in the case of G. Kl. Phlakkos at Eukarpeia (AD 147-151), who signs issues using both the ἐπί and ἐπιμεληθέντος formulae (Heuchert 28642871).

Προνοηθέντος appears only on the coinage produced in the name of the asiarchs and high priest of the Koinon Ionion, M. Kl. Phronton, for the Koinon Ionion. All of Phronton’s issues for the Koinon Ionion bear slight variations of the legend:
ΚΟΙΝΟΝ ΓΙ ΠΟΛΕΩΝ ΠΡΟΝΟΗ[ΘΕΝΤΟΣ] Μ ΚΛ ΦΡΟΝΤΩΝΟΣ ΑΣΙΑΡΧΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΩΣ ΓΙ ΠΟΛΕΩΝ (Heuchert 1516-28).287 The general meaning of this participle in this context is clear. Προνοηθέντος is derived from the verb προνοέω, which means ‘to foresee’, ‘to provide’ and ‘to take care’.288 In this case it is likely that the term either referred to Phronton having provided coinage for the koinon, or having taken concern for the production of coinage. If the latter sense is meant, then προνοηθέντος may have been

286 Howgego (1985), 87: however, at mints were the ἐπιμεληθέντος formula is not attested, ἐπί probably should simply be interpreted as the preposition. The abbreviation of a participle to a word in its own right would have held no special significance in a mint with no history of the ἐπιμεληθέντος formula.
287 See Head in BMC Ionia 1-2 and Howgego (1985), 87 for the restoration of προνοηθέντος.
288 For epigraphic examples of this verb from Asia Minor see MAMA VI 257 (mid 1st century AD Akmoneia).
an alternative for ἐπιμεληθέντος. Conversely, if the formula is interpreted as ‘to provide’, these specimens maybe viewed as commemorative issues produced for distribution among the Koinon Ionion and at Sardeis to celebrate Phronton’s role in presiding over a prestigious regional religious festival.

Aἰτησάμενος is perhaps the most controversial of these formulae, since the precise significance of this participle in this context has been the subject of lively scholarly debate. Robert initially interpreted aἰτησάμενος as signifying Roman imperial approval, either from the Emperor himself or from the local governor, for the production of local coinage. Such a formula would not be without parallels. The legend PER(MISSV) followed by the name of the governor or Emperor appears on the Latin language provincial coinage of several cities of Lusitania, Baetica, Africa and Syria. More recently, P. Weiss and J. Nollé compiled compelling evidence for the use of this term to denote the introduction of a proposal before the civic apparatus (the demos and boule). The editors of RPC I and II attempted to resurrect Robert’s thesis at least in part. They argued that the verb aἰτέω could refer to civic requests to the Roman governor or Emperor as well as to a request made to the local civic apparatus. However, this argument is unsatisfactory. The PER(MISSV) coinage of the Spain, Africa and Berytus always indicates the individual from whom permission to coin was sought and granted (either the Emperor, PERM DIVI AVG (Italica RPC I 64-5), or the governor PERMISSV L. APRONI PROCOS III (Paterna

---

289 Heuchert (Thesis), 32.
290 For further discussion of Phronon and his coinage see pages 122-125.
292 This legend appears on the coinage of the cities of Eboron and Emerita in Lusitania, the cities of Italica, Traducta, Patricia, Italica and Romula in Baetica, the cities of Paterna, Cercina and Thaena in Africa and the Roman colony of Berytus: Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 2.
The αἰτησάμενος coins of Roman Asia do not generally indicate the source of permission. The coinage of Ti. Basillaos of Phrygian Ankyra does give the name of the serving proconsul (ΑΙΤΗΣΑΜΕΝΟΥ ΤΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΛΑΟΥ ΕΦ ΟΥΟΑΣΕΝΝ ΑΝΘΥΠΑΤΩ). However, Weiss argued that the proconsular name is in the dative case and since verb αἰτέω does not take a dative, the proconsul cannot be the object of the verb. Even if one does not accept Weiss’s interpretation of the coin legend, the absence of references to either proconsular or imperial permission on all but one of the types citing the αἰτησάμενος formula is significant. It seems implausible that coin legends would not distinguish between local civic and imperial permission and so one must conclude that αἰτησάμενος referred to local permission in the vast majority of cases.

The participle αἰτησάμενος is indicative of the role of the local civic administration in the authorisation of minting. Nevertheless, to assume that only coins, which utilise the participle αἰτησάμενος, were authorised by the local boule and assembly would be a grave error. Αἰτησάμενος, in common with most alternative legend formulae, displays a limited pattern of distribution. Instances of this formula known to Robert were confined to Stratonikeia/ Hadrianopolis on the Kaikos in Mysia and Ankyra, Appia, Alia and Eukarpeia in Phrygia. Issues which carry this formula may not have been managed significantly differently from the coins bearing the ἔπι + genitive formula so ubiquitous.

---

295 The iconography of the smallest denominations of Ti. Basillaos, measuring 15 mm in diameter, is of particular interest. They depict a stèle in a field (RPC I 3113). It is possible that this stèle was intended to commemorate the actual stèle on which Basillaos’ request to the city was inscribed, or was at least intended to symbolise of Basillaos’ civic beneficence. An honorific stèle was depicted on the subsequent small denomination coinage of Ankyra, but this time with a distinct honorific crown. These later issues did not carry the name of the eponym and so cannot be explained as personal monuments. By this time the type may have become denominational marker, illustrating only indirectly the processes entwined with elite involvement in the production of coinage: Weiss (1992), 178-9.


elsewhere. Klaudios Kandidos minting at Stratonikeia/ Hadrianopolis signed his largest issues with the αἰτησάμενος formula, but his two smaller denominations with the ἐπί + genitive formula. Similarly, in most cases the use of the αἰτησάμενος formula cannot be identified with the opening of a new civic mint. This formula is attested on the issue of Phl. Sestyllianos, c. AD 161-2, at Stektorion’s, which was either the first or second issue attributed to the city. However, the same formula appears on the coinage of P. Kl. Max(imos) Markellianos at Antonine Eukarp eia, a mint known to have produced coinage during the Julio-Claudian (RPC I, 3159-60) and Trajanic-Hadrianic (e.g. BMC Phrygia 15: portrait coin of Sabina) periods. Nor does αἰτησάμενος appear to be confined to non-magistrates. Both at Appia under Trajan (Gaios Plotios Pollio) and at Stratonikeia on the Kaikos/ Hadrianopolis (Klaudios Kandidos) the eponyms are described as strategoi. It is likely that coinage followed the pattern found in relation to other types of elite benefactions. All civic coin issues were probably authorised by a decree of the local council (boule) and they may even have received the assent of the popular assembly (demos). The continued relevance of the demos in the formal process of civic decision-making is illustrated by a coin legend from Trajanic Ephesos: Ο ΝΕΩ[ΚΟΡΟΣ] ΕΦΕ[ΣΙΩΝ] ΔΗ[ΜΟΣ] ΕΠΕΧΑΡ[ΑΞΕΝ] (‘the neokorate people of the Ephesians minted’ BMC Ionia 223; SNG Aul 1884). Only in Phrygia, (rarely) in Mysia and once in Ephesos was it the practice to record intermittently this process on the coin legend.

The participle εἰσανγείλαντος is only attested on the issues of one Flavian eponym: M. Klaudios Oualerianos of Eumeneia, archiereus Asias (RPC II 1386-7). In the

---

298 Nollé (1993), 497.
299 Heuchert 2806 (AD 147-175) 2807-2812 (AD 161-2).
300 Robert (1960), 56-7.
301 Howgego (1985), 87; Weiss (2005), 62.
epigraphic record the term εἰσαγείλαντος refers to the act of announcing a proposal before the city. Thus, in the numismatic context the proposal placed before the city must have been the initiation of the production of coinage. Εἰσαγείλαντος would appear to be very close in meaning to the participle ἡφισαμένου found on the coinage of Klaudios Melas from Mylasa and Phl. Diomedes of Stratonikeia (all in Karia) and indeed the αἰτησάμενος formula discussed above. The variation in terminology reflects the vocabulary employed in the epigraphic context. For example εἰσαγείλαντος is attested in the inscriptions of Phrygia. However, the appearance of these participles on the coinage is surely connected to the predominantly Phrygian practice for recording the process of the petitioning of the civic authorities on the coinage. Why such a phenomenon should become so geographically concentrated is difficult to discern with any certainty. However, the theory of Weiss that once one city adopted such a practice, the limited circulation of local issues would have created a local fashion is most attractive.

Local fashion would also explain the distribution of the prepositions διά + genitive formula (through, by means of, arising from) or παρά + genitive formula (from). The former is attested only in the Karian cities of Attouda, Kidramos, Trapezopolis, Tabai and Apollonia Salbake and Laodikeia on the Lykos in Phrygia and Antandros in the

---

302 Weiss (1992), 175-6: for example of this term in context see MAMA VI 267. In this case the participle is used to describe the proposal of a motion to honour a citizen: [ . . . . . . γραφήματος το δεύτερον ἐπε[μεσκ] ἡ πόλις εἰσαγγείλαντος Ἀριστον[ο]ς τοῦ [— — —]. For the idea that the terms εἰσαγγείλια and εἰσήγησις were reserved for non-office holders see Magie (1950), 1504, n. 28.

303 Howgego (1985), 87.

304 Weiss (2000), 236-9; MAMA V 204 (Nakoleia). Variants of this formula are also attested in other regions: I.Milet VI. 3 1225. 5.

305 Weiss (1992), 179.
Troas. All of these cities, with the exception of Antandros, are notable for their relative proximity and by the Antonine period the cities of Kidramos, Attouda and Trapezopolis were all situated in the "conventus" of Alabanda. Attouda and Trapezopolis were particularly close and enjoyed the greatest degree of social interaction. The Antonine eponym Markos Oulpios Karminios Klaudianos is attested epigraphically at both cities and is known to have produced a "homonoia" issue celebrating the close relationship between these communities. Consequently it is unsurprising that διὰ is more commonly attested at the mints of Attouda and Trapezopolis than in Apollonia Salbake, Laodikeia and Antandros, where it occurs just once in each city. Conversely διὰ is relatively common on the coinage of Attouda and Trapezopolis, although neither of these mints were particularly prolific. Διὰ is rarely used in conjunction with a magisterial office, but the eponym Markos Oulpios Karminios Klaudianos is accorded the honorific title ‘son of the city’ and the Phlabia Arria was described as a priestess. This may indicate that the eponyms were not magistrates at the time of minting, but this is an argument from

306 Διὰ on coinage was largely confined to Karia, but the usage of this term to indicate personal responsibility was more widespread. I.Ephesos II 232 records the dedication made by the demos of Aizanoi to the temple of the Imperial Cult at Ephesos under Domitian. According to this text the dedication was made through (διὰ) the first archon Klaudios Menandros: Weiss (2005), 64.
308 Thonemann and Ertuğrul (2005), 75-86.
309 The legend ΔΙΑ [ Κ]ΑΛΛΙΠΠΟΥ is known from Apollonia Salbake (BMC Karia 9) and the legend ΔΙΑ ΚΟΡ ΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΙΔΟΥ appears on the coinage Laodikeia (AD 81-96, RPC II 1281-1296): Lenormant (1879), 119. For the case of Chairephanos in Antandros during the Flavian period see RPC II 907-9. This formula is far more common on the coinage of Kidramos. The eponyms Pamphilos under Hadrian Imhoof-Blumer (1890) 208 nos. 664-665, Polemon II Seleukou (Heuchert 2224-2225) Aretmas Polemonos (2226) and Seleukos Polemonos (2227) under Antoninus Pius sign issues with this formulae.
310 At Attouda the preposition διὰ can be associated with three eponyms: Menippos (Tranjanic BMC Karia 6-9), Kl Phlabia Arria (Septimius Severus, BMC Karia 10-12, 30) and Markos Oulpios Karminios Klaudianos (Heuchert 2150-2155, 2158-2160: Plate XXXIV. 1-9). At Trapezopolis the legends of the eponyms, T. Phl. Malusios, (BMC Karia 3), Po. Ai. Adrastos (BMC Karia 5) and Markos Oulpios Karminios Klaudianos (Heuchert 2167-2169: Plate XXXV. 3-5) are prefaced by διὰ.
311 Lenormant (1879), 120-1.
silence.\textsuperscript{312} Moreover, there is little to suggest that διά indicated special procedures for the production of coinage. As we have already seen, Markos Oulpios Karminios Klaudianos signed with the διά, ἐπιμεληθέντος and ἀνέθηκεν formulae over the course of just two issues, which may indicate a degree of equivalence between these three terms.\textsuperscript{313}

The preposition παρά enjoyed an even more limited distribution, confined to the Phrygian cities of Apameia Kibotos, Keretapa Diokaisaraia, the southern Phrygian Metropolis in the Chal Ova and Sibia.\textsuperscript{314} At Apameia παρά first appeared in the reign of Commodus (P. Ail. Tryphon and Stratonikianos: Heuchert 2840-2) and continued in sporadic use until at least the reign of Gallienus (\textit{BMC} Phrygia 195-196 AD 253-260). Elsewhere παρά was used very infrequently, under Commodus at Keretapa, once in the name of Herennia Etruscilla at the southern Phrygian Metropolis and by one pair of eponyms at Sibia under Geta Caesar and Caracalla.\textsuperscript{315} In order to understand the significance of παρά on coin legends, instances of this preposition must be interpreted in their wider numismatic context. In the case of Apameia Kibotos, παρά is one of the most common, but not the only, formula used on coinage from the reign of Commodus. During the Severan dynasty the ἐπιμεληθέντος / ἐπὶ dominated contemporary legend forms,\textsuperscript{316} but from the reign of Gordian III παρά returned to prominence, providing that one accepts ‘Π’

\textsuperscript{312} However, it must be emphasised that many eponyms make no reference to a specific magistracy. This in itself cannot be taken as evidence that these individuals were non-magistrates: Weiss (2005), 64-8. Thus in most cases it is impossible to be sure whether the absence of a magisterial title is evidence for the involvement of non-magistrates in the production of coinage: Howgego (1985), 87.

\textsuperscript{313} Heuchert 2150-5; cf. Weiss (2005), 64.

\textsuperscript{314} Ramsey (1883), 53-71.

\textsuperscript{315} Ramsey (1895), 276-77: \textit{BMC} Phrygia 2, 6, 9 (Sibia) and Heuchert 2262-3 (Keretapa); \textit{BMC} Phrygia 4-6 (Metropolis).

\textsuperscript{316} \textit{BMC} Phrygia and \textit{SNG} Aul record no instances of παρά after Commodus until Bakchios in the reign of Gordian III.
as an abbreviation of παρά. 317 This preposition was often associated with the office of panegyriarches. 318 The panegyriarches was the presiding officer of the ‘festival’ of the koinon Phrygias. 319 The fact that panegyriarchai should be producing coinage in Apameia is significant, since they are not known to have struck coinage at any other city. Thonemann has convincingly posited a link between the koinon Phrygias and Apameia’s role as regional assize and market centre. 320 If this link is correct, it need not follow that the issues in the name of panegyriarches were coinages intended to facilitate exchange during the periodic market connected to the assize. The coinage is too irregular and too many other offices are attested on the later third century coinage of Apameia. 321 It is more likely that panegyriarchai produced coinage because they were leading citizens of the city and as such produced coinage as a personal benefaction to the wider community. However,

---

317 Such an assumption is not without merit. A single issue of the eponym M. Aur. Alexandros is prefaced with the letter ‘Ε’ (Otacilia Severa, BMC Phrygia 185). Since all the other issues of this eponym use the standard ἐπί formula, it seems probable that ‘Ε’ was intended as an abbreviation of ἐπὶ (BMC Phrygia 182-184). Moreover the eponym Bakchios signs with the abbreviations ΠΑΡ/ΠΑ, which were certainly intended as abbreviations of παρά (RPC VII 699-706).

318 For example the legend ‘ΠΙ ΠΕΛΑΝΓΟΝΤΟΣ ΠΑΝΗΓΥΡ ΑΠΑΜΕΩΝ’ appears in the name of Otacilia Severa (BMC Phrygia 186). The same legend type is used by Stratonikianos under Trajan Decius and Herennius Etruscus Caesar (BMC Phrygia 190-192). Under Gordion III the panegyriarches Bakchios signs several issues (RPC VII 699-706) with the παρά formula. Imhoof-Blumer published a specimen of the eponym Aur. Hermos with the legend: ΠΑΡΑ ΑΥΡ ΕΡΜΟΥ ΠΑΝΗΓΥΡΙΑΡΧΟΥ: Imhoof-Blumer (1908), 138-9. Moreover Loebbecke records an issue in the name of Gallienus of the eponym Kl. Apolinarios that mentions the office of panegyriarches (ΠΑΡΑ ΑΠΟΛΙΝΑΡΙΟΥ ΠΑΝΗΓΥΡΙΑΡΧΟΥ: Loebbecke (1885), 341. However the case of Kl. Apolinarios is problematic because the same eponym is also recorded as striking coins with the παρά formula in the reign of Trebonianus Gallus (AD 252-3, SNG Aul 3516-17, BMC Phrygia 193. Thus we may be dealing with two issues by the same man in quick succession. Only the legend of the coin struck in the name of Gallienus mentions any office. Thus it is possible that Apolinarios was not a panegyriarches at the time of his first issue.

319 The panegyriarches Pelagon also signed a pseudo-autonomous issue which bore the legend ΚΟΙΝΟΝ ΦΡΥΓΙΑΣ, but which did not specify the office of panegyriarches (BMC Phrygia 122). This personal connection may imply that the panegyriarches acted as the presiding officer of the koinon: Thonemann (Thesis), 86-7.

320 Both Strabo and Dio Chrysostom praise Apameia as the primary emporium of inland Anatolia (Strabo XII. 8. 15 and Dio XXXV. 13-17). The economic pre-eminence of Apameia was reinforced by the influx of non-residents from across the region for the Roman assize (judicial proceedings presided over by the governor or his legate) and the related regional market. Thonemann has further argued that this regional role came to be perceived in terms of koinon in Apameia and that the assize in time came to acquire the attributes of a koinon, including a presiding officer (panegyriarches): Thonemann (Thesis), 86-7.

321 The offices of agonothetes, grammateus, asiarches and archiereus: Thonemann (Thesis), 87.
not all eponyms who sign with the παρά formula are recorded as holding the office of panegyriarches. In the reign of Commodus the eponyms P. Ailios Tryphon and Stratonikianos make no mention of any civic office on their coinage, but their names are prefaced by παρά. It is therefore possible that παρά was also used by non-panegyriarchai, although the only possible case of a panegyriarches signing with an alternative formula at Apameia is dubious. Papá was certainly used by non-panegyriarchai outside of Apameia and therefore it is not inconceivable that this formula was also used by non-panegyriarchai in Apameia itself.

What then did the preposition παρά actually mean in the context of third century Apameia Kibotos? Thonemann has recently suggested that the large and irregular issues of Apameia during the third century were intended as dianomai distributed to the people at the time of the festival as an act of beneficence by the eponym. In such a context the use of the preposition παρά (from) is entirely logical. The preposition παρά was intended to leave no doubt about the identity of the benefactor from whom the gift was derived. The

322 Heuchert 2840-2; furthermore, Kl. Apolinarios may not have been a panegyriarches at the time of his first issue (SNG Aul 3513). There is also no indication of office on the coinage of the eponym Proklianos Tryphonos (Valerian, SNG Aul 3514). However, it is not impossible that Proklianos was in fact a panegyriarches. At the time of writing the provincial coinage from the reign of Valerian has yet to be published in full and the relevant edition of RPC may yet bring to light other issues of this eponym, which do indicate an office. We must bear in mind that not all the issues signed by Aur Hermos mention the office of the panegyriarches (BMC Phrygia 195-196).

323 The eponym Stratonikianos possibly signs coins using two different formulae. Lenormant cites an issue of this eponym with the legend: ΕΠΙ ΣΤΡΑΤΟΝΙΚΙΑΝΟΥ (which makes no mention of civic office): Lenormant (1879), 121. However, Lenormant does not mention the obverse type of the coin, which is significant because another Stratonikianos is known from the Antonine period (although he also uses the παρά formula, with no indication of office). It is also noticeable that the ἐπιμεληθέντος / ἐπί formula is used by the holders of other offices. The agonothetes Artemas is attested using this formula (BMC Phrygia 168; SNG Aul 3502), as is Α ΜΑ ΣΕΥ, the grammateus for the second time (BMC Phrygia 121, 169-171; SNG Aul 3499-3501). P. Ailios Tryphon ΑΣΙΑΡ ΙΠΠΙΚ (asiarches and equestrian: Severus Alexander BMC Phrygia 118, 179-180, SNG Aul 3505-3507) and M. Aur. Alexandros ΑΡΧΙ[ΕΡΕΥΣ?] (high priest?: Philip the Arab, BMC Phrygia 182-185).

324 For example the legend ΠΑΡΑ ΜΗΝΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΙΛΙΑΝΗΣ appears at Siblia in the Severan period; BMC Phrygia 2-3, 6, 8.

325 Thonemann (Thesis), 92.

326 For a discussion of the use of the preposition παρά in other contexts, particularly inscriptions on ceramics, to indicate gifts from specific individuals see Steinhart and Wirbelauer (2000), 262-3, 278.
dominance of *panegyriarchai* using the *παρά* formula is explained by their prestigious position at the festival of the *koinon* and their desire to commemorate this status through the coinage. Such an office would have provided the appropriate stage for the performance of a statement of personal devotion to their fatherland. The intimate link between the *παρά* formula and the office of the *panegyriarches* helps to explain its very limited distribution. In the two instances when *παρά* occurs outside of Apameia, the preposition may also refer to a distribution of coinage. Such distributions were either less common at Sibia and Keretapa Diokaisareia, or the act of distribution was not referenced so explicitly on the coin legend. Non-*panegyriarchai* at Apameia may also have produced coinage for this purpose, although such benefactions appear to be significantly more common in respect to *panegyriarchai*.327 It is also possible that coins with eponyms not prefaced by *παρά* were distributed in this way, particularly in regions, which had no tradition of using alternative legend formulae such as *παρά*. In most cases there is simply no way of identifying such issues without definitive epigraphic evidence.

The theory that both *διά* and *παρά* indicate that the eponym played a role financing coin production is common in numismatic literature.328 This association can be

327 Head, has suggested that the issues signed by Alex[andros] Tieiou from the Southern Phrygian Metropolis may also have been a festival coinage: (*BMC* Phrygia, lxxxiii-lxxxiv, 4-6). Such a hypothesis is certainly attractive given the prevalence of the formula on the festival coinage of Apameia. However, the legend of the coins themselves described Tieiou as ΑΡΧ ΠΡΩ (*protos archon*). Tieiou himself is attested epigraphically as the victor of the *pankration* at the local *Menneanic Themides*, an achievement for which he was honoured with a statue and honorific inscription (Ramsey (1883), 59-60). Furthermore, Tieiou was probably the grandson of the founder and *agonothetes* for life of the festival, Aurelius Menneas. Thus, it is possible that the coin type was intended for a distribution to people performed at the time of the festival to commemorate this benefactors’ victory and familial connections to the *Menneanic Themides*. Conversely the legends and the reverse types of these issues make no reference to the festival (the reverse types refer to the Kybele, Artemis and Men cults as well as the city Tyche): Ramsey (1883), 61. Thus it seems likely that these coins were produced by Tieiou in his capacity as magistrate and one of the leading citizens of the city and as such it is equally possible that the coins formed part of a distribution of *dianomai* during his tenure as *protos archon*.328 Heuchert (Thesis), 31; following Howgego (1985), 87 and Robert (1935), 106 n. 1.
traced back to the work of Lenormant from the late nineteenth century. Conversely it has been argued that that the participles εἰσγγείλαντος, ψηφισμένου, ἐπιμεληθέντος and αἰτησάμενος did not explicitly imply expenditure on behalf of the eponym. However, careful examination for the evidence of the epigraphic usage of these terms reveals that a more nuanced approach to analysis of these formulae is required. For example the appearance of the term ἐπμέλειαν in the Sestian inscription would indicate that the related term ἐπιμεληθέντος could have connotations of personal expenditure. This conclusion is strengthened by Weiss’ comparative study of numismatic legends in the context of epigraphic formulae. Weiss provided compelling epigraphic evidence for the use of the verbs (in either finite or infinitive form) or nouns related to the participles εἰσγγείλαντος, ψηφισμένου, ἐπιμεληθέντος and αἰτησάμενος in context of privately financed benefactions. For example Weiss cites an inscription from Thera (c. AD 149), which recounts the generosity of T. Phl. Kleisthenes Klaudianos:

τὰ ἔργα κατὰ τὴν εἰσαγγελίαν, ἣν ἐποιησάμην τῇ γλυκυτῇ τῇ πατριδί Θήρᾳ, κατασκευάσας ἐκ τῶν ἅρων ἄνε θηκα,... περιέχει καὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα (I dedicated the works just as stipulated in my ‘eisangelia’, which I made to my most dear fatherland Thera, having furnished from my own resources, ...the decrees were passed also (IG XII 3. 325 II 13ff).

329 Lenormant (1879), 120.
330 Burnett, Amandry and Carradice argue that the use of such participles is no guarantee of personal expenditure on behalf of the eponym: Burnett, Amandry and Carradice (1999), 4.
331 OGIS 399.
In this case the related nouns ἐισαγγελίας (the promises made to the community by a prospective magistrate before assuming office) and πὰ ψηφίσματα (decrees) are used in conjunction with ἀνέθηκεν to articulate the whole process of benefaction. It began with the promises of benefaction made by the prospective magistrate before the community. On entering office these proposals were placed before the boule and after having been accepted they were ultimately put into practice by the magistrate. Coin legends could not afford to be so verbose and so only one part of this longer process could be recorded. The balance of epigraphic evidence would indicate that the individual announcing and putting to a vote a proposal was generally expected to contribute financially in order to ensure the fruition of the proposal. Weiss also cites a number of cases in which the verb αἰτεῖσθαι had financial implications. Euodion Philotheou repaired the fire-damaged statue of the Praetor and legatus Augusti L. Vibius Varus and added the inscription:

Εὐοδίων... αἰτησάμενον ἀνέστησεν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων τῶν ἐαυτοῦ ἐνεργεῖ την (Euodion... having proposed dedicated his benefaction from his own funds: I.Ephesus III 738).

Once again the act of formally making a request before the city is intimately associated with the promise of private finance. Anyone familiar with the usual procedures of civic benefaction would have known the financial significance of such terminology.333

E) Conclusion

The evidence examined in this chapter regarding the eponyms on the provincial coinage of Asia would indicate that euergetism played a significant role in the production of coinage. Coinage was produced only intermittently and no city possessed a particular magistracy solely concerned with the production of coinage. Still, P. Weiss has argued strongly that the supervision of coinage by a particular eponym did not necessarily preclude much of the financial burden of production falling on the civic treasury. Thus for Weiss coinage bearing the participles εἰσαγγείλαντος, μηχανήμενον, προνοηθέντος, ἐπιμεληθέντος and αἰτησάμενος as well as the verb ἀνέθηκεν were financed differently from the great mass of coinage displaying the ἐπί formula. In the Latin West the late first century BC and early first century AD civic issues could carry the abbreviated formula PP (Pecunia Publica, Public monies). However no such explicit references to public funds are known from Asian civic bronzes of the imperial period and it is difficult to concur with Weiss’ hard line in respect to this matter. Even in the West legend formulae referring to private financing are attested. Furthermore, the evidence examined in this chapter would suggest that the difference in terms of production between coins displaying the ἐπί formula and those bearing alternative formulae can be easily exaggerated. On occasion ἐπί, particularly in Phrygia where use of such ἐπιμεληθέντος formulae was concentrated, could act as an abbreviation of ἐπιμεληθέντος. Moreover Apollodotos of Hyrgaleis, who is likely to have struck coinage as part of a wider benefaction, is represented by the simple ἐπί + genitive

---

334 Weiss (2005), 63.
335 This formula is attested at the mints of Utica (RPC I 721-730) and Carthage (RPC I 745-8, 752-7).
336 The abbreviations SPDD (sua pecunia dono dedit) and DSP (de sua pecunia Constantine RPC I 701 and 703) are also known, which refer to private financing. Burnett, Amandry and Carradice (1999), 3-4. Crawford concluded that the first century BC issues of Paestum were produced for the purpose of cash distributions made by the elite: Crawford (1985), 72.
formula on his coins. Thus private financing may have played a more significant role in the production of coinage than Weiss would allow.

Since no Asian coin inscriptions unambiguously state that the coinage was produced at public expense, any attempt at quantifying the proportion of publicly funded coinages is futile. The possibility that some issues were financed by the state should not be dismissed. In the Antonine period only around 40% of the known types carried eponyms, and eponyms are particularly rare on small denomination coins. In many cases the absence of eponyms on small denominations may be explained by the lack of space. Eponyms may have been responsible for both the large and small denominations, but only deemed it practical to sign the larger denominations. However, flan size cannot explain the absence of an eponym in all cases. For example the smallest denomination signed by the Domitianic eponym Kornelios Dioskourides at Laodikeia on the Lykos measures 12 mm in diameter, but pseudo-autonomous issues without eponyms were struck at Laodikeia measuring 15 mm in diameter during the latter part of the first century AD.337 In such cases state financing would be an attractive hypothesis, but private financing cannot be ruled out even for anonymous issues. We know epigraphically that Moschion supervised the production of coinage, but the coins of Magnesia from this period bore no eponym (I.Magnesia no. 164). Even in the Roman imperial period civic funds were made available to magistrates to defray the costs of their offices.338 Nevertheless, there is evidence for the private financing of coin production in the Hellenistic period. In most cases the names and monograms of individuals appearing on civic coinage is best explained in terms of

337 RPC II 1296 (for Dioskourides), 1297-8.
338 Dmitriev (2005), 140-152.
liturgies.\textsuperscript{339} It is probable that the Hellenistic tradition of private financing of coin production continued and expanded into the Roman period.\textsuperscript{340} As early as the second century BC the balance of epigraphic evidence indicates that magistrates increasingly met the expenses incurred by their office from their own resources.\textsuperscript{341} This change occurred in the context of the blurring of the distinction between the holding of civic offices and the fulfilment of expensive liturgies.


\textsuperscript{340} One possible exception to this general rule may be Ephesos. In the Augustan period we have seen that a board of magistrates or liturgists probably handled the production of coinage. Subsequently, eponyms are rare on post Julio-Claudian Ephesian coinage, but when they do occur, they appear in the \( \epsilon\pi\iota\) + genitive. It is possible that the move away from eponyms marks a change towards state financing of most issues, which would explain the relative infrequency of eponyms at this mint. Ephesian eponyms may represent rare cases of private financing at this mint. However, such a reconstruction is by no means certain. We know that Moschion struck coinage, which did not carry eponyms: Schultz (1975), 22-25. Thus the absence of eponyms on Ephesian coinage cannot be taken as definitive proof for the dominance of public financing for coin production at Ephesos.

\textsuperscript{341} Dmitriev (2005), 34-39.
4. Personalised Iconography

In the preceding chapter it was argued that the eponyms often undertook responsibility for the production of coinage. This chapter will examine the evidence for the influence of the eponym over the choice of coin iconography. The first section will deal with possible Hellenistic antecedents for the practice of personalised iconography. The subsequent section focusing on the Roman period will be divided into a series of case studies. These case studies have been chosen with reference to chronology and geography. However, lacunae in our evidence limit the extent to which comprehensive representation is possible. Not all cities are equally well explored archaeologically, epigraphically and numismatically. Similarly the numismatic material of some chronological periods and regions are better understood than others. Moreover, it is the aim of this chapter to focus on the details of individual cases. More detailed analysis of the role of geography and chronological context in the choice of coin iconography will be conducted in the subsequent chapter.

**Personal Iconography in the Hellenistic Period**

The evidence for personalised motifs on the earliest Greek coinages, particularly the diverse iconography of the early electrum coinage, has already been discussed in the context of chapter three. It has been established that the tradition of representing individuals on coinage with specific symbols probably began with the beginning of
coinage and continued into the Hellenistic period, most notably on the New Style coinage of Athens. Some of these symbols were chosen because they were a pun on the name of the eponym. Punning was not the only way in which such ancillary symbols were connected with specific individuals. Symbols could have overt political connotations. A coin type signed by Kointos (Quintus) depicted the goddess Roma crowned by Nike. This symbol reflected the personal choice of an individual ‘Roman’ eponym who happened to be in charge of the coinage and is therefore the product of the prevailing political climate in Athens at this time. It is difficult to imagine the addition of pro-Roman symbols by a probable Roman to the coinage at a time when the anti-Roman faction was in the ascendance. Another category of symbols found on the New Style Athenian coinage of Athens is allusion to ancestors or homonyms. The name of eponym Themistokles is found with the symbol of a trophy on a galley and it is difficult to avoid Thompson’s view that this symbol is anything other than a reference to his namesake’s famous naval victory over the Persians. Festivals and agonistic contests are also common motifs on the New Style Athenian coinage. Many symbols are more difficult to interpret and no personal connection can be established with the relevant eponym, although such lacunae could simply be the result of gaps in our prosopographical knowledge. Such personalised badges may have reiterated the individual responsibility of the eponyms in the production of coinage or served to emphasise the honorific nature of the names on coins.

342 The symbols on the Athenian New Style coins of ΝΑΥΚΡΑ[ΘΣ] and HPA can be seen as ‘puns’ on the names of the mint magistrates. The name of Naukrates is given in the form of a monogram and is accompanied by the maritime symbol of a rudder. The lion skin and bow of Herakles was employed on the coinage of HPA, a name that is likely to have been derived from the god Herakles: Thompson (1961), 603.

343 Thompson (1961), 604.

344 The name of Herakleidas is represented by a Tyche and amphora. Since an amphora of olive oil was the prize at the panathenaia, this motif may refer to an agonistic victory. Allusions to other festivals and cults are also found on the coinage, for example the kerchnos, Demeter, Triptolemos and ears of grain found on the New Style coinage and these may represent Eleusinian symbols. It is possible that the eponyms of this year were connected to the celebration of the mysteries: Thompson (1961), 605.
In contrast to subsidiary symbols, the main types of Hellenistic and Classical coins tended to be standardised civic symbols with little personal resonance. However, it would appear that in a very small number of cases, in a few very specific contexts, whole types may have been used to honour the individual achievements of the relevant eponyms. Currently I am aware of only two possible examples of this phenomenon, one from Chalcis and another from Priene, both of which may be linked to the glorification of athletic victories. Knoepfler has provided a detailed analysis of the apparent commemoration of an Athletic victory by the eponym Theokles son of Pausanias on his coinage. The obverse type is that of a quadriga driven by a man with the ethnic ΧΑΛΚΙΔΕΩΝ and the reverse depicts the legend ΘΕΟΚΛΗΣ ΠΑΥΣΑΝΙΟΥ (Theokles the son of Pausanios) within a crown. Knoepfler knew of twenty-five examples of this type and concluded that the original issue must have been large. The date of the Theokles type has been disputed. Head dated the type to c. 196-46 BC on the grounds that he did not want to separate this wreathed issue from the quadriga/ oak-wreath series of tetradrachms from the same mint. Picard challenged this attribution arguing that this type is absent from bronze hoards of the first half of the second century BC. Instead Picard dated the coin to early first century AD. He cited the similarities between the Theokles type and a coin of Phlastos of Mylasa in Karia with a quadriga obverse type and a name in wreath reverse type.

Knoepfler offered a third date of around the turn of the second century BC for the Theokles type on prosopographical grounds. He identified the eponym with Theokles Pausaniou, whose name inscribed within a wreath is listed as the winner of the boys

---

345 Knoepfler (1979), 165-188.
346 RPC I 1343 (Plate I. 1) (BMC Central Greece, 89-91).
347 Picard (1979), 122-3.
Pankration of the Herakleia.\textsuperscript{348} Furthermore the same person appears to have been mentioned on another monumental inscription recording athletic victories at the Hermaia festival.\textsuperscript{349} Both these festivals appear to have been primarily local affairs with some limited participation by non-Chalcidian citizens.\textsuperscript{350} Knoepfler reasoned that the unusual nature of the iconography could be explained as a monument to the athletic prowess of Theokles.\textsuperscript{351} This is the only example of a name depicted within a wreath at Chalcis and the visual similarity between the coin type and names of victors inscribed within wreaths on IG XII 9, 952 is striking. Knoepfler also suggested that Theokles’ youthful victories were insufficient to warrant such an honour. He further hypothesised that the impetus for these coins came from a victory in a four-horse chariot event at one of the great Pan-Hellenic games, since a male figure driving a quadriga is depicted on the obverse.\textsuperscript{352} However, more recently, Knoepfler association of the coinage with the celebration of Theokles athletic prowess was undermined by re-dating of the Theokles coinage to the mid first century BC (the triumval period) by the authors of RPC I.\textsuperscript{353} This reinterpretation need not rule out the possibility that the type was honorific in nature, but it does cast doubt on the identification of the eponym with the victor of IG XII 9, 952.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{348} IG XII 9, 952.
\item \textsuperscript{349} SEG XXIX 806: Theokles was entered in the category of the neoteroi at the Hermaia and so would have been about ten years older: Knoepfler (1979), 179-82.
\item \textsuperscript{350} Knoepfler (1979), 181.
\item \textsuperscript{351} The device of an encircling wreath was not unusual in the Hellenistic period and was not always associated with honorific monuments. In the case of the so-called wreatheh coinages of the mid second century AD, the addition of the wreath to the types of Lebedos, Herakleia on the Latmos, Aigai, Kyme, Myrina, Smyrna and Magnesia on the Maiandros was most probably either an aesthetic choice or was intended to promote acceptability: Kinns (1987), 106-7.
\item \textsuperscript{352} Knoepfler (1979), 187-8.
\item \textsuperscript{353} Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 269.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
A more convincing case of personalised iconography in the Hellenistic period may be made for Athenopolis of Priene.\textsuperscript{354} The obverse type is that of a facing Athena wearing an Attic helmet with the civic ethnic ΠΡΙΗ. The reverse type depicts Nike holding a victory palm and wreath surrounded by a stylised representation of the Maiandros River. The crown held by Nike is placed directly above the reverse legend: ΑΘΗΝΟΠΟΙΟΛΙΣ. Regling records only one other Nike type at Priene from the Hellenistic period (no. 174). Moreover, this issue depicts the goddess in the form of a bust, whereas Nike is depicted in full on the coinage of Athenopolis.\textsuperscript{355} The effect of the composition is that Nike is crowing the name of the eponym. The most obvious parallel for this device occurs on the coinage of the \textit{diadochos} Lysimachos, which depicts an enthroned Athena holding Nike in her right hand. Nike holds a crown in her outstretched hand crowning the name of the king. This motif is repeated so frequently on other royal coinages that it cannot be coincidence.\textsuperscript{356} The similarity between the Athenopolis and royal issues is striking and indicates that the former was probably modelled directly on royal prototypes.

It seems that in this case Athenopolis appropriated a gesture of royal victory and military prowess and adapted it for the civic context. However, the way in which this device was reinterpreted can only be understood if we know the identity of the eponym Athenopolis. We are aware of at least two men of this name from Hellenistic Priene. The first is Athenopolis son of Kydimos, who is known from several inscriptions from Priene. The most important of these is \textit{I.Priene} 107, which honours Athenopolis for his many services to the city. Athenopolis is commended for being a good man (\textit{ἀνὴρ καλὸς}) having

\textsuperscript{354} Regling (1927), no. 27 (Plate I. 2).
\textsuperscript{355} Regling (1927), no. 174.
\textsuperscript{356} The motif is common on the coinage of the later Seleucids and other Hellenistic monarchies. For the Seleucid examples see Houghton (1983), 134-142, nos. 107-9.
performed many things of profit for the city (πολλά καὶ χρήσιμα τῇ πόλει). Moreover, Moschion the brother of Athenopolis was honoured by an even longer honorific inscription, which records that Moschion was honoured with a golden crown (στεφάνωι χρυσέωι), although it is unknown whether Athenopolis received a similar honour. However, the second and more likely candidate is Athenopolis the son of Pythotimos. According to the stemma of this family complied by Hiller from the evidence of I.Priene 162, Athenopolis Pythotimou was the maternal uncle of Athenopolis Kydimou. We know the former from a monument commemorating his athletic prowess. Originally composed of a statue group surmounting a plinth, this monument was inscribed with a victory epigram celebrating the achievements of Athenopolis. The statue group is no longer extant, but from the remains of the base it is possible to reconstruct two figures depicted in wrestling poses. The victory epigram was composed in two parts. The first part praises Athenopolis as the first wrestler from Priene to win a prize at the crowned games of Epidauros. The second part of the epigram is later and not only mentions Athenopolis’ victory at Epidauros, but also states that he was the first to win the wrestling prize at the Pythian games, one of the four great Pan-Hellenic games. These achievements were clearly unprecedented and would have provided a more than adequate explanation for the prominence of the victory motif apparent on the coinage. Thus, if the eponym Athenopolis can be identified with a known citizen of Priene, the famous wrestler Athenopolis son of Pythotimos is the most likely candidate.

---

357 I.Priene 108. 15-6.
358 [Ab]rotera the daughter of Pythotimos and the sister of Athenopolis Pythotimou married Kydimos, the father of Athenopolis Kydimou; Hiller (1906), 154.
359 I.Priene 268, republished with further restorations by Ebert 73.
360 Hiller (1906), 153.
The real obstacle to the association of either one of the honorands of *I.Priene* 107 or Ebert 73 with the eponym Athenopolis is chronology. Hiller dated *I.Priene* 107 to c. 130 BC. This chronology appears to be sound in the light of the evidence of *I.Priene* 268, which can be confidently dated to the second half of the second century BC on palaeographic grounds. However, Regling associated this type with his group C on stylistic criteria (c. 270-240 BC). Therefore, in order to save the identification of Athenopolis with either the agonistic victor or the civic benefactor of *I.Priene* 107, one must re-date this issue. Le Rider also dated the issue of Athenopolis to the third century and placed the issue of Athenopolis in the time of Lysimachos or the Seleucids on metrological grounds. However, the metrological analysis of Regling and Le Rider was based on a single highly corroded specimen. More recently an example of this type in excellent condition has come onto the market weighing 4.04g; this is significantly lighter than the rest of Regling’s group C, although one badly oxidised specimen of this group weighing 4.13g is known. Consequently, it is very difficult to place the Athenopolis within the standard denominational structure of Priene. It appears to be closest in weight to the Attic standard, but the correlation is not precise and there remains the possibility that the Athenopolis issue was not part of the Attic octobol series. The typological evidence of Seleucid bronze coinage provides some support to Regling’s chronology. The type of the facing Athena with three crested helmet was found on the late bronze coinage of Antiochos I, ruled 281-261 BC produced in western Asia Minor at Smyrna, Sardeis, and Magnesia on

---

361 Regling comments that although these specimens deviate in type from the rest of group C, the style is good, the Maiandros border is not degenerated, the fabric is flat and the large Π and Σ are used in conjunction with the small omicron and theta: Regling (1927), 30-31.
362 Le Rider equated the 4.9-8g denomination with the octobol of the Attic standard and dated this series to the period when Lysimachos and later the Seleucids dominated Western Asia Minor: Le Rider (1999), 347-349.
363 Gemini Auction III 9th June 2007 lot 187.
364 Regling (1927) no. 12.
the Maiandros or some other unidentified mint. Since Nike is such an uncommon motif on the silver coinage of Priene, it seems safe to assume that the Seleucid bronze was the prototype for the Athenopolis issue. In this context Regling’s date of around 270-40 BC appears to be perfectly reasonable. However the date of the Seleucid bronze only provides a *terminus post quem* for the Athenopolis type. There is no definitive evidence that the Athenopolis issue must have followed very closely the minting of Antiochos’ bronze. The specific motif of a side facing victory holding a palm in one hand, while extending another hand in a crowing motion remained a common type from Antiochos I until well into the Roman period. Furthermore, this type is relatively common in Western Asia Minor during the Hellenistic period. A bronze type of Magnesia on the Maiandros, depicting a right facing Athena typical of the coinage of Priene and the same Nike reverse type as the Athenopolis issue, is known (*SNG Cop* 848).

In conclusion, the balance of evidence would indicate that the issue of Athenopolis could date anytime from the mid third to mid second centuries BC. The chronological and metrological arguments deployed by Regling and Le Rider cannot prove beyond reasonable doubt that the issue of Athenopolis belongs to the first half of the third century BC. Conversely, there is no compelling reason to assign a second century BC date

---

365 Houghton and Lorber (2002), 122-123. Moreover, one variant of this type, Houghton and Lorber 329, depicts the stylised Maiandros river border around the obverse type, although this motif is actually found on the reverse of the Athenopolis issue. This type was probably struck at neighbouring Magnesia on the Maiandros and so must have been known at Priene.

366 For example, in the Flavian period Nike appears to crown the cognomen of the eponym Kor. Dioskourides at Laodikeia (*RPC* II 1293).

367 The chronology of the late Hellenistic bronze coinages of Magnesia is little understood. However, Kinns’ study of the later Hellenistic silver issues is clear in placing *SNG Cop* 848 after the value marked bull/rider silver series and their associated bronze. Kinns re-dates the value marked issues to c. 155-4 BC, therefore the Athena/ Nike may be dated to the latter half of the second century BC: Kinns (1989), 148. Another bronze issue of Magnesia from around the same time depicting Nike with wreath and palm reverse type is known: *SNG Cop* 852 (Plate I. 3). The fact that the Nike with palm and wreath type was in use at the neighbouring city of Magnesia during this period increases the likelihood that the type was also current at the mint of Priene.
for this coinage, other than prosopographical considerations. The bronze coinage of Antiochos I provides a *terminus post quem* for the Athenopolis issue. However since Antiochos’ bronze could have remained in circulation for a long time, the Athenopolis issues may have been struck substantially later. At the present time the eponym Athenopolis cannot be definitively identified with wrestler Athenopolis Pythotimou, although such an identification is by no means impossible. The motif of Nike crowning the name of the eponym is still significant in its own right. It was an honorific device derived from the coinage of the Hellenistic kings and so its appearance in a civic context is intriguing. It would appear that in this case a private individual usurped a royal motif for private self-glorification. However, it is clear that such gestures of individual self-promotion were rare on coinage in the Hellenistic period and that self-representation on coinage did not become more common until the Roman period.

**Personal Iconography in the Roman Imperial Period**

**The Alleged Portrait coins of Laodikeia on the Lykos**

*RPC* I identified two possible cases of individual portrait types at the mint of Laodikeia on the Lykos in Phrygia. 368 Seitalkas, tentatively dated by *RPC* I to the late first century BC, signed a single issue depicting a reverse type of the Demos of Laodikeia and obverse type of a clean-shaven bare male head with the legend ΣΕΙΤΑΛΚΑΣ (*RPC* I 2892: Plate XXXVII. 1). The obverse portrait is notable for his slightly jowly appearance and does not conform to any known imperial portrait type. Another unidentified male head appears as one of the obverse types signed by Pythes son of Pythes, probably in the reign of Tiberius

---

368 Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 475.
The head is noticeably more mature than the imperial portrait type signed by Pythes and is distinguished by a pronounced hooked nose. The head is accompanied by the legend ΠΥΘΗΣ, whereas Pythes signed all his other issues on the reverse side (RPC I 2901-5, 2908-10 Plate XXXVII. 10-15, 18-20). As with Seitalkas the reverse type depicts the diademed head of the demos of Laodikeia. Were these unidentified heads portrait types of the eponyms themselves? If so, then they would be the only examples of self-portraiture by eponyms from mainland Anatolia. Support for the portrait theory is offered by the fact that both heads were juxtaposed with a single name. Since it is very rare for eponyms to sign the obverse die at Laodikeia, the legend may have been intended to act as label identifying the portrait. Moreover Pythes and Seitalkas were active at a time of experimentation in coin portraiture. This is the period in which several cities adorned their coinage with the portrait of the relevant proconsul. However, so little is known about Seitalkas and Pythes and non-imperial portraiture on coins is so rare that absolute certainty in this matter is impossible. The evidence is at best circumstantial, although I am aware of no compelling alternative explanation for the unidentified busts.

**Ti. Klaudios Damas**

---

369 At Priene a single specimen in the name of [Pompeius?] Macer is known. This issue may celebrate the Augustan legate Pompeius Macer: Regling (1927), 101-6, Grant (1946), 388-9. However, the specimen is unique and the reading of the legend is uncertain. Identification with a local notable cannot be ruled out: Burnett, Amandry and Ripollés (1992), 446-7.

370 Several Asian cities produced types bearing proconsular portraits during the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius: M. Tullius Cicero c. (Magnesia on the Sipylos 20’s BC, RPC I 2448), Pontitius Messala (Aizanoi, c. 25 BC, RPC I 3067), Fabius Maximus (Hierapolis (in the conventus of Kibyra), 10/9 BC, RPC I 2930, 2932, 2934, 2936, 2939, 2941-2), P. Cornelius Scipio (Pitane, c. 8/7 BC RPC I 2392), Asinius Gallus (Temnos AD 5, 2447), M. Plautius Silvanus (Pergamon, c. AD 4/5, RPC I 2364) and L. Arruntius (Kibyra, c. AD 15/16, RPC I 2887).
The types signed by Ti. Kl. Damas at Miletos are notable for their iconographic innovation. New types were introduced celebrating the religious identity of the city. The cults of Apollo Delphinios and Apollo Didymeos were represented by types of Apollo seated on a rock holding a bow and a cult statue of Apollo holding a stag and bow respectively (RPC I 2712-14: Plate XXVII. 1-3). The coins of Damas also introduced the type of the cult statue of Artemis Pythia (holding a patera and bow standing before a stag, 2715-16: Plate XVII. 4-5) and a depiction of the hero Miletos with aphlaston and spear (standing on a bow in front of a river deity, 2712a: Plate XXVII. 6-8). Finally, the Hellenistic type of a right facing standing lion with star, in this case surrounded by a wreath, was revived under Damas (RPC I 2717).

Damas is known from three inscriptions from Miletos and Didyma, the longest of which details his concern for the ancestral cults of the city. In particular, Damas as archiprytanis is recorded as drafting a decree for the demos that obliged the stephanephoroi to execute the entertainments (εὔνομα) of the kosmoi and molpoi according to the civic custom (lines 14-17). If anyone should attempt to convert these liturgies into revenue, then he should be considered impious and a lawbreaker and be subject to a fine of 500 staters (lines 26-8). In addition, we know that Damas strengthened his ties to the most prestigious cults of the city by twice presiding over the oracle of Apollo at Didyma as προφήτης. Robert first noted the link between Damas’ novel types and his career. Damas’ interest in the Delphinion and Didymeos cults is undisputable and so it seems reasonable to attribute the adoption of these motifs on the civic coinage to the personal

371 I.Didyma 237 II, 268: Milet I. 3 134: for a German translation of 134 see Herrmann (Milet VI. 1, p.169).
372 I.Didyma 237 and 268: The προφήτης was the priest appointed each year to preside over the Didyma oracle. He was assisted by a treasurer and board of overseers.
initiative of the eponyms, drawing upon the religious traditions of the city. Moreover, the religious and antiquarian concerns of Damas provide a ready context for the adoption of the Artemis Pythia and lion types, since Apollo shared the Didyma site with a cult dedicated to Artemis Pythia. The lion and star type was the principal motif on the Hellenistic coinage of Miletos and its revival under an eonym who displayed such obvious concern for the cults and traditions of his city is wholly comprehensible. Personal interest is less clearly apparent in the Hero Miletos type, but the depiction of a local hero certainly does not seem out of place in this overtly antiquarian context.

The iconographic motifs established by Klaudios Damas continued to be among the most popular types to appear on the Roman provincial coinage of Miletos. For example, no less than fourteen types of Miletus from the Antonine period represent Apollo Didymeos as either a nude standing figure or a cult statue surrounded by his temple.\(^{374}\) The ubiquity of this and other such images demonstrate the degree to which Milesian coin iconography had become conventional. However, the similarities in the careers of Damas and other members of the Milesian elite demonstrate why these particular types became such popular iconographic motifs.\(^{375}\) This shared background encouraged the eponyms of Miletos to continue and elaborate the types first introduced by Damas, because service at the main civic cult centres was a defining characteristic of the elite strata of Miletos and indeed Asia as whole. For example, Phlaouios Andreas is an eponym known to have signed 4 types for Miletos (c. AD 175-177). One of his types depicted a temple with four

---


\(^{375}\) In this respect, it is perhaps worth citing the case of Demetrios son of Glaukos, who dedicated a statue of Apollo Delphinios at the turn of the second century BC; an image which later served as the model for Apollo Delphinios types of the late Antonine and Severan periods: Robert (1967), 50, \textit{I.Didyma} 346. Intriguingly, this Demetrios was also a \textit{prophetes} at Didyma and thus, like both Phl. Andreas and Klaudios Damas, appears to have served both the main Milesian Apollo cults.
columns surrounding the nude cult statue of Apollo Didymeos, who holds a stag and bow (1940: Plate XXVII. 9). We know from three separate inscriptions that Andreas was the προφήτης of the temple of Apollo at Didyma.\(^{376}\) We can also be confident that the father of Andreas, Titos Phlaouios Kyrina Andreas, also held the office of prophetes.\(^{377}\) Thus Andreas was not only a prophetes himself, but was also the descendant of a prophetes through his father. Furthermore, like Damas, Andreas was associated with both the major Apollo cults of Miletos. Heuchert 1941 portrays Apollo Delphinios, seated atop a rock with his right hand on his head and with his left arm resting upon an omphalos with serpent coils (Plate XXVII. 10). He holds a bow in his left hand. Apollo Delphinios type may also have held significance for Andreas, since he held the office of wreath-bearer (στεφανηφόρος), which was intimately connected to cult of Delphinion Apollo.\(^{378}\) The religious offices held by the family of Andreas can also be seen as having resonances with another type. Heuchert 1942 depicts Artemis Pythia, who holds a bow and patera (Plate XXVII. 11). We know that Andreas’ own mother, Aurelia Lesa, served as a water-bearer for the cult of Artemis Pythia, as one would expect for a family so intimately bound to the service of the oracle of Didyma.\(^{379}\) In this case these types cannot be described as personalised, because they were drawn from the conventional repertoire of the city.\(^{380}\) However, this repertoire proved to be so successful, precisely because it was a reflection of the cultural interests and identity of the local elites.

\(^{376}\) I.Didyma 219, 238 and 287: This identification was first put forward by Robert (1959), 673.

\(^{377}\) I.Didyma 286.

\(^{378}\) I.Didyma 287. 11-12; for the connection between the stephanephoros and the cult of Delphinion Apollo see Robert (1967), 50. We should also note that the section of Milet I. 3 134 dealing with the religious responsibilities of the stephanephoros occurs in the context of an inscription concerned with the proper management of both the cults of Apollo Didymeos and Delphinios. For a recent discussion of the stephanephoroi at Miletos see Herda (2006), 58-68, 75-6.

\(^{379}\) I.Didyma 287. 21-22 (μητρὸς δὲ Αὐρλίας Λέσης ὑδρηφόρου).

\(^{380}\) Heuchert 1939 portrays a naked Zeus holding a chlamys and thunderbolt.
Markos Oulpios Karminios Klaudianos

We are fortunate in that prosopography of the Karminioi of Attouda is comparatively well known to scholarship. The stemma of this family is secure for five generations, but comparatively little is known about the career of the eponym Markos Oulpios Karminios Klaudianos in Attouda. Thonemann and Ertuğrul recently published two new inscriptions, probably originally from Attouda, honouring this magistrate. The first of these, from the Aydin Museum Inv. 4706, provides no further detail of his career. The second, Inv. 4705, is of greater interest. It records that he served as *stephanephoros* (‘wreath-bearer’) and priest (*ἱερατεύσαντα*) and along with many other benefactions (*πολλά καὶ μεγάλα ἀεὶ εὐεργετοῦντα*) he dedicated ‘grain money’ (ἀναθέντα σειτωνικὰ χρήματα) to the city. In addition to the honours recorded epigraphically we know from his coinage that Karminios was awarded the titles ‘son of the city’ and ‘son of the demos’. Moreover, Klaudianos is known to have pursued a career outside the confines of Attouda, which culminated in the high priesthood of Asia. However, Thonemann and Ertuğrul are almost certainly correct not to identify the eponym with a well-known benefactor of Aphrodisias, Markos Oulpios Karminios Klaudianos. The latter is the son of the Attoudian eponym: *Μαρ. Οὐλ. Κλαυδιανόν ὑὸν Καρ. Καρμινίων Ἀσίας ἄρχιερέως*. We know that issues of coins were produced under the name of Markus Oulpios Karminios Klaudianos at both Attouda (2150-2159: Plate XXXIV. 1-9) and Trapezopolis.

---

381 Pera (1996), 313-322; Thonemann and Ertuğrul (2005), 75-86.
382 See Thonemann and Ertuğrul (2005), 75-6 for a discussion of the provenance and origin of these documents.
384 Thonemann and Ertuğrul (2005), 78, for the alternative identification see Campanile (1994) no 53a.
Karminios’ coinage in the name of Attouda may be divided into at least two series, the first dating to AD 138-61 (2150-1), and second to c. AD 166-169: (2152-2159). Of the two issues at Attouda, the two reverse types of the earlier issue display the clearest evidence for personalised iconography. The first of these types depicted two facing crowned standing *Tychai* representing the cities of Attouda and Trapezopolis, each holding a sceptre and with one raised arm; inbetween the *Tychai* stood a veiled goddess flanked by two lions (2150). The legend of this type reads: ΔΙΑ ΜΟΥ ΚΛΕΑΔΙΑΝΟΥ ΥΙΟΥ ΔΗΜΟΥ ΑΤΤΟΥ∆Α ΤΡΑΠΕΖΟΠΙ ΟΜΟΝΟΙΑ. The same veiled deity with flanking lions is depicted on 2151, but the *tychai* are absent and the legend uses the ἀνέθηκεν formula: ΜΟΥΛ ΚΑΡΜΙΝΙΟΣ ΥΙΟΣ ΠΟΛΕΩΣ ΑΤΤΟΥ∆ΕΩΝ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ. The high degree of personal involvement on the part of the eponym in the production is apparent in both the iconography and legends of the issue. Karminios is named on issues from both Attouda and Trapezopolis, which must indicate that the eponym was active at both centres. Thus, it is logical to ascribe the impetus for the production of the *homonoia* type to the personal influence of the eponym himself. In effect, this *homonoia* issue becomes as much a celebration of the personal networks of a certain local aristocrat as it is a statement of civic solidarity. Similarly, the use of the ἀνέθηκεν formula on 2151 identifies the issue as the personal dedication of the eponym.

Moreover, Thonemann and Ertuğrul have put forward the thesis that Karminios’ *homonoia* issue, celebrating the alliance between Attouda and Trapezopolis, included a

---

386 The obverse portrait types of Antoninus Pius dates the first issue (2150-1), but Heuchert is unsure whether these issues were struck on the same occasion. This second issues issue is dated to AD 166-169 by the use of the titles ΑΡ ΠΙΑ ΜΑ (victor over the Armenians, Parthians and Medes) in the imperial titulature: 2152-3. Heuchert associated the pseudo-autonomous issues of Karminios with the second series on the grounds that all they share the διὰ formula (2154-9): Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 742. However, since the διὰ formula is also used on the *homonoia* issue this chronological cannot be regarded as absolute.
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subtle reference to the career of the eponym. They identify the veiled deity as Meter Adrastou, a local variant of Kybele. Karminios certainly held a priestly office and so Thonemann and Ertuğrul have suggested that this should be identified with Meter Adrastou. They further argue that 2150 represents the alliance of Attouda and Trapezopolis as mediated by Meter Adrastou and that this deity was chosen for her specific associations to Markos Oulpios Karminios Klaudianos. Two of Karminios’ descendents certainly held priesthoods of this deity. The image of the goddess, either standing or enthroned, between two lions is a motif that occurs several times in the output of Markos Oulpios Karminios Klaudianos at Attouda. Nevertheless, although the theory put forward by Thonemann and Ertuğrul is tantalising, it cannot be confirmed. We do not know which cults Markos Oulpios Karminios Klaudianos served as priest. The prevalence of this type in the output of Karminios could be explained in personal terms, but we must also consider that the lion and goddess type is one of the most common motifs on the coinage of Attouda. Thus the Meter Adrastou type may have been chosen on the grounds of its importance to civic identity in general.

Types of personal resonance are less apparent in the remaining issues of Karminios at Attouda. Aside from the Meter types discussed above, this issue included types depicting a facing cult statue of Artemis (Anaitis?) with extended arms (2155), a draped bust of Men Karou (2156-7), the Dioskuroi nude holding swords and spears (2158), and a standing Nemesis plucking her chiton and holding a bridle (2159). From what we know of the career of Karminios, there is no reason to associate any of these types with

---

387 Thonemann and Ertuğrul (2005), 79.
388 The cult is attested at Attouda: MAMA VI 74. 3.
389 M. Oulpios Karminios Klaudianos neoteros (MAMA VI 74.2-3) and Karminia Ammia (MAMA VI 75. 2).
390 Heuchert 2152, 2153-2154 (AD 166-9).
391 BMC Karia xli.
personalised iconography, although this state of affairs may be the result of the paucity of the evidence. One may speculate that one of the issues of Karminios from Trapezopolis, 2168, possessed particular personal resonance. Since, the obverse type depicts Demeter with a corn wreath. This is the only known occasion in which this type appears on the coinage of Trapezopolis in the Julio-Claudian, Flavian and Antonine periods. Thus it is tempting to associate this type with a gift of either subsidised grain or grain money. It is recorded epigraphically that Karminios dedicated such a gift on at least one occasion, almost certainly at Attouda. Nevertheless, because Karminios was active at both Trapezopolis and Attouda, it is not impossible that this eponym made a very similar benefaction in both places. This benefaction could have been celebrated by the addition of a Demeter obverse type on his coinage, but such a reconstruction is highly speculative.

**Statilios Attalos**

Perhaps the clearest example of an eponym influencing coin iconography is that of Statilios Attalos of Herakleia Salbake. Herakleia was a small community located in the conventus of Alabanda, near to the neighbouring cities of Laodikeia, Aphrodisias and Kolossai. The city of Herakleia itself was not particularly large or distinguished, but it did have the good fortune to produce the Statilloi, who were to rise to prominence during the first half of the second century AD. Two members of this family were able to attain the rank of the personal physicians to the Emperors. The first to do this was Titus Statilios Kriton, the

---

392 The inscription in question was not found in situ, but was brought from Kuyucak in the lower Maiandros valley to the Aydin Archaeological museum in 1998. Thonemann and Ertuğrul are almost certainly correct in assigning this text to Attouda, because both the inscription and the coins in the name of Markos Oulpios Karminios Klaudianos utilise the honorific title ‘son of the city’: Thonemann and Ertuğrul (2005), 75-6.
court doctor under Trajan. His great nephew, the eponym Statilios Attalos, went on to achieve the same distinction during the joint reign of Lucius Verus and Marcus Aurelius.

Indeed Attalos’ honorific title ἀρχιατρὸς Σεβαστῶν (High doctor of the Emperors) is attested in two short inscriptions published by Robert. Unfortunately, aside from this title, these inscriptions offer no further information relating to the life and career of Statilios Attalos. However, Robert assumed that since Statilios Attalos was the imperial physician, he must have spent significant periods of time at the imperial court in Rome. Therefore, the eponym should be identified with the physician Attalos, described as the pupil of Soranos of Ephesos, who was encountered by Galen in Rome. As a student of Soranos it is not unlikely that Attalos originally studied medicine at Ephesos, before achieving fame as an imperial physician.

In addition to researching the prosopography of Statilios Attalos Robert carried out an analysis of his numismatic output. The first point of interest is that the series was produced as a dedication to the youths of Herakleia. Heuchert 2179 (Plate XXXV. 7) bore the legend ΣΤ ΑΤΤΑΛΟΣ ΑΡΧΙΑΤΡΟΣ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΩΤΩΝ ΝΕΟΙΣ (Statilios Attalos to the youth of Herakleia). The use of the dative case in this instance indicates a dedication to the youth of the city. Thus the issue of Attalos was targeted at a specific section of the citizen population and may even have entered circulation via a targeted distribution. The impact of the dedicator nature of this series on the iconography of these types is clear.

393 Robert (1957), 223.
394 Robert (1957) nos. 76 and 77 (MAMA VI 117).
395 Robert (1957), 79, citing C. G. Kühn, Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia vol. x (Lipsiae 1825), 910-915.
396 Robert (1957), 179.
397 Robert (1957), 220.
398 Howgego (1985), 86; the term Neoi refers to the age class composed of the new citizens, who had recently completed ephebic training. They were organised into official associations, which could posses their own gymnasia, control their own funds, appoint their own officials and receive legacies: Jones (1940), 225.
Heuchert 2178 (Plate XXXV. 6) depicted a naked standing Herakles grasping a bow and club. Robert is surely correct to emphasise the fact that Herakles often fulfilled the role of the patron deity of exercise and the gymnasium, the locus of physical training and instruction in the civic values for the youths of the city.\textsuperscript{399} The appearance of Herakles on an issue dedicate to the youths of the city was therefore highly appropriate, although, as the patron deity of the city, Herakles also possessed more general connotation for the wider citizen body.\textsuperscript{400}

However, the other types of this series reflect more the personal achievements and career of Statilios Attalos than the role of the youths in the ideology of the city. Heuchert 2180 (Plate XXXV. 8) depicted the cult statue of Artemis Ephesia with her \textit{kalathos} and flanking deer (AD 139-147). This was a relatively common type across the province of Asia and is found on the coinage of neighbouring Laodikeia (Heuchert 2315-16 and 2372). However in this case it is tempting to see a connection with the time that Statilios spent training as a doctor under Soranos at Ephesus. One can also undoubtedly detect Attalos’ personal influence in the iconography of 2179, which portrays a standing Asklepios, the god of healing with his serpent and staff: a certain reference to Attalos’ position and status as the imperial physician.

Thus there is good cause for identifying all the types represented in this series with either the dedication or career of the dedicant. Furthermore the influence of Attalos may have extended to coinages not actually produced under his name. In the reign of the Emperor Commodus, AD 184-190, the neighbouring city of Laodikeia produced a \textit{homoioia} issue, which celebrated ‘the alliance’ between Laodikeia and Herakleia:

\textsuperscript{399} Robert (1957), 220.
\textsuperscript{400} Robert (1957), 226-7, 229-230.
Heuchert 2185. The obverse type followed the usual *homoioia* pattern by representing the ties between the cities in terms of the juxtaposition of two patron deities. In this case the choice of Patron deity for Laodikeia, Zeus of Laodikeia, is wholly unsurprising, but the decision to represent Herakleia with Asklepios is intriguing. It is clear that Herakles was the patron deity and logical choice to represent Herakleia. Herakles is the most commonly depicted deity on civic coinage from Augustus to Septimius Severus and a local Herakles cult is amply attested. How can we explain the appearance of Asklepios in such a context? One solution is that even as late as the reign of Commodus the distinguished careers of Statilios Attalos and Statilios Kriton overshadowed the city of Herakleia to the extent that the patron deity of doctors came for a time to represent the community as a whole. The achievement of the Statilii in gaining such intimate access to the imperial person was used by the city as a source of civic prestige and honour. Herakleia was a relatively small city and it is perhaps unsurprising that it would be keen to celebrate its two most famous sons in this way.

**Klaudios Aisimos**

We owe our knowledge of the career and stemma of the Pergamene Klaudios Aisimos to Robert and Habicht’s analysis of *I.Askl.* 40. This inscription honours one S. Klaudios Aisimos, the son of L. Silianos, as the *agonothetes* (president) of the competition of Asklepios the saviour (ἀγωνοθέτησαν τοῦ Σωτήρος Ἀσκληπιοῦ καλῶς ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων). The stone of this text was found at modern Kilisse-köy (ancient Elaiia). However Robert put forward the thesis that the S. Klaudios Aisimos from *I.Askl.* 40 was not a native of Elaiia as
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401 Robert (1957), 226.
previously thought, but was in fact identifiable with the Pergamene eponym Klaudios Aisimos. This supposition was confirmed by Habicht’s publication of *I.Askl*. 39 from the Asklepeion of Pergamum. This text, which recorded a dedication by Sex. Klaudios Silianos Aisimos (the son of Klaudios Aisimos), followed precisely the same formula as that set down in *I.Askl*. 40. It is notable that the son fulfilled exactly the same office of *agonothetes* as his father. Consequently Habicht was able to reconstruct the stemma of the family of the Klaudioi Silianoi. Perhaps most significantly of all, Habicht was able to connect S. Klaudios Aisimos with Gaios Klaudios Silianos, probably as brothers. This Gaios Klaudios Silianos was responsible for the foundation of the *pronaos* in the Demeter sanctuary. Moreover his wife, Iulia Pia, is known to have made a dedication at the Propylon of the same sanctuary. Thus we can state with some confidence that Klaudios Aisimos, the eponym during the years AD 137-8, was president of the games of Asklepios and possessed strong familial ties to the Demeter cult. Were these achievements reflected in the iconography of the coinage produced in his name? Heuchert 794 depicts a standing Demeter, wearing a *kalathos*, holding two torches (Plate V. 1). There are only two other cases of Demeter appearing at Pergamum during the Antonine period: Heuchert 884 and *RPC* online no. 9595. The latter dates from AD 144-58 and portrays Demeter as a standing figure holding a sceptre and an uncertain object. The former, dating to AD 177-80, is more interesting in that it reprises the standing facing Demeter type utilised by

---

402 Robert (1937), 66.
403 Habicht (1967), 85.
404 Habicht (1967), 86.
405 Hepding (1910), no. 25.
407 Demeter is more commonly attested in the latter third century, for example under Maximinus Demeter occurs on the following types: *CNG* 60 1233 43. 40: *BMC* Mysia 338-339: von Fritz (1910). 63 pl. iv, 23.
Aisimos. As Demeter is not an especially common type at Pergamon in the Antonine period, it is therefore tempting to associate 794 with activities of the brother of Aisimos.

Heuchert 796 depicts standing figures of Hygeia and Asklepios. (Plate V. 3) Hygeia is represented feeding a serpent from a patera, while Asklepios stands to the right holding a serpent staff. Aisimos was personally linked to this cult through his service as *agonothetes* of the Asklepios, although the timing of his tenure is impossible to date precisely, and he apparently mitigated the expense of the office from his personal resources. However, the city of Pergamum was famous for its sanctuary dedicated to Asklepios and his healing cult. Such service at the primary civic cult was standard practice for the Pergamene elite. Moreover this deity was the most common reverse type for Pergamum throughout the imperial period. Indeed the same Hygeia and Asklepios type occurs frequently during the Antonine period; Heuchert 827, 828, 829, 830, 846, 905, 910 and *RPC* online no. 9596. Aisimos’ background is indicative of the extent to which the local elites were enmeshed in fabric of religious life and identity of the city. His tenure as *agonothetes* and his signing of an Asklepios type reflected displays of the devotion and patriotism expected from members of the elite strata. The ideology of civic patriotism is reflected in the third and final type produced in the name of Aisimos, which portrayed the personification of *homoioia*. This type seeks to associate directly the civic virtue of political and social harmony with Pergamon. Since there is no reference to another city on Aisimos’ ‘*homoioia*’ issue, we must assume that the concord the type is celebrating the internal harmony of the city.

---

408 *L.Askl*. 40.
409 Heuchert 795 (Plate V. 2).
M. Kl. Phronton

The career of Kl. Phronton is not attested in the epigraphic record, but the personal influence of the presiding eponym is clearly manifest in the images and legends of the coins themselves. Phronton is known to have signed coins struck in the names of both the city of Sardeis and the Koinon Ionion. Sometime during the early years of Pius’ reign Phronton had served as asiarches and had held the office of protos strategos at Sardeis.

M. Kl. Phronton is also known to have acted as the archiereus of the Koinon Ionion, during which time he supervised the only known coin-issue produced solely in the name of the league (Heuchert 1516 to 1528: Plate XX. 1-4, XXI. 1-4, XXII. 1-4). This issue is attributed to the period between AD 139 and 144 by the youthful portrait types of Marcus Aurelius as Caesar (1525 to 1528). Heuchert has further reasoned that Phronton’s Sardian coinage was probably contemporary with the league coinage, because the sizes and weights and reverse designs are similar in both issues. Indeed, it must surely be significant that most of the coin types struck in the name of the Koinon Ionion borrowed from the contemporary Sardian types familiar from Phronton’s civic coinage. Heuchert 2470 and 1517 and 1518 all depict the rape of Persephone by Hades, 2471 and 1522 and 1523 show Demeter being pulled in a serpent drawn biga, while 2472 and 1524 portray a temple with an imperial statue. The latter type is of particular interest, because it has been thought to represent the statues of Pius and Faustina the Elder erected in the temple of

410 Not be confused with the homonym M. Claudius Fronto, the commander of the Legio I Minerva in the Parthian campaigns of Lucius Verus (PIR² C 874).
411 For the first systematic analysis of these types see Gillespie (1956), 31-53 and (1959), 211-13.
412 Heuchert 2470-2472 (Plate XLVIII.3, XLIX. 1-2), Heuchert (Thesis), 45.
413 Engelmann argued that the since Heuchert 1524 accorded Faustina the title of thea it must post date her death in AD 141: Engelmann (1972), 188-192. However, Price has demonstrated that the Greek thea is not the equivalent of the Latin diva: Price (1984b), 79-95. Thus this title offers no clue to the date of the issue: Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 500.
414 Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 503-4.
Artemis of Sardeis after the bestowal of the second *neokoros*. Moreover, it has been argued that the temple of Lydian Kore depicted on 1526-1528 should be identified with the temple of Artemis modified with colossal statues of the house of Antoninus Pius and probable location of the second *neokoros*, although this interpretation has been challenged. The only types with no overt connection to Sardeis are 1519-20, which depicts Herakles and Auge, the mythical priestess of Athena and mother of Telephos. Heuchert has tentatively postulated that this latter type could be explained if we identify Klaudia Paula, priestess of Athena at Pergamon, with the daughter of Kl. Phronton.

In this way the coinage of the *Koinon Ionion* was adorned with distinctly Sardian types, even though the city of Sardeis itself was neither located in Ionia nor a member of the league. Why should a Sardian become so involved in what was a distinctly Ionian religious association. According to Kampmann, the issues of Phronton should be interpreted in the context of the commemoration of Sardeis’ second *neokoros*. If Kampmann is correct, then the occasion of the dedication of the second neokorate temple may have been the impetus for simultaneous celebrations of the provincial *koinon* games and the festival of the thirteen cities, both of which were presided over by Phronton in his

---

415 Price (1984a), 260: recently Burrell has sought to identify the male figure standing in the centre of the temple as Dionysos: Burrell (2004), 108. However, Heuchert’s work on the Antonine provincial coinage of Asia, which represents the most recent and complete examination of the material, upholds the traditional identification and even tentatively identifies a Nike in the hand of Emperor: Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 508.

416 The link between the extant sculptural fragments and Lydian Kore temple type rests on the theory that cults of Artemis and Lydian Kore were synonymous at Sardeis. For the arguments in favour of this association see Johnston (1981), 8-10: Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 504. For the counter arguments see Burrell (2004), 103-109.

417 *IGR* IV 462 records that a certain Klaudia Paula, daughter of a Kl. Phronton, was priestess of Athena at Pergamon: Heuchert (Thesis), 45: for the identification of the Herakles and Auge type with Pergamon see: Lacroix (1956), 30.

418 Herrmann (2002), 230.
capacity of high priest.\textsuperscript{419} Nevertheless, as Herrmann has emphasised, Kampmann’s reconstruction rests entirely on circumstantial evidence. Phronton may simply have been attracted to the league by the opportunity to enhance his personal prestige by serving one of the most ancient religious institutions in Asia. Moreover, Phronton was not the only Sardian to have been active with the \textit{Koinon Ionion}. The Trajanic era Sardian eponym L. Ioulios Libonianos held the office of \textit{ἀρχιερέα των τρις καὶ δεκα πόλεων} (high priest of the thirteen cities i.e. the \textit{Koinon Ionion}).\textsuperscript{420} Thus the link between the Sardian elite and the \textit{Koinon Ionion} can be traced back to at least the beginning of the second century AD. And in spite of the fragmentary nature of the evidence Herrmann has speculated that this link may be related via the office of \textit{asiarches}, since both Phronton and Ioulios Libonianos served in this capacity.\textsuperscript{421} However, the nature of this association remains obscure.

**Kl. Hestiaios II**

The career of Kl. Hestiaios II can also be shown to have influenced the coin designs produced in his name for the city of Kyzikos.\textsuperscript{422} Hestiaios served as eponym twice during his career; once as \textit{hipparches} in the reign of Antoninus Pius and once as \textit{neokoros} during the early years of the joint reign of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. The types dating

\textsuperscript{419} Kampmann (1997), 91: it should also be noted here that the detail of Kampmann’s analysis must be modified in the light of Heuchert’s re-reading of the reverse inscription of Gillespie’s no 12. According to Gillespie the legend read: \textit{ΚΟΙΝΟΝ ΓΙ ΠΟΛΕΩΝ ΠΡΟ Μ ΚΛ ΦΡΟΝΤΩΝ ΑΣΙΑΣ ΠΡΟΤΩΝ ΕΦΕΣΙΩΝ ΠΕΡΓΑΜΗΝΩΝ}. However, Heuchert has demonstrated that the later part of this legend is the result of re-tooling. The legends of Phronton’s series make no mention of either Ephesos or Pergamon: Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 501-2.

\textsuperscript{420} Herrmann (2002), 236-7: Libianos is also known from a Trajaniac issue of Saridan coinage. This issue displays the type of a thyrsos bound with a taenia, a fly or bee is depicted in the field: \textit{BMC Lydia 75}, Imhoof-Blumer (1897), no. 13.

\textsuperscript{421} Herrmann (2002), 236-8.

\textsuperscript{422} Heuchert (Thesis), 45-6, Heuchert 55 (AD 138-61: Plate II. 3), 124-127 (c. AD 161-165: Plate II. 4-7): another Klauhdios Hestiaios is attested at Kyzikos under Antoninus Pius: Heuchert 49-54 (Plate I. 4-7, II. 2-3). The eponym of 55 is probably his son, since he is distinguished by a ‘\textit{beta}'. It is likely that the \textit{neokoros} is to be identified with Hestiaios the ‘second’ on chronological grounds: Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 26.
from his second stint as eponym differ from those of his first in that they emphasise the theme of the imperial family and cult more strongly. For instance Heuchert 125 depicts the two co-emperors clasping hands over an altar, 126 portrays a mounted emperor lifting his hand in greeting, while 127 bears an octastyle temple (possibly of the imperial cult). Only 124, depicting an enthroned Serapis deviates from the imperial theme; whereas the reverse type of Hestiaios’ first issue (55) was not in anyway relevant to the imperial cult. It depicts two altars, above which three men manoeuvre baskets topped with crescent and stars using bars, while a fourth man climbs the bars carrying a flaming torch.423 The fact that by the time of his second term as eponym Hestiaios had attained the rank of neokoros (warden of the imperial temple) cannot be coincidence. Thus the infusion of imperial themes can be linked directly to a change in the political circumstances of the eponym concerned.

**L. (P?) Ailios Pigres**

The eponym L. Ailios Pigres of Laodikeia on the Lykos should not be confused with the two men by the name of P. Ailios Pigres from Lydian Philadelphia and Patera.424 The most recent readings of the relevant coins indicate that the eponym bore the praenomen ‘Λ’ (Loukios), rather than the ‘Π’ suggested by Head in *BMC Phrygia*.425 The Laodikeian Pigres is most notable for an impressive issue of large denomination coins in the reign of
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423 The type is typical of Kyzikos: Heuchert (Thesis Appendix) 23.
424 W. Eck, ‘P. Aelius Piger’, *RE suppl. xiv* (1974), col. 1: for Patera see *TAM* II. 2 451; for Philadelphia see *TAM* V. 3 1421 (AD 255). Bowie has argued that the eponym Pigres should be identified with Περίγητος τοῦ Λυδοῦ, the only pupil of Kassianos, mentioned in Philostratos: *VS* 627. He argues that because the name ‘Perigetos’ has no parallels, it should be corrected to Pigres and be associated with the coin eponym of the same name: Bowie (1982), 35. Bowie may be correct in identifying a mistake in the manuscript tradition, but his identification of this figure with the coinage is confused. Bowie erroneously, having misinterpreted Keil and Gschnitzer (1956), attributes the coinage of Pigres to Philadelphia, whereas the name is only attested on the coinage of Laodikeia. For the suggestion that Pigres of Laodikeia is the father of the Philadelphian homonym see Keil and Gschnitzer: Keil and Gschnitzer (1956), 228.
Caracalla, many of which are notable for their overtly imperial iconography. One type depicted Caracalla standing in a quadriga pulled by four lions. The emperor holds a globe surmounted by Nike in his right hand and an eagle headed sceptre in his left.\textsuperscript{426} In another type Ge and Thalassa stand supporting a statue of Caracalla with a radiate crown, phiale and sceptre, beneath which an eagle with a wreath is depicted. Ge is identified by her cornucopia and two ears of corn. Thalassa wears a distinctive crab headdress, wields an oar and is flanked by a dolphin.\textsuperscript{427} The juxtaposition of land and sea reflects a form of imperial dedication common in this period in which the Emperor is lauded as the master of land and sea.\textsuperscript{428} The military prowess of the Emperor is celebrated by the depiction of the equestrian Emperor riding down a vanquished enemy or lion.\textsuperscript{429}

Such overt imperial imagery displayed by the issues signed by Pigres is entirely consistent with the office of \textit{asiarches} held by the eponym on three occasions during the course of his career, but imperial motifs were a common feature of the iconography of the period.\textsuperscript{430} Moreover, the expression of civic devotion to Caracalla on behalf of the Laodikeians is readily comprehensible. Laodikeia was first briefly made \textit{Neokoros} under Commodus, but the distinction was renewed under Caracalla, a fact that was celebrated on the coinage by the addition of this title on the coinage.\textsuperscript{431} However, what makes the iconography of the Pigres issues so striking is not only the profusion of the imperial types, but also the unique imagery. Admittedly, the type depicting the togate Emperor standing between the two patron gods of the city, Zeus Laodikenos and Asklepios is not unusual for

\textsuperscript{426} \textit{BMC} Phrygia 225 (Plate XLIII. 5); Burrell also records the existence of a variant of this type in which the quadriga of the Emperor is pulled by four centaurs: Burrell (2004), 121 (Paris 1688).

\textsuperscript{427} \textit{BMC} Phrygia 226 (Plate XLIII. 6).

\textsuperscript{428} For example see \textit{I.Magnesia} 216 (Caracalla); \textit{I.Ephesos} IV 1053 (Caracalla).

\textsuperscript{429} Enemy: unpublished coin from the \textit{BNF} collection cited by Burrell (Burrell (2004), 121-122 (Paris 1604)), Lion: \textit{SNG} Leybold 1673 (Plate XLIV. 3).

\textsuperscript{430} Harl (1987), 38-51.

\textsuperscript{431} Burrell (2004), 119.
the time.\footnote{Burrell (2004), 121, type 7: the juxtaposition of the imperial image with the patron deities of the city could represent the integration of the neokoros of Caracalla into the fabric of the local civic cults. However, Johnston has rightly emphasised that in many cases such types may simply have served a symbolic function, rather than commemorating a particular event: Johnston (1983), 60.} Yet, two other imperial types of Pigres are far from generic. The first of these types portrays an imperial sacrifice. The togate Emperor is shown holding a phiale over a tripod, while being flanked by two civic goddesses carrying images. Before an octastyle temple a flautist plays while two attendants slaughter a sacrificial bull. There also appears to be a military standard in the background.\footnote{Burrell (2004), 121-2, type 8 (Plate XLIV. 2).} The last of the ‘imperial’ types of Pigres, depicting the Emperor in a trapezoid enclosure, is the most interesting of all. Caracalla is shown in military dress holding two wreaths and flanked by bodyguards in front of the temple. Four (possibly five) figures, probably local citizens, advance towards the Emperor in groups of two and three. The Emperor appears to offer a wreath to the leading figure. Two figures are also represented attaching garlands to the colonnade in foreground of the scene, while two civic goddesses stand between the central columns.\footnote{Pigres signs BMC Phrygia 227 with the legend: Λ. ΑΙΛ ΠΙΓΡΗΣ ΑΣΙΑΡΧΗΣ Γ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕΝ (L. Ail. Pigres asiarches dedicated).} The type is unique in Laodikeia and in the province of Asia as a whole.

The imagery of the latter type is so striking and specific that it is has been associated with the commemoration of an imperial visit.\footnote{Pigres was also responsible for several non-imperial types. Helios was depicted in a radiate crown riding in a quadriga pulled by four elephants: SNG Aul 3857 (Plate XLV. 1). Standing representations of Zeus and Asklepios appear on an issue with the obverse type of Julia Domna: SNG Aul 8417 (Plate XLIII. 8). Dionysos with a Thyrsos was represented in a biga pulled by two panthers accompanied by a satyr, small Eros and Maenads: Loebbecke (1885), 346. Finally, an enthroned female deity, probably Aphrodite, was shown holding a patera to a winged figure (Eros) in her right hand and a sceptre in her left: Babington (1866), 93.} There is no independent documentary evidence relating to an imperial visit to Laodikeia by Caracalla and Johnston has rightly warned against seeking to associate instances of imperial iconography on
coinage with imperial visitations in all cases. However, in the case of the sacrifice scene and the imperial address scene the iconography is so unusual and the details of the imagery seems to be so specific that it is difficult not to relate them to actual events. The events commemorated may not have occurred in Laodikeia itself. Burrell discusses the possibility that the twin civic goddess depicted in both the crowning and sacrifice type refer to the Nemeses of Smyrna (thus locating the scene in Ionia). Even if we are not dealing with depictions of episodes from the recent history of Laodikeia, the temptation to identify some connection between the scene shown on the coinage and the office held by the eponym is overwhelming. In fact, if we are dealing with ‘foreign’ scenes on Laodikeian coinage, this would only serve to emphasise the link between the iconography and the eponym. Since, the connection between the city and event represented would have been mediated through the personal influence of the Pigres as thrice *asiarches*. Nevertheless, the balance of probability favours Laodikeia as the location of the scenes. The coins were produced in the name of the Laodikeia and it is probable that they represent events of local significance. The visit of the Emperor was obviously a source of great local prestige and so its celebration on contemporary coin types would not be surprising. Yet, the fact that such issues were signed by a three time *asiarches* is instructive. These iconographic motifs must have held some attraction to an individual who had served the imperial cult at the provincial level and who consequently may have been personally involved with an imperial visit either at Laodikeia or elsewhere. Moreover, it is tempting to interpret at least
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436 Johnston (1983), 58-76.
437 Johnston discusses the plausibility of an imperial visit to Laodikeia in AD 215, while she does not rule out the possibility, she treats it as speculative: Johnston (1983), 70.
438 Similar sacrifice scenes were also depicted on the coinage of Magnesia on the Maiandros and Ephesos: Burrell (2004), 122.
439 For an attempt to identify the location of the rectangular ‘forum’ with the archaeological site of Laodikeia by the recent survey team see Sperti (2000), 91-2.
one of these issues in relation to the personal activities of Pigres during the visit. We should note that BMC Phrygia 277 depicts Caracalla extending a wreath to one of the five figures. This figure could easily represent Pigres himself receiving an honour from the Emperor. In contrast to his other issues, Pigres signs this type with ἀνέθηκεν rather than the ἐπί formula, which may indicate that Pigres felt a special affinity with this type.440

Alexandros of Synnada

Under Gordian the third, the mint of Synnada produced a series of five types signed by a certain Alexandros. In the fullest version of the legend Alexandros is described as ΑΡΧ ΑΛΕΞΑΝ∆ΡΩ Β ΑΓΩΝΟΘ ΑΡΧΙΕΙΡ Β (archon Alexandros II agonothetes high priest (probably of the Imperial cult) for the second time).441 Unusually, in two instances the name of Alexandros is in the dative case and in the remaining specimens his name is abbreviated to ΑΛΕΞ and so the case is obscured. It is unknown why Alexandros should sign some of his coinage in the dative case. The dedicatory dative has already been discussed in chapter 3. However, in this case it is the name of eponym that is in the dative case. Thus, either the issues were dedicated to Alexandros as an individual or alternatively the Greek dative case is meant as equivalent of the Latin ablative absolute. If, the latter is correct then the dative may have functioned as an alternative of the ἐπί formula.442

Two of the types signed by Alexandros are typical of Synnada and therefore of little interest in respect to personalised iconography. These are types of Dionysos with

440 BMC Phrygia 227 (Plate XLIII. 7); Burrell (2004), 122.
441 RPC VII 788-9 (Plate L. 1-2).
442 Spoerri-Butcher (2006), 279.
thyrsoi standing within an octastyle temple and Amalthea holding the infant Zeus.\textsuperscript{443} A further type of Alexandros shows the Emperor riding in a quadriga being crowned by Nike.\textsuperscript{444} The presence of such an overtly imperial motif in the iconographic scheme of a series signed by a priest of the Imperial cult is readily comprehensible. However, as civil war and barbarian incursions increasingly came to threaten civic prosperity in the third century the theme of imperial victory became more prominent on coinage. In this way, the Emperor and Nike type is entirely consistent with this wider trend, which was certainly not confined to issues in the name of imperial cult officials.\textsuperscript{445} Of potentially greater significance is the type of Alexandros depicting a prize crown with two palm branches.\textsuperscript{446} The legends of Alexandros’ coins proclaim the fact that he held the office of agonothetes and as such was responsible for presiding over a local Agonistic festival. Moreover, this same Alexandros is attested as having erected a bronze statue of Telesphoros, the local victor in the pankration.\textsuperscript{447} Types celebrating local agonistic festivals were not uncommon in the third century AD and Synnada was no exception. The motif of the prize table and palms was found on issues signed by non-agonothetai and contemporary issues, which were not signed at all.\textsuperscript{448} However in this case it remains possible that the eponym manipulated the existing iconographic repertoire of the city to suit his personal interests.

However, the final type of Alexandros is the most unusual and of the greatest significance. It depicts two columns supporting a circular pediment surrounding a star. At

\textsuperscript{443} \textit{RPC} VII 789-90 (Plate L. 2-3).
\textsuperscript{444} \textit{RPC} VII 788 (Plate VII. 788).
\textsuperscript{445} Harl (1987), 40, 42-51: the theme of imperial victory was also a common motif on issues not signed by an eponym.
\textsuperscript{446} \textit{RPC} VII 792 (Plate L. 4).
\textsuperscript{447} \textit{MAMA} IV 67: this identification is confirmed by the fact that Alexandros is described as twice high priest in the body of the text.
\textsuperscript{448} \textit{RPC} VII 796, with the reverse legend: ΔΩΡΙΕΩΝ ΙΩΝΩΝ ΣΥΝΝΑΞΩΝ. However, \textit{BMC} Phrygia records another example of the agonistic prize type with the legend ΑΡΧ ΤΑΛΠΟΛΕΜΟΥ ΙΠΠΙΚΟΥ ΑΓΩ: \textit{BMC} Phrygia 28.
the centre of the temple structure is a rectangular object with a circular depression or
diamond shape in the middle; flanking the rectangular object are two palm branches.\footnote{449}
Nollé plausibly identified this mysterious rectangular object as a representation of a
gladiatorial shield.\footnote{450} This identification is confirmed by the presence of the same rectangle
flanked by two palms motif in upper field of a later issue of Synnada depicting the combat
between two gladiators.\footnote{451} In the reign of Caracalla a similar type appears on the coinage
of Side, although at Side a triangular pediment surmounted the temple structure enclosing
the shield.\footnote{452} Nollé linked the appearance of this motif at Side with the bestowal of the
right to put on \textit{venationes} and gladiatorial contests from the imperial authorities, through
the intervention of the ex-consul and citizen T. Likinnios Mukianos.\footnote{453} Consequently,
Nollé further suggested that the shield and temple motif was intended to signify the award
this privilege to the city and that the temple setting reflected the sacred nature of the games
in the context of religious festivals.\footnote{454} Since the coinage of Alexandros is the first occasion
in which this motif appears at Synnada, Nollé suggested that permission to hold such
spectacles was sought by Alexandros himself and that the shield type reflects the

\textit{gladiatorial shows} and \textit{venationes} put on by Alexandros during his tenure as high priest.\footnote{455}

\footnote{449} RPC VII 791 (Plate L. 4).
\footnote{450} Nollé (1992/3), 70-1; such rectangular shields are commonly depicted in monumental depictions of
gladiators in other media. For example a grave monument from Klaudiopolis in Bithynia was designed in the
form a large convex rectangular shield with a helmeted head protruding from the top: French (1989), 91-7.
\footnote{451} SNG Aul 3998 from the reign of Gallienus.
\footnote{452} SNG Pfälzer IV 695; subsequent representations of the city goddess tend to include the depiction of a
mysterious oblong object at her feet (\textit{BMC} Pamphylia 90), but as Nollé has noted this motif is not found on
issues preceding the reign of Caracalla. Nollé therefore identified this object with a gladiatorial shield: Nollé
\footnote{453} Nollé (1992/3), 63: for the text confirming the award of this privilege see \textit{I.Side} TEp. 1 (early third
century AD).
\footnote{454} The performance of gladiatorial spectacles was intimately related to religious festivals, particularly those
of the imperial cult. For a discussion of the relation between the office of \textit{asiarches} and gladiatorial
spectacles see Carter (2002), 41-68.
\footnote{455} Nollé further speculates that since Alexandros was also \textit{agonothetes} he combined the Greek \textit{agon} and
Roman blood spectacle into a single foundation: Nollé (1992/3), 74-5.
The suggestion that Alexandros was involved with the production of gladiatorial contests is plausible. Robert demonstrated the link between officers of the imperial cult and both beast hunts and gladiatorial fights.\(^{456}\) Both Provincial and civic priests of the imperial cult were involved in gladiatorial displays and therefore the involvement of a two-time high priest would accord well with this context.\(^{457}\) Conversely, the only inscription dealing with the career and activities of Alexandros is the text recounting the erection of the monument to Telesphoros the agonistic victor. Thus there is no independent evidence that is able to verify the suggestion of Nollé that Alexandros was personally responsible for staging of gladiatorial games at Synnada. However, on balance the circumstantial evidence does favour Nollé’s theory. In the period following Alexandros the mint of Synnada produced types depicting both gladiatorial combat and *venationes*, which must indicate that the city possessed the right to stage such contests at this time.\(^{458}\) The fact that Alexandros’ issues are the first reference to gladiatorial combat from Synnada may imply that this institution originated during his tenure as priest.

**Kl. Kallistos**

In the reign of Trebonianus Gallus (AD 251-3) the eponym Kl. Kallistos signed a series of issues in name of the Emperor and his son Volusianus at the mint of Kolophon. Three of the types signed by Kallistos are typical of the mint of Kolophon. They depict Apollo reclining on a lyre and holding a laurel branch (Milne 259), a facing depiction of the cult

\(^{456}\) Robert (1940), 270-5.

\(^{457}\) For an example of the connection between the Provincial cult and gladiatorial combat see Aurelios Diadochos at Thyatira (*TAM V.* 2 950); for an equivalent example of a civic high priest of the imperial cult presiding over gladiatorial games see M. Oulpios Phlabianos Phileas at Miletos: *I.Didyma* 279. 10-12; 152. 8-12.

\(^{458}\) *SNG* Aul 3997-3998 (Gallienus: Plate L. 7-8).
statue of Artemis Ephesia (Milne 260) and a standing Athena (Milne 261). However, Kallistos also signed a remarkable type depicting the sacrifice of a bull before a tetrastyle temple, probably that of Apollo Klarios. In the top part of the field a seated cult statue of Apollo is shown within the temple. Beneath the temple a bull approaches a flaming altar, before which are arranged thirteen figures each with raised hands and possibly holding wreaths. The identity of these figures as representatives of the Koinon Ionion is confirmed by the legend ΤΟ ΚΟΙΝΟΝ ΙΩΝΩΝ inscribed across the centre of the coin. Around the edge of the flan variants of the legend ΕΠΙ ΣΤΡ ΚΛ ΚΑΛΛΙΣΤΟΥ ΙΕΡΕΩΣ ΙΩΝΩΝ ΚΟΛΟΦΩΝΙΩΝ (when Kallistos priest of the Ionians was general, (coin) of the Kolophonians) may be read. The flans of this type tend to be wider and heavier than the other types of Kallistos, indicating that this was intended as higher denomination piece. Thus, it would appear that the eponym deployed standard civic iconography on the smaller denomination pieces of his series. However, the potential for personal display provided by the large flan of the largest denomination was fully exploited. Kallistos was the priest of the Ionians and so the commemoration of this institution was of obvious personal significance. The iconographic motif depicting thirteen representatives around the temple of Apollo is suggestive of the commemoration

459 The thirteen cities of the Koinon Ionion were Klaizomenai, Kolophon, Ephesos, Erythrai, Lebedos, Miletos, Myos, Phokaia, Priene, Smyrna, Teos, Chios and Samos: Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 499.
460 Milne (1941), 100 no. 255; SNG Aul 2024 (Plate XXIII. 9): Herrmann also identified a specimen of this type in an auction catalogue (Aufhäuser (Munich), 10, 1993 no. 526): Herrmann (2002), 229.
461 Milne records that the flan diameter of the Ionian specimens he examined ranged from 33-36 mm (c. 16.85 g). The diameter of the Apollo type ranged from 32-28 mm (c.10.17 g). The Artemis Ephesia and Athena types tend to be around 30mm in diameter (10.38 g): Milne (1941), nos. 255, 259-261 (Plate XXIII. 1-2). This indicates that the Artemis and Athena types and possibly the Apollo types were of the same denomination. The denominational relationship of the issues was reinforced by the juxtaposition of the obverse portrait type of the Emperor with the Ionian type and an obverse portrait type of his son and junior partner Volusianus with Apollo and Artemis types.
462 The significance of the title ‘the priest of the Ionians’ is discussed by Herrmann; aside from the coins of Kallistos, the only other reference to this office appears in an inscription honouring T. Phl. Aur. Alexandros of Erythrai: I.Erythrai 64, 9. However, very little is known about the function of this office and how it related to the high priesthood of the koinon held by Phronton: Herrmann (2002), 239.
of a meeting or festival of the koinon held at the city of Kolophon, very possibly during the priesthood of Kallistos himself. 463 It must be conceded that in the absence of further evidence the association of coin type with an actual meeting or festival of the koinon cannot be confirmed, but such an interpretation seems reasonable. Moreover, the fact that a self-confessed priest of the Ionians introduces this type to the mint of Kolophon must be significant.

The same type appears on one more occasion at Kolophon, in a series in the name of P. Ailios Kallineikos in the reign of Valerian. 464 Kallineikos signs with the legend ΕΠΙ ΣΤΡ Π. ΑΙ. ΚΑΛΛΙΝΕΙΚΟΥ ΚΟΛΟΦΩΝΙΩΝ (When P. Ai. Kallineikos was general, (coin) of the Kolophonians). Thus, there is no evidence that Kallineikos held any formal priesthood or office in the koinon Ionion. The motivation for the revival of this type remains unclear, but two possibilities present themselves. The type could commemorate another meeting or festival of the koinon at Kolophon in the reign of Valerian. Kallineikos may have not held a formal position in the league, but the act of hosting a meeting of the koinon may still have been deemed important enough to be celebrated on the coinage. The other possibility is that the type was revived for denominational reasons. The three specimens of the type catalogued by Milne ranged from 33-32 mm in diameter. This is largest denomination produced at Kolophon at this period and these measurements are compatible with the diameters of the specimens of the koinon issues of Kallistos. 465 Thus the koinon type may simply have functioned as an indicator of high denomination during the latter part of the third century, although the very specific nature of the iconography makes it more likely that it refers to an actual event related to the Koinon Ionion.

463 Herrmann (2002), 229.
464 BMC Ionia 60; Milne (1941), no. 263 (Plate XXIII. 4).
465 Milne records examples of this type with diameters of 33, 36 and 33.5 mm: Milne (1941), 100 no. 255.
Conclusion

Personal iconography may have had antecedents in the Hellenistic period, but the phenomenon became more prominent in the Roman period. The case studies outlined here are some of the clearest examples of this overt individual elite self-representation on coinage. The iconography displayed by these issues is unusual enough to be distinguished from the bulk of the local monetary output of their respective mints. However, not all coin iconography was as explicitly individualistic. The majority of the lower denomination issues produced in the name of Kallistos at Kolophon were adorned with conventional iconography. The motifs of reclining Apollo and Artemis Ephesia were common types repeated consistently throughout the history of the mint of Kolophon during the Roman imperial period. Even such conventional types could still possess resonances for the eponyms who signed them. The types signed by Phl. Andreas were both typical of the mint and reflected his career in the service of cult of Apollo at Miletos. The prevalence of particular types at certain mints can be explained in terms of their importance to civic identity and the activities of the civic elite who promoted and maintained this identity. Such types were not overtly personalised, since they were in common usage, but there may have remained some flexibility in the system. Individual eponyms may have been free to choose the types most pertinent to their interests from the established cannon of civic iconography. In the vast majority of examples, where extensive documentation is absent, such processes are often invisible to the modern scholar. It is only in cases where the eponym is attested extensively in the epigraphic record or where the iconography is highly unusual is this process visible. Consequently, one of the few practical ways to analyse this
phenomenon is through case studies focused on individual eponyms. However, another approach may also prove fruitful. By studying the patterns in the deployment of individual types in the context of the total output of a mint it is possible to gain some understanding of the factors governing the choice of civic coin types: including the degree of the personal involvement of the eponym. This methodology has been applied to the mints of Thyateira and Laodikeia in the succeeding chapter.
5.

The Mints of Laodikeia and Thyateira

It is the intention of this chapter to analyse the function of coin eponyms within the context of the total output of two specific mints. Not all issues were signed by eponyms and it is only by looking at the entire output of a mint that it is possible to see this phenomenon in its full context. Questions that are pertinent to this area include, who were coin eponyms, who determined when coinage was produced; what type of coinage was to be produced; what was the role of the eponyms in this process? In the absence of detailed evidence it is not always possible to answer these questions fully. However, by studying patterns in the material, it is possible to gain some understanding of the factors that governed civic coin production and the role of the eponyms in this process. Therefore, this section will seek to identify patterns in the citation of eponyms and explain why such patterns occur. The diversity and nature of types that were signed by eponyms are compared with those that were not, in order to determine the effect of the naming of a specific individual on the nature of coinage and its iconography. The preceding chapter examined examples of personalised iconography in detail. In such cases it is clear that the eponym made the choice of type. However, in the vast majority of instances evidence for personalised iconography is sparse and the majority of small denomination coinage did not bear eponyms. In order to understand this material, this chapter will look in detail at the two principal structural factors which may have affected this process: the influence of the denominational structure and establishment of centralised production at ‘workshop
centres’. Furthermore, the final section will compare the material from Thyateira and Laodikeia with the output of the well-published mints of Aphrodisias, Smyrna and Magnesia on the Maiandros, in order to determine whether the patterns at these mints were typical of the province as a whole.

Laodikeia on the Lykos in Phrygia and Lydian Thyateira have been chosen for study because of the diversity of their imagery. Moreover, Thyateira is of particular interest because many of its eponyms are unusually well attested in the epigraphic record and thus it is possible to gain a better understanding of the diversity or homogeneity of eponyms as a group. However, this process is complicated by the fact that material from Nerva-Hadrian, the Severans and Trajan Decius until the end of provincial coinage in Asia is yet to be published by the \textit{RPC} project. Material relating to Maximian and Philip is in preparation, but the preliminary material was kindly made available to me by permission of M. Amandry. This handicap is particularly detrimental for the coinage of Severan Laodikeia, since this mint was very prolific under Caracalla, who granted \textit{neokoros} status to the city. However, collecting the material in the \textit{BMC} corpus, \textit{SNG} corpora and Waddington inventories may compensate much of this deficiency. The material published by Mionnet in the first half of the nineteenth century has also been consulted, because two eponyms from Thyateira are known only from specimens in Mionnet. The age of this catalogue has obvious drawbacks in terms of the accuracy of the readings and attributions, and the lack of photographic plates makes evaluation difficult. The vast majority of the types from Thyateira and Laodikeia recorded in Mionnet are not now in the \textit{BNF} collection. Moreover many of the types published in Mionnet were derived from the earlier
catalogues of Vaillant, Sestini and Eckhel. Therefore the existence of some of Mionnet’s entries may be debated. However, in cases where the name of the eponym is attested elsewhere and the types are common at either Thyateira or Laodikeia, it is likely that Mionnet refers to a genuine type. Therefore, the authenticity of each type must be decided on a case-by-case basis.

**THYATEIRA**

**The City of Thyateira**

Thyateira, modern Akhisar, is located on the river Lykos south of ancient Attaleia and east of Apollonis in North West Lydia. The pre-existing Lydian settlement was augmented by a Seleukid military colony, probably founded in the period between Seleukos Nikanor’s victory over Lysimachos at Korupedion and his assassination in 281 BC. The earliest epigraphic evidence for the colony is a dedication to Apollo Pityaēnos dated to the 37th year of the Seleukid era (274 BC). Throughout the course of the third century BC the city changed hands between the Seleukids and Attalids several times, until the treaty of Apameia finally ended the Seleukid claim to the city. In the early Roman imperial period Thyateira was attached to the *conventus* district of Pergamon, but under Caracalla Thyateira was made a *conventus* centre in its own right.

**The Coinage and Eponyms of Thyateira**

---

466 Vaillant (1698), Eckhel (1779) and Sestini (1796).
468 *TAM* V.2 881.
The study of the coinage of Thyateira is an exceptionally rich field. The unusual level of prosopographical detail provided by the inscriptions of TAM V.2 affords an unparalleled opportunity to analyse the careers and activities of the local coin eponyms. From this process it is possible to investigate on a civic scale whether personal factors affected the nature and function of the coinage produced in their name. Thyateira is one of the very few mints for which there is sufficient biographical material to adopt this methodology and the prosopography of the best attested eponyms will be outlined in a series of case studies later in this section. Moreover, on a fundamental level, the patterns of eponym citation at Thyateira pose questions concerning the factors dictating the choice and function of legend formulae. In order to answer these questions it is first necessary to outline the pattern of eponym citation in the context of the overall output of the mint.

The earliest issues of Thyateira were bronze pieces, conventionally dated to the second century BC. These bronze coins carried obverse types of either Artemis Boreitene or Apollo and reverse types of Apollo, a bow and quiver and a double axe. It is of interest that two cases of full or abbreviated names are known from this period: Hermokrates and Menandros. In the Julio-Claudian and Flavian periods eponyms did not sign issues. However, by the reign of Trajan it became common for the largest types of Thyateira to be adorned with the name of the proconsul. Three proconsuls are attested from this period: Fuscus (procos AD 98-102), Q. Fabius Postuminus (procos before AD 112?)

---

470 Imhoof-Blumer and Head were of the opinion that the earliest bronze coins of Thyateira may have belonged to the final period of Seleukid control of the city: Imhoof-Blumer (1897) no. 1 and BMC Lydia cxxi. More recent corpora such as Winterthur and SNG München follow a very similar chronology by dating the Hellenistic bronzes of Thyateira to the second century BC: Winterthur 3958 (early 2nd century BC) and SNG München 571-3 (around the 2nd century BC).
471 Head BMC Lydia cxxi. Thyateira is also thought to have issued a small series of cistophori under Aristonikos: Robinson (1954), 1-8.
and L. Dasumius Hadrianus (procos ca. AD 106/7). However the majority, particularly the smaller denominations, continued to be left unsigned by either local or Roman officials. These proconsular names may simply have served as a dating mechanism and it is instructive that the custom of regularly citing local eponyms on coinage does not emerge until after the practice of citing proconsular names had been abandoned. Thyateira does not begin to adorn large denomination coinage with local eponyms until the reign of Marcus Aurelius. The absence of eponyms in the first and early second centuries AD may have been the result of the small-scale nature of Thyateiran coin production in this period.

The Julio-Claudian output of the mint was limited to four issues, most of which are known from only a single type. In the reign of Marcus Aurelius an increase in iconographic complexity and the number and size of the denominations occurred. It is in the context of this change in mint productivity that the reasons for the re-introduction of local eponyms may be sought. Increased output may have required new controls for the management of coin production. Moreover, this upsurge in production was probably the result of the development of Kraft’s specialised workshop centres. In this context it is easy to see how the convention of incorporating eponyms into coin legends may have spread to Thyateira from neighbouring mints utilising the same production resources.

The eponyms listed on the 2nd and 3rd century AD coinage of Thyateira are as follows:

---

472 Since no issue associated with Cn. Pedianus Fuscus accords Trajan with the title of Dacius, his proconsulship must pre-date AD 103 (Stumpf 539, PIR² P 199). L. Dasumius Hadrianus was suffect consul in AD 93 (Stumpf 549, PIR² D 14). Q. Fabius Postuminus held the proconsulship in AD 111/2 (Stumpf 559, I.Ephesos VII. 2 3511, PIR² F 54).

473 The flan size of the signed issues tends to be over 30mm, while those of the unsigned issues are all below 30mm in diameter: e.g. BMC Lydia 74-5, Imhoof-Blumer (1897) nos. 35-6, SNG München 623, 626-8, SNG Tübingen 3854-5.

474 RPC I identifies four issues, one dating to the early first century AD (2379: Plate VI. 1), a Claudian issue dating to c. AD 50-4 (2380-1: Plate VI. 2) and two issues under Nero (c. AD 55-60 2382-2383, c. AD 60 2383: Plate VI. 3-4).

475 In this period new impressive denominations were introduced measuring 43 mm (41.9g) and 36mm (25.8g): Heuchert (Thesis), 337. For the diversity of Types see Heuchert 1044-1086.
Herma[go]ras c. AD 139-144

Krassipes? c. 138-161

G. Aur(elios) Stratonikianos: AD 161 to 175 (probably 169-75)

M. I(oulios) Menelaos, c. 166 - 180 (probably 169 to 177)

K. Laibian(os) K (?) strategos AD 177-180

Eudios II AD178-80

L. Aur(elios). Demostratos, AD 178 -180

Uncertain Magistrate c. 180-2

Moschianos Philippou c. 184-8

Titos Aure(lio) Barbaros c. AD 184-8

M. Aur(elios) Athenaios strategos c. AD 188-190

Artemidoros II Florou c. AD 191-2

---

476 The name of this eponym occurs on a single issue bearing a youthful portrait of Marcus Aurelius: Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 331.
477 The attribution of the single type mentioning Krassipes (Heuchert 1043: Plate VII. 2) to Thyateira is uncertain. Heuchert’s recent examination of the issue noted the extremely worn nature of the ethnic and the uneven nature of wear led him to question the authenticity of the personal name: Heuchert (Thesis Appendix) no. 331.
478 Heuchert 1049-1053 (Plate VII. 6-7).
479 Menelaos is known to have signed four different reverse types of at least two different denominations. The largest denomination measured c. 38mm (29.52-28.39g) in diameter and depicted either a standing Zeus Lydios holding an eagle and sceptre or standing Athena in helmet holding a phiale and resting her other arm on a shield (Heuchert 1054-55). The smaller domination measured either 33 (14.95g) and 34mm (15.18g) and depicted either a seated Hephaistos hammering a helmet, which he holds with tongs over a column or a standing Tyche wearing a modius and holding a rudder and cornucopiae (Heuchert 1056-57).
480 Currently two reverse types of the same denomination are known to have been signed by K. Laibianos(?): Heuchert 1058-9. It should also be noted that 1060/2 and 1061/2 with the name of Eudios II are die linked with 1059 in the name of Laibianos(?), thus indicating that the two issues may have been produced within a short time period of each other: Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 333.
481 Heuchert 1060-1064 (Plate VIII. 1-5).
482 Heuchert 1065-1068 (Plate VIII. 6-7, IX. 1).
483 Heuchert (1071: Plate IX. 3) records an issue with an illegible name of an eponym ending in ‘ANOY’, which he dated to c. AD 180-2 because Commodus is shown with a short beard and referred to by the name of Marcus: Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 333.
484 Heuchert 1072-82 (Plate IX. 2-6, X 1-5, XI. 1-2).
485 Heuchert 1083-6 (Plate XI. 4-6).
Asiatikos Hermogenes, strategos reign of Septimius Severus

Aur(elios) Glykon Loukiou, strategos, signs in the name of Septimius Severus, Caracalla and Geta Caesar

Moschos II, strategos, the reign of Septimius Severus

Glykon Bakchios, strategos

Kornelios Anton(inos?), strategos

Hieronymos, in the name of Geta Caesar

Philadelphos, strategos, early third century

MAur(elios) Agathokles, strategos, AD 217-18

Marcus Aur(elios) Diadochos equestrian, AD 217-18

T. Kl(audios) Stratoneikianos, strategos, AD 218-24

Aur(elios) Klo(dios) Dionysios, strategos, equestrian, strategos, AD 218-22.

---

486 Heuchert 1097: Head has suggested that the eponym should be associated with the Artemidoros Methy [...] mentioned in TAM V. 2 939: BMC Lydia cxxiii. However, the date of the text and therefore the identification with the eponym are uncertain: Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 334.

487 Asiatikos Hermogenes was responsible for a large issue of coinage in the reign of Septimius Severus: SNG Aul 3221 (Plate XIII. 3), BMC Lydia 89-90, Imhoof-Blumer (1897) no. 23. The name Aur. Hermogenes is attested in an honorific inscription from Thyateira, although it is unclear whether we are dealing with a family member or an unrelated homonym: TAM V. 2 953.

488 The same eponym may also be attested on the coinage of neighbouring Attaleia: Head BMC Lydia xxxvii.

489 Wadd 5364, Mionnet IV 932, SNG München 638, Franke-Nollé 2297-8, 2299-2301 and Imhoof-Blumer (1897) no. 27.

490 SNG Aul 3223, 8278 and Imhoof-Blumer (1897) no. 28 (Plate XVI. 2).

491 The only published specimen of Kornelios Anton(inos?) is Mionnet IV 955. No example of this eponym is currently in the collection of BNF. In the light of the problems of Mionnet’s accuracy it is possible that Kornelios is a false eponym.

492 The eponym Hieronymos is recorded on a single type depicting a Zeus enthroned with Nike: Mionnet IV 961 (following Sestini (1796), 445 no. 51). I not aware of an extant specimen of this type and therefore Hieronymos may be a false eponym.

493 As far as I am aware, this individual is only attested on a single pseudo-autonomous type depicting the senate (obverse) and Tyche (reverse) from the early third century AD: Imhoof-Blumer (1897), no. 26.

494 Stratoneikianos is attested on a series of coinage from the reign of Elagabalus AD 218-22: BMC Lydia 112, 119, Mionnet IV 977 (cf. Dr. Busso Peus Nachfolger 382 26 April 2005: 49.35: Plate XVI. 7), Hunterian 17, Mionnet IV 888 (following Sestini (1796) 441 no. 4), 981 and Mionnet Sup VII 633 (following Vaillant (1698), 160): for the correct reading of the coin see Head BMC Lydia cxxv.

G. Aroun(tios) Antoneinos, equestrian, strategos, Severus Alexander (AD 222-235)⁴⁹⁶

Artemagoras, strategos, Severus Alexander

Aur(elios) Kentauros Dionysios, strategos, Severus Alexander⁴⁹⁷

L. Mar. Pollianos, strategos, Severus Alexander⁴⁹⁸

M. Aur(elios) Phaeinos b, strategos, c. AD 235-8⁴⁹⁹

T Pha(bios) Alph Apollinarios, strategos, c.238-44⁵⁰⁰

Archidemos, AD 244-9 ⁵⁰¹

Okt. Artemidoros, strategos, Valerian and Gallienus (AD 253-60).⁵⁰²

The Prosopography of the Eponyms of Thyateira

Thyateira represents an invaluable opportunity for the study of the prosopography of coin eponyms, because the proportion of eponyms appearing in the epigraphic record of the city is so high. Therefore, it is possible to gain a better understanding of the social status and cultural affiliations of the coin eponyms of Roman Asia through a study of Thyateira.

⁴⁹⁶ BMC Lydia 122, Mionnet IV 878, 990 (following Eckhel (1779), 194 no. 4), Mionnet Sup VII 638: the eponym Antoneinos should also be probably identified with the local magistrate mentioned on a civic dedication to Alexander Severus (TAM V. 2 915).

⁴⁹⁷ Imhoof-Blumer (1897) no. 30-1 (Plate XVI. 4-5), BMC Lydia 123-4 (Plate XVII. 5-6), SNG Aul 3210 (Plate XII. 9).

⁴⁹⁸ SNG Aul 3235 depicts a reclining river deity with one hand grasping a tree and the other arm resting on an upturned water urn, a cow/ox/bull stooping to drink at his feet. BMC Lydia 121 (Plate XVII. 4) portrays a standing naked Apollo, who rests his left elbow on a column and left foot on bucranium while holding a snake in his hands. BMC 47 (SNG Aul 3211: Plate XII. 10) depicts a standing city goddess in mural crown holding her inflated veil in her left hand and a statue of Apollo Tyrimnaios grasping a double axe and laurel branch. Mionnet IV 993 shows an enthroned half naked Zeus with an eagle in his right hand and a sceptre in his left hand. Mionnet IV 994 carries the image of a standing Tyche, while Mionnet IV 880 (following Sestini (1796), 441 no. 4) portrays a standing veiled city goddess in mural crown. It is tempting to associate this eponym with the L. Markios Pollianos attested as the first eponymous archon and agonothetes mentioned in a partially preserved decree of the ethnos of Asia in honour of Thyateira: TAM V. 2 990.

⁴⁹⁹ CNG 53, 21st August, 1098; BMC Lydia 137; SNG Cop 631.


⁵⁰² SNG München 688, Mionnet Sup VII 642, SNG Cop 632-3, SNG München 689, BMC Lydia 142, Mionnet IV 1015.
I(oulios) Menelaos

The first eponym who may be identified in the epigraphic record is I(oulios) Menelaos (c. AD 167-77). At first glance the association of our eponym with the M. Ioulios Menelaos honoured in TAM V. 2 969 is attractive. The similarities in nomenclature between the two men indicate that they were either synonymous or closely related. This M. Ioulios Menelaos was high priest, councillor for life and agonothetes of an unspecified festival. Menelaos is also described as having received the Emperor and is honoured for having willingly embarked on three embassies to the Emperor. Unfortunately, the Emperor Menelaos is said to have received is Caracalla and therefore the inscription is dated to post AD 215.503 Since the coinage may be confidently dated to AD 180 at the very latest (and is probably no later than AD 177) one must assume an active career of over thirty-five years to Menelaos, if the ambassador is to be associated with the eponym. Such a long and active career is not impossible, but would require that coinage dated to the very beginning of Menelaos’ career. We can be sure that Menelaos the ambassador was not the son of Menelaos the eponym. We know from TAM V. 2 969. 13-17 that M. Ioulios Dionysios Akylianos (the asiarches of the temples in Pergamon, agonothetes, high priest and twice stephanephoros) was the father of Menelaos the ambassador. The father of Dionysios was himself called Menelaos. He is not accorded a gentilicum in the two inscriptions in which he is mentioned. However, the fact that both his sons M. Ioulios Dionysios and G. Ioulios

503 Although Caracalla and Marcus Aurelius bore very similar nomenclature, the imperial visit in which Menelaos received the Emperor is generally attributed to Caracalla: Johnston (1983), 67; Halfmann (1986), 136, 228. Caracalla appears to have raised Thyateira to the status of a conventus centre in the context of the same visit: TAM V.2 943. Unusually, the text of TAM V. 2 969 refers to the Emperor as Μ Αὐτόπλου Αὐτωνεαίνοβ βασιλέα; for a fuller discussion of the unusual imperial titulature of ‘basileus’ see Eck, Chiron vi (1976), 291-3.
Kelsianos were both Ioulioi strengthens the possibility that he himself bore this *gentilicum*.\(^{504}\) Thus the circumstantial evidence cannot eliminate the possibility that either Menelaos the ambassador or his paternal grandfather are attested on the coinage.

**K. Laibian(os) K.**

The next eponym to appear in the epigraphic record is K. Laibian(os) K. Unfortunately the reading of the legends of Heuchert 1058-9 are insufficiently clear to confirm the name of the eponym. Imhoof-Blumer read Κ Λ ΛΙΒΙΑΝ Κ, but it is difficult to reject Head’s reading of Κ ΛΑΙΒΙΑΝ Κ in the light of the prominence of La bianos Kallistratou in the epigraphic record.\(^{505}\) This individual is known from two honorific inscriptions from Thyateira, which detail his many benefactions on behalf of the city. Indeed, it is clear from the nature of these benefactions that Laibianos was one the wealthiest and most important figures in late second- century Thyateira. According to *TAM* V. 2 983 Laibianos was honoured by the *boule* for serving as *agonothetes* of the god Tyrimnos *pro poleos* (outside/before the city), making generous distributions and contributions to the *boule*, presiding over the festival and public sacrifices in the *panegyris*, adorning the city with unsurpassed prizes for both the theatrical and gymnastic games from his personal resources. More generally Laibianos is praised in the conventional manner for fulfilling all the magistracies and liturgies generously and for performing services for the city from his personal funds. A similar picture of personal generosity emerges from *TAM* V.2 982. Here Laibianos is honoured by both the *boule* and the *demos* for having been a corn-purchaser

\(^{504}\) For the career of Menelaos the father of Dionysios see *TAM* V. 2 960 and 992: for a stemma of the entire family see *TAM* V. 2 p. 356.

\(^{505}\) For the first reading see Imhoof-Blumer (1897), 153, no. 18, for the restoration of Head see *BMC* Lydia, cxxiii. For the latest discussion of the readings see Heuchert (Thesis Appendix) 332-3.
(seitonesanta), for having been a triteutes, for having expended and given much money to the city and for having spent much of his own money during his tenure as agoranomos; he was dekaprotos at a time of a heavy tax assessment;\(^{506}\) he was isagogeus at the Augousteia agonistic festival; he was superintendent of the works installing the chequered paving (σκουτλώσεως) in the oikobasilikon in the Hadrianeia, work which he restored in six months, and finally he is described as being useful to the city in all his remaining duties and liturgies. Crucially, both inscriptions make constant references to the personal generosity of the benefactor, particularly in respect to his willingness to incur personal expenses. In the context of this long personal history of euergetism it would not be surprising if Laibianos also served his community by supervising and even paying for the production of a small issue of coinage c. AD 177-8 consisting of just two types, one depicting Zeus Lydios holding sceptre and eagle (Heuchert 1058) and the another depicting a standing Tyche with rudder and cornucopiae (Heuchert 1059). It should also be noted that Laibianos was praised for having made cash distributions to the city in TAM V. 2 982, as well as having made contributions to the boule in TAM V. 2 983 (LL 7-8). It therefore remains possible that part of these distributions were composed of coins struck in his own name, although the evidence for this is wholly circumstantial and the limited number of types may indicate that the issue was not large, although this inference cannot be confirmed until a die study is conducted.

\(^{506}\) The dekaprotoi were civic officials appointed to oversee the collection of the tribute assessment of community calculated by the Roman authorities. It would appear that in the year Laibianos was dekaprotos the assessment imposed by authorities was particularly severe in the light of the expenses incurred by the state fighting against the Bastarnae tribe on the Danuban frontier: TAM V. 2 p 364. If a city was unable to meet its tribute requirement from its usual sources of revenue, the dekaprotoi were personally financially responsible. For a discussion of the system for the collection of taxes in the imperial period and the role of dekaprotoi see Jones (1940), 138-40 and Dmitriev (2005), 197-200.
M. Aur(elios) Athenaios

The eponym M. Aur(elios) Athenaios (strategos c. AD 188-190) may be confidently identified with the M. Aur(elios) Athenaios mentioned in inscriptions from both Thyateira and Ephesos. According to TAM V. 2 957 Aur(elios) Athenaios was an asiarches, rhetor, neokoros, the husband of Phlabia Preiskilla ‘β’ (the daughter of Preiskilla and high priestess from a senatorial family). He was also the father of M. Aurelios Preiskillianos (eques, neokoros of the Emperors) and grandfather of M. Aurelios Preiskillianos Satorneilos. Further prosopographical detail is provided by TAM V 954, which reiterates the status of Aur(elios) Athenaios as a rhetor and holder of the offices of asiarches, neokoros as well as prytanis. Phlabia Preiskilla is described as twice high priestess of Asia and prytanis. Furthermore, this inscription relates that Athenaios’ daughter Aurelia Hermonassa was the high priestess of the Tyche of the city for life, seven times prytanis with her family and twice high priestess of Asia and Thyateira. Hermonassa was the wife of Aurelios Diadochos, himself a coin eponym in the reign of Macrinus. We also know that Athenaios was honoured at Ephesos by the erection of a monument paid for out of the funds of the Ephesian boule.507 The identification of the Athenaios of I.Ephesos VII.1 3057 with the Thyateiran eponym is confirmed by the convergence of honorific titles, since he was honoured as archiereus of Asia, neokoros of the Emperor and rhetor (Ll 1-3). In I.Ephesos VII. 1 3057, Athenaios was honoured for his advocacy of “our fatherland” (Il 7-8 συνηγορίας τῆς πατρίδος ἡμῶν). This would imply that Athenaios utilised his rhetorical skills for some unspecified service or services for the Ephesians; since the absence of an ethnic in relation to Athenaios indicates that at some point he received Ephesian citizen

507 I.Ephesos VII. 1 3057.
rights. Athenaios probably performed the office of strategos at Thyateira before his term as asiarches, since this title is not mentioned on his coinage. Indeed, although it is not formally specified that Athenaios served as asiarches in Ephesos, his appearance in an Ephesian inscription strongly implies that this was the case. Puech has suggested that the Athenaios of I.Ephesos VII. 2 4114 honoured as the winner of the Chrysantheria at Sardeis must be an unrelated homonym. However, Caldelli, who dates the foundation of the festival to c. AD 176, rejects the thesis that the Sardian Chrysantheria was a Severan foundation. Nevertheless, the ethnic origin of the rhetor of I.Ephesos VII 2 4114 is recorded as Tyana and therefore he cannot be synonymous with the Thyateiran eponym.

**Aur(elios) Glykon Loukiou**

Aur(elios) Glykon Loukiou is known from a large number of reverse types struck with obverse types depicting Septimius Severus, Caracalla and Geta Caesar. The epigraphic record reveals little detailed biographical information. However, another Aur(elios) Glykon from the reign of Severus Alexander is recorded as the son of Aur(elios) Glykon. The chronology of Glykon senior would accord well with the date of the coinage late in the joint reign of Septimius Severus and Caracalla. However, the only detail provided by this text is that Aur. Glykon senior was himself the descendent of liturgists (ll. 6-7). The younger Aur(elios) Glykon was honoured by the association of the youths (νεανίσκοι) around the Herakleia of the first gymnasium for having presided over the agon of the epinikian festival of Severus Alexander. Another honorific inscription commemorates

---

511 TAM V. 2 949.
the eponym Aurelios Artemagoras from the time of Severus Alexander. This Artemagoras is described as the son of Glykon and it is possible that the father of Artemagoras may be identified with the eponym Aurelios Glykon.\textsuperscript{512} No further prosopographical detail is known about the family of Aur(elios) Glykon the younger and Aur(elios) Artemagoras, but the nomenclature is consistent with the supposition that both Glykon the younger and Artemagoras may have been the sons of our eponym.\textsuperscript{513}

**M. Aurelios Agathokles**

The most recent publication of the specimen allegedly signed by M. Aurelios Agathokles, depicting Zeus standing between Macrinus and his son Diadumenianus Caesar (dating from the brief reign of Macrinus (AD 217-18)), is found in Mionnet.\textsuperscript{514} Campanile tentatively identified this eponym with the \textit{asiarches} M. Aur. Agathokles attested at Ephesos.\textsuperscript{515} This text records that this man was four times \textit{philosebastos, grammateus} of the \textit{demos} and \textit{asiarches} of the provincial imperial temples in Ephesos.\textsuperscript{516} The association of the Thyateiran Agathokles with the \textit{asiarches} of Ephesos remains plausible; however since there is no convergence between the titulature of the inscription and the coin legend this association cannot be confirmed. The name Aurelios Agathokles is not attested in the epigraphy of Thyateira itself. Moreover, the questionable accuracy of both Vaillant and Mionnet casts doubt on the authenticity of this eponym. Thus the existence of this type cannot be confirmed until the publication of an extant specimen.

\textsuperscript{512} \textit{TAM} V. 2 945.
\textsuperscript{513} For further discussion of the prosopography of this family see \textit{TAM} V.2 p. 349.
\textsuperscript{514} Mionnet IV 963, following Vaillant (1698), 147.
\textsuperscript{515} Campanile (1994), 128, no. 128.
\textsuperscript{516} \textit{L.Ephesos} III 897.
M. Aurelios Diadochos

The eponym M. Aurelios Diadochos, who appears on coinage in the name of Macrinus and his son Diadumenianus Caesar (AD 217/18), may be securely identified with the M. Aurelios Diadochos recorded in three inscriptions from Thyateira. M. Aurelios Diadochos Tryphosianos was the son of the otherwise unattested M. Aurelios Moschianos and Aurelia Tryphosia. It has already been established that Diadochos was the husband of Aurelios Hermonassa, the daughter of the eponym M. Aurelios Athenaios and twice high priestess of Asia and Thyateira. Diadochos held equestrian status and had simultaneously served as *asiarches* and high priest of the imperial cult at his fatherland. In addition, he was honoured with the title councillor for life. Moreover we know that Diadochos’ tenure as *asiarches* at the provincial imperial temples of Pergamon and high priest of the imperial cult at Thyateira were notable for their lavish games. According to *TAM* V. 2 950 Diadochos was given the honour by Severus Alexander of becoming the first man to combine the office of the high priesthood of the imperial cult with gladiatorial combat using sharpened weapons (*τοῖς ὀξέσιν*). It is clear from the frequency with which both civic and provincial high priests are connected with displays of gladiatorial combat that such shows were an integral element of such priesthoods. However, the

---

517 *TAM* V. 2 950, 951 and 952: Diadochos is also known from several coin types from the reign of Macrinus and Diadumenianus Caesar depicting Apollo Tyrimnos standing between Macrinus and Diadumenianus (*SNG* Leypold 1296 (Plate XV. 1), Mionnet Sup VII 624), Zeus standing with sceptre (Mionnet IV 966) and Tyche standing holding a statue of Apollo Tyrimnos (*SNG* Aul 3230).

518 *TAM* V. 2 952: in this text Tryphosianos is described as an equestrian, a distinction also held by the eponym Diadochos. For a complete stemma of this family see *TAM* V. 2 p. 351.

519 *TAM* V. 2 954. 2-7.

520 *TAM* V. 2 954. 12-16.

521 Robert (1971), 218-9. Friesen has argued that the imperial *indulgentia* of this inscription refers to Diadochos being the first to receive permission to add gladiatorial games to the *archierosyne*: Friesen (1999), 287. However this argument ignores the significance of the *τοῖς ὀξέσιν* (with sharpened weapons) within the clause.

522 Carter (2004), 41-68.
emphasis here on sharpened weapons would indicate that such shows were generally performed with dull blades in order to reduce the risk of injury and the likelihood of expensively trained fighters having to be replaced.\footnote{Carter (2004), 51.} Such a practice was obviously intended to limit the potential costs incurred by the asiarchai during their terms of office. The games of Diadochos were notable precisely because he sought and was granted imperial permission to remove this safeguard.\footnote{The eponym Diadochos is also attested in fragmentary inscription TAM V. 2 951, but this text offers no further prosopographical information.}

**Aur(elios) Artemagoras**

The name Artemagoras is attributed to Thyateira on a specimen published by Mionnet from the reign of Severus Alexander.\footnote{Mionnet IV 995} The reverse type is described as depicting two urns containing two palms sitting on an agonistic table. The authenticity of this type cannot be proved until the publication of use of an extant example, but it is highly likely that Mionnet’s reading is genuine. The fact that a contemporary Artemagoras is attested epigraphically strongly favours the authenticity of this eponym. Mionnet’s catalogue follows Vaillant’s description of this piece: Vaillant (1698), 165. Since the earliest reference to TAM V. 2 is from 1750, it is unlikely that another issue was retooled to refer to a known local notable. Moreover, in this case the choice of an agonistic type may have carried extra resonance, since the eponym Artemagoras may be confidently identified with the strategos Aur(elios) Artemagoras mentioned in TAM V.2 945.\footnote{TAM V. 2 p. 348.} This honorific text, erected by the dyers of Thyateira, records that Artemagoras was the holder of the office of the lampadarchia (the torch-magistrate) of the great holy isopythia Augousteia (ll. 9-11).
Therefore, if this specimen is genuine the choice of iconography may reflect the eponym’s own particular interest and career. However, the legend of the coin refers to the ‘ΙΕΠΕΙΑ ΟΛΥΜ’ (sacred Olympia, probably the [Hadrian]ia Olympia attested elsewhere\textsuperscript{527}), whereas Artemagoras held office at the Augousteia. Thus, the type refers to a different festival and the correlation between the iconography and eponym may not be direct. This inscription also states that Artemagoras served as one of the dekaprotoi, as did Laibianos Kallistratou, thus indicating the wealth and status possessed by Artemagoras.

**Eponyms and Iconography**

Now that the background and cultural interests of the Thyateiran eponyms has been established, it is necessary to examine the impact that these factors had on the iconography and frequency of coin production. The most obvious conclusion is the correlation between denomination and the signing of coinages. The largest denominations in all but a very few cases were signed, while those coins below 25 mm in diameter were invariably left unsigned.\textsuperscript{528} The distinction becomes blurred for flans in the range of 25 and 27 mm in diameter, since a large numbers of both signed and unsigned specimens in this range are known.\textsuperscript{529} The 25-27 mm area appears to have been a border zone, in which both practices

---

\textsuperscript{527} *TAM* V. 2 p. 315, 1026. 3.

\textsuperscript{528} For examples of unsigned small denominations see *SNG* Cop 586 (Plate XIII. 4), *SNG* Leypold 1265, *SNG* München 590, and *SNG* Lewis 1372.

\textsuperscript{529} In general this chapter will refer to denominations by reference to their module size. For the third century the work of Johnston has made it possible to assign values in terms of *assaria* to provincial denominations. However, the picture for first and second centuries is more complex. This situation is particularly confusing because the denominational system at most mints went through considerable changes throughout the first and second centuries and indications of absolute value are very rare. However, using the model established by Johnston, it is possible to make tentative suggestions regarding absolute values for earlier civic coins. In her table 74 Johnston set out her hypothetical values in terms of *assaria/chalkon* for Smyrna and Sardeis for the first and second centuries: Johnston (2007), 244-247. For example, Heuchert 1042 c. AD 139-44 (Hermagoras) measures 25mm and weighs 9.91g. Heuchert 1064, measuring 26mm in diameter, was signed by Eudios II. If Johnston’s values for late second century Sardeis and Smyrna apply to Thyateira, then they
were commonly employed. Exceptions to these general rules appear to have been rare. In
the period of joint rule between Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus (c. after AD 164) a
series of large denomination unsigned issues is attested.\textsuperscript{530} However, the eponyms who
signed the preceding issues under Antoninus Pius, Krassipes and Hermogenes, are known
from only one type each.\textsuperscript{531} Moreover, they are the first eponyms to appear at Thyateira
since the Hellenistic period. Thus eponyms were a new phenomenon at Thyateira at this
time, and so the systems and practices employed in later periods may not have been fully
developed. Other exceptions and ambiguities in the general pattern are apparent in later
periods. For example, in the reign of Maximinus \textit{SNG} Cop 631 and \textit{SNG} München 682 are
of the same denomination and share the same obverse die, but only the former is signed by
the \textit{strategos} Aur(elios) Phaeinos. In the reign of Caracalla we find an unsigned reverse
type was produced measuring 34mm in diameter.\textsuperscript{532} Nevertheless, this specimen represents
the largest unsigned reverse type of Thyateira from the period when eponyms were a
common feature of the coinage of which I am aware. The very largest denominations
measuring in excess of 40mm in diameter are entirely the preserve of signed issues.\textsuperscript{533}

The fact that the smallest denominations from Thyateira invariably went
unsigned raises questions concerning the place of these types in the structure of individual
issues. There are two main possibilities: either small denominations were produced
separately and were unrelated to the larger denominations, or the small denominations

\textsuperscript{530} Heuchert 1044 (40mm), 1045 (39mm), 1046 (38mm), 1047 (37mm), 1048 (35mm).
\textsuperscript{531} Heuchert 1042-1043.
\textsuperscript{532} \textit{SNG} Aul 3226 (Plate XLIII. 6), \textit{BMC} Lydia 96, \textit{SNG} München 647.
\textsuperscript{533} For example see \textit{SNG} Leypold 1296 (46mm 37.45g, M. Aurelios Diadochos, under Macrinus).
formed part of the same issues, but were unsigned as a result of their small flan size. The latter of these options is the most likely scenario in the vast majority of cases. For the period when eponyms were common at Thyateira (Antoninus Pius-Valerian), little work has been done on identifying individual issues. Small denomination coins are often difficult to date and most corpora treat pseudo-autonomous issues separately from issues bearing imperial portraits. However, the homonoia coins produced in the reign of brief Gordian III (AD 238-244) show that single issues were often composed of multiple denominations. Spoerri-Butcher records nine reverse types from this issue corresponding to five denominations (50mm, 40mm, 35mm, 30mm, 25mm).\textsuperscript{534} The eponym T. Phabios Alph Apollinarios invariably signed the three largest denominations of this issue and two of the three 30mm denomination types.\textsuperscript{535} Why this eponym did not sign the other 30mm type is difficult to say. However, the thematic unity (homonoia with Smyrna) indicates that these types should be understood as a single issue. The same conclusion may be drawn from the ‘year 88’ coinage of Laodikeia, which will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter. In this case a civic era replaces the name of an eponym as the dating mechanism for the coinage. Since the ‘year 88’ coins can be dated so accurately it is clear that these specimens constitute a single issue. The succinct formula ‘TO ΙΙΗ’ (year 88) could fit even the smallest denominations and types bearing this date range in eight from 43.91g to a mere 3.76g.\textsuperscript{536} Thus, this abbreviated dating mechanism affords us a rare opportunity to see how issues of civic coinage were generally composed of a wide number of denominations, including both imperial and pseudo-autonomous obverse types.

\textsuperscript{534} RPC VII 191-9.
\textsuperscript{535} RPC VII 197-8.
\textsuperscript{536} For an example of the largest denomination see SNG Aul 3856 and for the smallest types see SNG Cop 592-3.
The implications of this point for our understanding of the function of coin eponyms are significant. If, as has been argued in chapter two, eponyms often contributed financially to the production of civic coinages or at least were involved in the administration of civic coin production, then it is probable that the same eponyms were usually also responsible for the production of the majority of unsigned small denomination issues. In this context, it is pertinent to ask whether there were any marked iconographic distinctions between signed and unsigned issues. The answer to this question is a qualified yes, but the reasons for these differences are best explained in terms of the relationship between denomination and function.\footnote{At Rome the act of distributing coins to the populace was recorded on coin iconography, either in the form of the personification of \textit{Liberalitas} or the image of the Emperor distributing coins. However, such issues would have only represented a tiny proportion of the coins actually distributed: Metcalf (1993), 337-346.} The most elaborate iconography appears on the very largest denominations, which from the sole reign of Marcus Aurelius were almost invariably signed by eponyms.\footnote{Metcalf (1993), 337-346.} It is probably no coincidence that eponyms become a regular feature at Thyateira very soon after the introduction of these large denominations. The correlation between eponyms and elaborate iconography is particularly true of large denomination reverse types depicting elaborate imperial imagery. The first possible instance of a reverse type of this genre occurred c. AD 178-180, when a figure in military dress was shown riding while making the \textit{orans} gesture.\footnote{Heuchert 1066 (Aurelios Demostratos).} However, such motifs did not become common until the early Severan period. The types signed by the eponyms Asiatikos Hermogenes and Aurelios Glykon Loukiou, depicting Geta and Caracalla each holding either a patera or spear dressed in the \textit{paludamentum} flanking a burning altar are paradigmatic of the kind of imperial motif produced in this period.\footnote{Asiatikos Hermogenes: \textit{BMC} Lydia 91 (46mm), cf. Mionnet IV 933 for the same type signed by Aurelios Glykon Loukiou.} The Emperor was
often depicted interacting with local gods.\textsuperscript{541} Glykon also signed a type, which depicted Caracalla riding to the right making the \textit{orans} gesture with his right hand to an image of Apollo Tyrimnaios held in the right hand of the city goddess.\textsuperscript{542} The theme of imperial piety to local gods is also apparent on Glykon’s other reverse types. One type shows Caracalla in military costume standing in centre field holding a \textit{phiale}, flanked by a standing Asklepios with serpent staff to the left and a civic Tyche with mural crown and sceptre, who crowns the Emperor, to the right.\textsuperscript{543} Another type portrays the togate Caracalla standing and holding a phiale; next to him stands a naked Apollo Tyrimnaios in laurel wreath holding a double axe over his shoulder, and between the figures stands a flaming altar.\textsuperscript{544} On other occasions eponyms signed more elaborate versions of the standard civic motifs. A type of Aurelios Kentauros Dionysios from the reign of Elagabalus depicted Hekate clutching two torches, but with the addition of a wagon pulled by lions.\textsuperscript{545} Similarly, a large denomination piece weighing 46.55g depicts three of the most important deities represented on Thyateiran coinage, a standing Zeus with eagle and sceptre, a standing Athena with shield and lance and Apollo Tyrimnaios with double axe and bough on the same type.\textsuperscript{546}

This emphasis on complex civic and imperial imagery is unsurprising given the tendency of eponyms to sign only the largest denominations, which were large enough to be adorned with complex images. Eponyms were also known to have signed the standard representations of civic deities also found on unsigned issues. Common civic motifs such

\textsuperscript{541} In the reign of Elagabalus, the Emperor was shown jointly supporting an agonistic urn with Apollo Tyrimnaios: \textit{BMC} Lydia 119 (36mm). For the popularity of the motif of the piety of the Emperor to local cults throughout the civic coinages of the third century see Harl (1987), 52-70.
\textsuperscript{542} \textit{BMC} Lydia 94 (Plate XVII. 2): 44mm cf. Mionnet Sup VII 619: Imhoof-Blumer (1897), no. 24: 45mm.
\textsuperscript{543} \textit{SNG} München 645: 45.37g.
\textsuperscript{544} \textit{SNG} München 646: 19.57: Wadd 5367: Mionnet IV 953: Imhoof-Blumer (1897), no. 25: 35mm.
\textsuperscript{545} \textit{SNG} Aul 3210 (31.78g).
\textsuperscript{546} \textit{SNG} Aul 3221 (Asiatikos Hermogenes in the reign of Septimius Severus).
as the Tyche holding a rudder and cornucopiae and advancing Artemis drawing an arrow from a quiver are found on both signed and unsigned types. Once again denomination played a significant role in this process. The standard civic iconographic motifs were more common on the comparatively lower denomination signed pieces (c.27-35mm in diameter), while more elaborate types were confined to the very largest denominations. If we examine in detail the issue signed by M. I(oulios) Menelaos, we find that it is almost entirely composed of civic types common to Thyateira during this period. Heuchert 1054 (38 mm) depicts Zeus Lydios standing with eagle and sceptre, 1055 (38 mm) portrays a standing Athena with patera, shield and spear, 1056 (33 mm) depicts Hephaistos working on a helmet with a hammer and tongs and 1057 shows the civic Tyche with rudder and cornucopiae. In this period, the Zeus Lydios type is common on signed coinages, but the Athena motif is also attested on unsigned issues dated to c. AD 188-92. Thus, we may conclude that the iconography of both signed and unsigned issues were drawn from the same cultural and religious repertoire and that motifs employed on signed and unsigned types could overlap. The most striking difference was the degree of elaboration in terms of the detail and complexity of the scene afforded by the largest flan sizes.

The type depicting Hephaistos manufacturing the helmet is of potentially greater significance. This same motif is attested in the issues signed by M. Aurelios Athenaios (Heuchert 1087), Moschianos Philippou(?) (Heuchert 1073) and Titus Aurelios Barbaros

---

547 Both these motifs were found on types signed by G. Aurelios Stratonikianos: Heuchert 1050 and 1052 (probably AD 169-75). Unsigned specimens depicting these motifs include: RPC VII 190 (Artemis, Gordian III) and SNG München 683 (Tyche, Maximus).
548 For example, the Zeus Lydios type is also attested on Heuchert 1049 (Aurelios Stratonikianos, 35mm) and 1060 (Eudios II, 32mm). For an unsigned Athena type see Heuchert 1090.
549 The reading of the name of this eponym is uncertain and Heuchert only tentatively assigned this type to Moschianos: Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 343.
(Heuchert 1083) in the Antonine period. The same Hephaistos type also occurs once in the name of Asiatikos Hermogenes in the reign of Septimius Severus. This variant depicted Hephaistos seated on a cippus hammering a helmet, which he holds with tongs over a column, while Athena stands to the left resting her arm on a shield. Why this motif should suddenly be adopted on the coinage of Thyateira at this time is impossible to ascertain. There is currently no evidence of cult activity connected to Hephaistos from Thyateira and the fashion soon goes into decline. Heuchert suggested that this elaborate version of the type was modelled on an imperial medallion of Antoninus Pius. However, there are many significant differences between the composition of the medallion and coin types. On the Medallion Vulcan sits on a chair with one arm by his side and one raised, although the specimen recorded by Gnecci is too badly damaged to identify what he is holding. Athena stands with her right arm raised, but does not appear to hold the helmet as she does on the Thyateiran coin types and only the rear of shield is depicted. On the Thyateiran coin type, Hephaistos is seated on a cippus and holds the helmet in one hand and a hammer in the other. Athena also grasps the helmet and the side of her shield is visible. In addition the column on which the helmet rests is considerably thinner. A type identical to this is attested at Silandos (AD 184-8). Moreover, a simplified version of this motif without Athena is known from Nikomedia in Bithynia under Antoninus Pius. Since the composition of the types from Thyateira, Silandos and Nikomedia is identical,

550 Moschianos also produced a simplified version of this motif: Heuchert 1077.
551 For the Severan piece see Dr. Busso Peus Nachfolger 366 lot 738 29/10/00 (46mm, 53. 68g: Plate XVI. 7).
552 The final possible reference to Hephaistos on a coin minted after the reign of Commodus occurs on a specimen published by Mionnet: Mionnet IV 880 (following Sestini (1796), 441 no. 4, Severus Alexander).
553 Gnecci (1912) II, 18, no. 78, pl. 52.4: Plate X. 6): Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 337.
554 Silandos c. 177-80: RPC online no. 9954: the same type occurs at Magnesia on the Maiandros under Maximin Thrax (Shultz no. 307).
555 Nikomedia RPC online 5593 (c. AD 138-161).
these types must share a common prototype. The specimens of Nikomedia are the oldest example of this motif from Asia Minor, but since only the simplified version of the motif is known, these issues cannot have served as the prototype for Thyateira and Silandos. The nature and medium of this prototype remains unknown.

Although in this instance it is unlikely that a Roman imperial medallion served as the direct prototype for a civic coin type, it is possible that contact with Roman medallions and large denomination bronze coins affected the nature of civic coin iconography in general. Interaction with the sestertius and medallions, which were notable for their large size and elaborate iconography, may have encouraged provincial die engravers and their clients to attempt larger and more visually ambitious base metal issues. The evidence for the distribution of Roman medallions in Asia Minor is slight; Toynbee recorded only a very limited number of a Roman medallion finds from Anatolian contexts. However at Pautalia in Thrace and Tarsos in Kilikia there are examples of impressive base metal issues, which do not fit easily into the local denominational system. It is possible that these specimens represent local interpretations of the phenomenon of imperial medallions. Roman imperial base metal coinage do not appear to have been common in Asia, but the evidence of site finds indicate that they did circulate in limited numbers. Thus the shift towards larger and more impressive flans for civic coinages from the first century AD may have in part been influenced by Roman practices. Interaction with the sestertius provided the model for the development of large civic base-
metal denominations and the Roman tradition of employing diverse coin iconography was probably played a significant part in the introduction of more elaborate civic coin iconography.\(^{559}\) Another factor which may have played a role in this process, which will be discussed in greater detail in the subsequent chapter, was the desire to produce elaborate presentation pieces, possibly intended for cash distributions amongst the citizen body.\(^{560}\)

In this way the large denomination coinage of Thyateira became another medium for the display of civic culture and ideology. Moreover, this was a form of display in which the names of individual notables were prominent aspects. In this context it would not be surprising if the eponym played a significant role in the choice and composition of these elaborate types, particularly if the eponyms had played some role in the financing of coinage. No ancient source explicitly states who was responsible for the choice of civic coin types, but the fact that these large types were concerned with the specific collective identity of the city would indicate that these types were chosen at the local level. We can see this state of affairs clearly in the output of the eponym Aur(elios) Stratonikianos. In the reign of Elagabalus Stratonikianos signed a remarkable type depicting the Emperor and civic deity Apollo Tyrimnaios. The Emperor is shown on the right wearing a cuirass and jointly supporting an agonistic urn with Apollo Tyrimnaios, above which is written ΠΥΘΙΑ. Apollo grasps his usual attribute of a double axe and a burning altar is depicted between the figures.\(^{561}\) This was not the only type to deploy agonistic imagery during this period. The same eponym signed a type inscribed with the legend ΑΥΓΟΥΣΤΕΙΑ ΠΥΘΙΑ surrounded by a laurel wreath and a type depicting Apollo Tyrimnaios holding an agonistic
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\(^{559}\) For a discussion of the adoption of denominational modules based on the sestertius at the Provincial and civic mints of the eastern Mediterranean from the late first century AD see Burnett (2009), 233.

\(^{560}\) For further discussion see pages 238-257.

\(^{561}\) BMC Lydia 112 (44 mm) (cf. Mionnet IV 975, Mionnet Sup VII 631-2 and Hunterian 17): Plate XVII. 112.
urn as well as the more usual double axe. Similar types also adorned the unsigned coinage during this period and thus it is very likely that they formed part of the same issue. The cultural context for these types is provided by an honorific decree dedicated to the athlete Gaios Perelios Aurelios Alexandros. This decree records that Alexandros went on an embassy to Elagabalus on behalf of his fatherland during the course of which the Emperor granted isopythian status (equal to the Pythian games of Delphi) to the local festival of the Augousteia. This event was the impetus for the production of a significant commemorative coinage celebrating the prestige bestowed on the city by the presence of an isopythian festival and the role of the Emperor in this process. There is no evidence that Stratoneikianos himself was involved in the successful embassy to the Emperor or in the subsequent games, but the types signed by Stratoneikianos are clear evidence for the employment of coinage as one medium of many for the celebration of important civic events. Similar agonistic coinages are known from Laodikeia and were a common

562 Mionnet IV 977, Dr. Busso Peus Nachfolger 382 26 April 2005 (wreath): BMC 119: 36mm, Imhoof-Blumer (1897) no. 29 35 mm (Apollo holding an agonistic urn).
563 SNG Cop 616 (Plate XIII. 7), SNG München 669 and SNG Leybold 1302 (Plate XV. 3) depict a wreath containing three pebbles/ prize apples on a agonistic table; two palms in a prize crown are depicted on SNG Aul 3231 (Plate XIII. 1) and SNG Cop 621; a type showing two prize palms between a pair of creepers is known from SNG München 666 and SNG Leybold 1305 (Plate XV. 4); SNG Aul 3232 (Plate XIII. 2) and SNG Leybold 1301 (Plate XV. 2) portray two crowns sitting on a table, beneath which is an amphora; a pseudo-autonomous type with a Roma/ Athena obverse bust depicts an agonistic prize crown inscribed with ΑΥ[ΓΟΥΣΤΕ]ΙΑ, beneath which was written ΠΥΘΙΑ on the reverse (BMC Lydia 38 and SNG Leyold 1269).
564 TAM V.2 1018: Keil and von Premerstein were the first to publish this text and their discussion of the significance of this inscription in the context of the coinage remains pertinent: Keil and von Premerstein (1911), 35-7; see also Robert (1937), 119-123. We know from TAM V.2 1017 that Alexandros was a former victor in the Pankration discipline.
565 The Thyateiran Augousteia was an established festival before the grant of isopythian status: TAM V. 2 982. A fragmentary inscription from Smyrna mentions a victor at the Augousteia Pythia, Hadriana Olympia and Tyrimneia, but unfortunately the name is lost: Petzl (1974), 119. For a discussion of iselastic festivals, equal in rank to the great Panhellenic festivals of the Pythia and Olympia, in Asia see Herrmann (1975), 155-8. For a general discussion of agonistic types see Klose (2005), 123-133.
566 Not all the iconography of the types signed by Stratoneikianos was notable for its agonistic imagery. He signed types depicting the standard civic motifs of Apollo Tyrimnaios holding a double axe and bough and Artemis reaching for an arrow from a quiver: Mionnet IV 888 and Hunterian 19. Mionnet also records two types, depicting a winged Nemesis with griffin and Herakles with club and altar, which Head argued
feature of the third century coinages of Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{567} Agonistic motifs also appeared on later Thyateiran coinage, although never in the concentration associated with the celebration of the attainment of isopythian status for the Augousteia. In the reign of Valerian Okt. Artemidoros signed a type celebrating the two main agonistic festivals of the city. The type shows two prize crowns containing palms resting on a table, below which is an amphorae flanked by two vases. The legend reads: \textit{ΕΠ Σ ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΥΓΟΥΣΤΕΙΑ ΠΙΥΘΙΑ ΑΔΡΙΑΝΑ ΟΛΥΜΠΙΙΑ] ΘΥΑΤΕΙΡΗΝΩΝ}.\textsuperscript{568} The Hadriana Olympia was also celebrated on the issue of Artemagoras under Severus Alexander.\textsuperscript{569} The motivation for the production of these types is unclear. Artemagoras held offices at the Augousteia, but his coinage is concerned with the Hadriana Olympia. There is no evidence in the epigraphic record for a change in status for either of these contests in the reigns of Severus Alexander and Valerian, although such a grant cannot be ruled out. Thus, such types may simply reflect the importance of agonistic festivals in the civic culture of the third century Asia Minor.

\textbf{The ‘Workshop’ system and Thyateira}

The preceding section argued that the coin types of Thyateira, particularly the large denominations, were a medium for the display of the civic culture and ideology propagated by the elite stratum, from whose ranks coin eponyms were drawn. The choice of these elaborate types was taken at the level of local administration. However, in most cases there is no definitive evidence to prove that the eponyms were involved in this process. The

\textsuperscript{567} Harl (1987), 63-70.
\textsuperscript{568} \textit{SNG München} 688.
\textsuperscript{569} Mionnet IV 995 (following Vaillant (1698), 165).
circumstantial evidence suggests that this possibility cannot be dismissed. Our prosopographical data demonstrates that eponyms were drawn from the apex of the elite stratum in control of the apparatus of civic government. Yet, frustratingly, we still lack the definitive evidence for the involvement of eponyms in the choice of the majority of coin types necessary to confirm this conclusion.

Whoever was ultimately responsible for the choice of coin iconography, it is certain that Kraft’s work on die-sharing in the late second and third centuries AD must also be considered as part of this process. Were all coin types chosen at the local level or did centralised production facilities limit the scope of iconographic diversity and dictate the choice of iconography in some cases? The relationship between Thyateira and the workshop system is of particular interest because of the relative frequency with which the city changed workshops. The first direct evidence for the participation of Thyateira in the workshop system occurs in the reign of Marcus Aurelius (probably c. AD 169-79). Heuchert’s analysis of the obverse die used to strike 1054 and 1055 (under the name of I(oulios) Menelaos) revealed marked stylistic affinities with the contemporary coins of Attalos the sophist from Smyrna. The obverse dies of both Menelaos and Attalos were produced in the so-called ‘Southern workshop’, active in the southern part of the province c. AD 138-161.\footnote{Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 335-6.} However, in the reign of Commodus, the evidence of Kraft’s external die links indicates that Thyateira was sourcing its dies from the workshop of ‘Pergamon’\footnote{External die-link 282 (Mytilene-Thyateira-Silandos/) 283 (Magnesia on the Sipylos-Thyateira), 285 (Kame-Thyateira), 293 (Attaleia-Thyateira) and 294 (Attaleia-Thyateira: Kraft (1972), 60-1.}. This arrangement continued into the reign of Septimius Severus, since examples of Thyateiran external die-links are apparent in all three of Kraft’s stylistic sub-
groups attributed to the workshop of ‘Pergamon’. Thyateira is also represented in Kraft’s group D, which he attributed to the workshop of ‘Sardeis’. External die-links between Thyateira and other cities in the sphere of the ‘Pergamon’ workshop are known from the reign of Severus Alexander. However, a further group of external die-links from the same reign places Thyateira in the sphere of the workshop of ‘Sardeis’. In the reign of Philip I Kraft placed Thyateira in the area of the workshop of ‘Smyrna’, but in the time of Valerian and Gallienus Thyateira appears to have returned to the fold of the ‘Pergamon’ workshop. Why Thyateira should alternate between workshops throughout the third century is unclear. It is possible that the choice of workshop may have been dictated by practical considerations. Choice may have been limited to the most convenient active workshop with sufficient opening for an order, but the minutiae of this process remain obscure.

What, if any, effect did the concentration of die production in a few regional workshop centres have on the iconographic repertoire of Thyateira? Kraft was convinced that the development of the workshop system had a profound effect on civic iconography, with each city being compelled to choose from a limited number of standardised types offered by the relevant workshop. In the case of Thyateira Kraft argued that the appearance of the hiera synkletos obverse type in the reign of Philip I was directly influenced by the change from the ‘Pergamon’ to the ‘Smyrna’ workshop. Kraft’s explanation for the appearance of this obverse at this time is entirely plausible. However,

---

572 Kraft (1972), 50-3.
573 External die links 234, 239.
574 External die link 167.
575 External die links 133, 134, 135 and 137.
576 External die links 19 and 25.
577 External die links 174-5.
578 Kraft (1972), 94-6.
579 Kraft (1972), 94-5.
obverse types were frequently shared by cities, precisely because of their generic nature. Reverse dies were not shared between cities, because they carried the ethnic of the issuing authority and therefore had to be specially engraved. Thus they provided greater opportunity for the display of specific civic iconography. The great variety of third century coin types and the very specific resonance of many of the types to the cultural and religious identity of the city has often been emphasised in modern scholarship.580

The limited influence of the workshops on the subject matter of large denomination civic coin types is demonstrated by the analysis of the iconography of the Thyateiran reverse types from the reign of Philip I produced by the workshop of ‘Smyrna’. Kraft records eight die-links from this period representing the cities of Thyateira, Hyrkaneis, Phokaia, Smyrna, Temnos and Erythrai.581 The types struck by Thyateira at this time include: the city goddess holding the infant Apollo Tyrimnaios, a standing Athena with lance and phiale, Apollo Tyrimnaios standing with double axe and laurel branch next to the two Nemeseis of Smyrna, a standing Apollo holding a serpent resting his elbow on a column, the turreted city goddess of Thyateira with double axe grasping hands with the city goddess of Smyrna and an enthroned Athena with Nike and spear.582 None of these types appear on the contemporary coinage from the workshop of ‘Smyrna’ produced for other cities. Two types produced during this period do represent deities and personifications associated with Smyrna in addition to more traditional local motifs. However, these are homonoia issues and therefore the iconography is entirely conventional. It is possible that

581 External die links 18-25.
582 City goddess and infant (Gorny & Mosch 108, 3 April 2001, 1498, 22.56), standing Athena with phiale (M&M Deutschland 15, 21-22 October 2004, 888, 6.05g: Plate XVI. 8), Apollo and Nemeseis (SNG Aul 3238), Apollo and serpent (BMC Lydia 140), city goddesses of Thyateira and Smyrna (BMC Lydia 156), enthroned Athena (Unpublished coin from the British Museum Collection: 1975,0411. 140).
Thyateira’s patronage of the workshop of ‘Smyrna’ may have encouraged the striking of a homonoia issue, but Smyrna’s position as one of the wealthiest and most prestigious cities in the province may have provided sufficient motivation. Moreover, all the non-homononoi types produced in the reign of Philip were drawn from the standard iconographic repertoire of the city. The standing Athena with phiale type and the Apollo with serpent and column are known from at least the reign of Trajan and the enthroned Athena and Nike motif appears on a pseudo-autonomous issue of the early third century. Thus, all these types were utilised at Thyateira, either before the full maturity of the workshop system or at a time when Thyateira was engaged with another workshop. The only possible conclusion is that these types were chosen at Thyateira, rather than at the workshop.

A similar pattern emerges from the reign of Commodus, when Thyateira was in the supply area of the workshop of ‘Pergamon’. The majority of the iconographic motifs found on the reverse types from this reign were drawn from the pre-existing iconographic repertoire of the city. However, new types and motifs were introduced during this period. For example, the eponym Moschianos Philippou signed the type depicting the abduction of Persephone by Hades in quadriga. Very similar types appear on issues of Elaia and Hyrkaneis, which were also in the sphere of the workshop of ‘Pergamon’ in the reign of Commodus. Nevertheless, this mythological motif was very popular across many cities.

---

583 BMC Lydia 73-74 (Trajanic), and SNG Lewis 1370 (reign of Caracalla).
584 It should also be noted that the iconography of Thyateira displayed considerable overlap with the nearby city of Attaleia: Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 323. Moreover, in the Severan (Aur. Glykon and Artemidoros) period many of the same eponyms appear at both Attaleia and Thyateira: BMC Phrygia xxxviii. Therefore, this iconographic overlap was the result of extensive cultural and social interaction and not external constraints.
585 Heuchert 1072 depicts, in addition to Hades struggling with Persephone, a flying Eros flying holding a torch is depicted. Beneath the horses is an overturned flower-basket. Heuchert 1318 from Hyrkaneis c. AD 180-2 displays the same composition as the Thyateiran specimen with the addition of Athena attempting to stop the abduction with a spear and a serpent biting the horses. The specimen from Elaia depicts the
in Asia Minor and beyond. This type appears four times at the mint of Nysa from c. 139-175, twice with the addition of overturned flowers beneath the horses and twice without flowers. At Maioneia c. AD 161-65, the composition of the Hades-Persephone types mirrors precisely that of the Thyateiran example, with the scene incorporating both the upturned flowers and flying Eros lighting the way with a torch. Thus the occurrence of this motif was probably the result of the more general popularity and spread of this motif during the second half of the second century AD and not the creation of the workshop system. In particular the religious significance of this motif may have done much to encourage the adoption of the rape of Persephone type at Thyateira. Although there is no evidence for a Persephone/Hades cult from Thyateira itself, the worship of these deities is amply attested in western Anatolia. The village of Acharaka, situated in the territory of Nysa, is known to have been the location of a significant cult centre and annual festival of Hades and Kore (an alternative name for Persephone). The depiction of the abduction of Persephone has been a feature of the coinage of Nysa since at least the first century BC and continued to be a prominent feature of the coinage of Nysa throughout the imperial

586 This motif is also attested on the issues of Kyzikos Heuchert 128, 164, *RPC* online nos. 9162, 9751 (AD 161-180), Dionysopolis Heuchert 2769 (AD 161-80), Hierapolis in the *conventus* of Kibyra Heuchert, 2382, 2407, Ioulia Gordos Heuchert 2733, 2737, 2739, the *Koinon* of Ionia Heuchert 1517-1518 (AD 139-44), Magnesia on the Maiandros Heuchert 1880 (AD 139-144), Mostene Heuchert 1328 (AD 182-184), *RPC* online no. 7790 (AD 161-175), Sardeis Heuchert 2470 (AD 139-44), Silandos *RPC* online no. 9956 (AD 139-47) and Tomara Heuchert 1040 (AD 177-180). The variant of this type with the flying Eros and flowers is even attested at Sebaste in Syria-Palestine c. AD 177-92 (*RPC* online no. 6267). The Hades Persephone is also attested at Egyptian Alexandria (*RPC* online no. 13960, AD 141-142), Makedonian Stobi (*RPC* online 10813 AD 161-180) and Korakesion (*RPC* online no. 6009 AD 138-161).

587 With flowers Heuchert 1784 (c. AD 139-47: Plate XXIV. 9) and 1808 (AD 161-9: Plate XXIV. 10), without flowers 1798 (AD 152-175: Plate XXIV. 12) and 1820 (161-9: Plate XXIV. 11).

588 Heuchert 2499.

589 Strabo XIV.1.44 (650), cf. Heuchert 1825, 1784, 1798, 1808 and 1818 for instances of this type at Nysa.
period. At Sardeis the image of a shrouded goddess usually identified as ‘Lydian Kore’ was common civic coin type from the mid second century AD. The image of the rape of Persephone first appeared on Sardian coinage during the reign of Vespasian. It is probable that either the coinage of Nysa or an unidentified local monument served as the prototype for many of the subsequent Hades-Persephone issues. Therefore the popularity of this type in certain areas of western Anatolia may be explained in terms of local religious traditions. It also may not be coincidental that spread of rape of Persephone type in Lydia was connected to the contemporary rise in popularity of the shrouded ‘Lydian Kore’ coin type. Although this mysterious shrouded deity is entirely absent from the coinage of Thyateira, this motif is attested on the coinage of several important Lydian cities from the second century AD: Sardeis, Daldis, Ioulia-Gordos, Maioneia, Silandos and Tmolos-Aureliopolis. It remains possible that general regional popularity of the ‘Lydian Kore’ may have encouraged Thyateira to adopt elements of the wider Kore/Persephone repertoire for its own usage, but certainty in this area is impossible in the absence of further evidence. Similar local factors or religious affiliations may have encouraged the spread of the motif elsewhere.

However, the rape of Persephone type displays an extremely dispersed distribution pattern and so the spread of this image outside of Lydia may have been affected by other factors. This motif appears to become significantly more popular on civic coinages from

---

590 Regling (1913b), no. 31 and 33 (pre-Imperial: Plate XXIV. 1-3), see also RPC I 2665 (Claudius; Plate XXIV. 4), 2668 (Nero: Plate XXIV. 5) and RPC II 1115-1116 (Plate XX IV. 6-8).
591 For the development of the cult of Kore at Sardeis see Johnston (1981), 8-10, for the rape of Persephone coin type see RPC II 1311.
592 For a catalogue of the depiction of the rape of Persephone in the art of classical antiquity see Lindner (1984).
the mid second century AD. Could the sudden adoption of the rape of Persephone motif at Thyateira also be connected to contemporary political events? The difficulty lies in identifying an event likely to have caused this phenomenon. One candidate that may be ruled out definitively as the impetus for the spread of this type is the death of Faustina the Elder (late AD 140/ early 141). In this context the image of Hades kidnapping Persephone had the potential to act as a mythological metaphor, lamenting the fact that death in the form of Hades had prematurely carried off the Empress. Nevertheless the objections to this interpretation are overwhelming. At Thyateira the earliest example of the rape of Persephone type dates to c. AD 184-188, long after the death of Faustina, and many cities continued to produce rape of Persephone types until the late third century AD. This longevity is not in itself fatal to the Faustina hypothesis. The mint of Alexandria was still minting Faustina the Elder portrait types until AD 161. This is unsurprising in the light of the posthumous divine honours accorded to her and her status as the mother of the Empress Faustina the Younger and grandmother of Commodus would have secured her dynastic relevance long after her death. Moreover, once the type became an established part of a local iconographic repertoire, tradition and denominational factors may have encouraged the continued use of the type until long after the immediate political relevance of Faustina had faded. More harmful to the uncritical acceptance of the Faustina-Persephone analogy is lack of overt evidence linking the cult of Faustina the elder to Persephone. At no time is the Hades-Persephone reverse type paired with a Faustina the
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594 For a full analysis of the distribution of the rape of Persephone motif on ancient coinages see Lindner (1984), 90-98.
595 Heuchert 1072: see SNG Aul 5663 for the use of this type at Kolybassos in Kilikia during the reign of Valerian: Lindner (1984), no. 136.
596 Heuchert (Thesis), 126.
597 For a discussion of religious honours and consecration coinage dedicated to Faustina at Rome see Mattingly (1948), 147-151.
Elder portrait type, although the image of Faustina the Younger is utilised in this way at Mostene.\textsuperscript{598} None of the extensive consecration coinages dedicated to Faustina the Elder by the mint at Rome make any reference to Proserpine or Hades. Moreover, although the rape of Persephone type became more popular from the mid second century AD, the type was far from unknown in the preceding centuries. Outside of Nysa and Sardeis, this motif had already appeared on a Cistophoros of Hadrian (\textit{SNG} Aul 6628, Lindner 126) and had been used at Alexandria under Trajan and Hadrian (Lindner 127 a-c).

The strongest evidence against attributing too much influence to the workshops over civic iconography of the larger denominations is the relative consistency and longevity of the types employed on the coinage of Thyateira. The same types re-appear without significant regard for the workshop supplying the city. Examples of the standing Athena with shield, spear and phiale type were produced by the workshops of ‘Pergamon’ and ‘Sardeis’ and examples of naked Apollo holding a snake and resting his elbow on a column type are known to have been manufactured at the ‘Smyrna’, ‘Sardeis’ and ‘Pergamon’ workshops.\textsuperscript{599} The motif of a naked Apollo Tyrimnaios with double axe and laurel wreath occurs from the reign of Trajan until the final issues of Thyateira in the joint reign of Valerian and Gallienus.\textsuperscript{600} In short, it is clear that in the majority of cases the choice of the subject matter for coin iconography was taken at the civic level, usually drawing on the repertoire of the religious identity of the city. Aside from the ubiquitous forms of Apollo Tyrimnaios, many of the most frequently depicted deities are known to have enjoyed cult honours at Thyateira: Asklepios Soter, Artemis Boreitene and Dionysos.

\textsuperscript{598} \textit{RPC} online no. 7790 (AD 161-175).
\textsuperscript{599} Kraft (1972), plate 37, 59b (Athena, Sardeis), 89, 25b (Athena, Pergamon), 7, 44b (Apollo, Smyrna), 31, 25a (Apollo, Sardeis), 47, 72a (Apollo, Pergamon).
\textsuperscript{600} Fuscus procos AD 98-102, \textit{SNG} München 622 (\textit{BMC} Lydia 72: AE 30mm: Imhoof-Blumer (1901) no. 2: 33mm); Gallienus AD 253-268, \textit{SNG} Cop 632 (\textit{BMC} Lydia 141).
Kathegemon. In other cases it is more difficult to associate the coin type with the religious life of the city as represented in the epigraphy. The type of Selene-Hekate was frequently depicted on the coinage of Thyateira throughout the period from c. AD 178-82 to Gordian III. However, there are no epigraphic references for this cult. Similarly, there is no known local cult of Hephaistos during the reigns of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus, when Hephaistos manufacturing a helmet became a popular motif on the coinage of Thyateira. The same type is known from Silandos, which was also located in the supply area of ‘Pergamon’ at this time. Thus the workshop may have played a role in the transmission of this motif. However, it would be unwise to view this exceptional case as evidence for the strong influence of the workshop system on high denomination iconography. The same prototype was employed in contemporary Bithynia and this type is found in none of the other cities in the supply area of the ‘Pergamon’ workshop.

Denomination and the Iconography of Reverse Types

In the section on Thyateira and the workshop system it was proposed that the ‘workshops’ played only a limited role in the choice of iconography of the larger denominations. However, another important structural factor must also be considered in this context. Most types may have been decided locally, but the choice of types may still have been governed by the need to clearly distinguish the local denominational structure. Therefore, this section will evaluate the correlation between coin types and the indication of monetary value. In the Julio-Claudian and Flavian periods it may be demonstrated that the choice of reverse
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601 For the games of Asklepios Soter see TAM V. 2 948. 6-7 and 1021, for Artemis see 884.2, for Dionysos see 976.8 and 979.5.
602 Heuchert 1069 and RPC VII 189.
603 Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 335-6, 900.
types was significantly influenced by denomination. At this time two denominations were struck in the name of Thyateira, the larger denomination measuring c. 20mm in diameter and a smaller denomination measuring c. 15-17 mm. Reverse types were not shared by the two denominations. The double axe and tripod motifs are only found on the smaller denomination, whereas the draped Empress bust and Nike with wreath and palm reverse types were reserved for the larger denomination. 604

However, by the beginning of the second century AD the pattern of coin production in the name of Thyateira underwent profound change. The scale of production began to increase in the reign of Trajan and subsequently reached its zenith in the early Severan period. This upsurge in coin production was accompanied by the manufacture of a greater diversity of denominations. 605 The ‘mint’ of Thyateira continued to produce a multiplicity of denominations into the later third century and by the time of Gordian III the weight standards in use at Thyateira had coalesced into a regional system metrological standard comprising many of the cities in the assize districts of Sardeis, Philadelphia and Thyateira. 606 In the light of such denominational complexity, it would be unsurprising if denominational value was indicated by the use of specific types, especially since (with the exception of Chios) the Roman provincial coinage of Asia carried little external indication of value. It has been acknowledged that the obverse type could provide some indication of

604 Double axe and tripod: RPC I 2379, 2381-2 (Plate VI.1-3) and RPC II 941, 945, 947-9 (Plate VI.5-7); draped bust and Nike and palm: 2380, 2383, 940 and 942.

605 The reign of Trajan witnessed the introduction of a new, large 30mm diameter denomination: for example BMC Lydia 72 c. 98-102. By the Antonine period Thyateira were producing denominations of 43mm/41.9g, 36mm/25.8g, 31mm/15.5g, 27mm/9.9g, 23mm/6.2g and 16mm/2.6g: Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 337.

606 Other cities associated with the weight standard by Spoerri-Butcher include Daldis, Kadoi, Philadelphia, Saiitai, Sardeis, Tabala, Hypaipa, Akrasos and Stratonikeia. The denominations identified by Spoerri-Butcher include 50mm, 40mm, 35mm, 30mm, 25mm, 21/22mm pieces, although not all denominations were struck by each mint at the same time: Spoerri-Butcher (2006), 75-6. However, Johnston has argued persuasively that in spite of such regional variation in weight standards, by the beginning of the third century all civic coinages in Asia had become tariffed in terms of Roman ‘assaria’ (the Greek term for the Roman ‘as’). Thus, although the weight and diameter of the modules of each denomination may have varied across the cities of the province, issues may have carried the same value in terms of assaria: Johnston (2007), 29.
value. Kraft noted that the same obverse types tended to appear on the same denominations across several cities. Johnston went further and argued that across the province of Asia the choice of obverse type was frequently related to the value of the denomination tariffed in ‘assaria’. Thus an obverse type of the head of Serapis, Herakles or Roma indicated a value of half an assarion, the bust of the city Tyche indicated a one assarion coin, a senate, Caesar or junior Augustus was typically valued at two assaria, the Augusta indicated three assaria and the senior Augustus represented four assaria.

These general conclusions may be compared with the relationship between the denominational structure and iconography at Thyateira. In some cases it is possible to detect overt denominational significance in some of the obverse types employed at Thyateira. This is particularly true of the Herakles head obverse type. This type, found on the coinage of Thyateira throughout the life of the mint, was reserved consistently for the 16-17mm denomination from the Julio-Claudian to Antonine periods. Thereafter the Herakles bust obverse type was consistently associated with a denomination of 14-15mm in diameter and c.1.45-2.97g in weight. The change in the module size of the Herakles type was not coincidental. Kraft observed that the Herakles bust obverse type paired with either a walking lion or Telesphoros reverse type was employed consistently to denote the same denomination across several cities in the supply area of his ‘Pergamon’ workshop. Kraft cited the evidence of die links from three third century specimens of these types from Akrasos, Attaleia and Hyrkaneis. However, specimens of the same types and weight

---

607 Kraft (1972), 94-5.
608 Johnston (2007), 43.
609 *RPC* I 2379, *RPC* II 946, 974, 948, Heuchert 1101-3 (Plate XII. 2-6).
610 For example *SNG* Leypold 1262 (Plate XIV. 1), 1265-6 (Plate XIV. 4), *BMC* Lydia 43, *SNG* Cop 586.
611 Kraft (1972), 94.
612 Kraft (1972), plate 115 14a-c.
standard exist in the name of Germe and Thyateira, which were also located in the supply area of the ‘Pergamon’ workshop. Thus, we may conclude that not only did these particular types have particular denominational significance, but also that this system was shared by a significant number of the Lydian cities located in the ‘Pergamon’ workshop supply area.

Conversely, the situation in respect to other obverse types is more complex. The majority of the Roma/Athena bust issues have a diameter of c. 19-20mm and a weight of between 2.95 and 4.78g. However, a few of the Roma/Athena obverses measure only c.14mm in diameter and can weigh as little as 1.54g. Since we cannot explain this discrepancy in chronological terms, as both standards co-existed in the Severan period, we must be dealing with a single obverse type covering two denominations differentiated by their weight, appearance and reverse types. Similarly, although the status of the member of the imperial household depicted on coinage may have had denominational significance, this system does not appear to have been employed systematically at Thyateira. In the reign of Titus, the difference in status between the Emperor and the Empress Julia was used to reinforce the discrepancy in value between the 17 and 20mm denominations. In other cases, the relationship between the denomination and member of the imperial household was more fluid. For example, obverse types in the name of Geta Caesar are known for at

613 SNG München 577 2.34g, SNG Leybold 1265 14mm 1.45g (both Thyateira) and BMC Lydia 8 (Germe).
614 It should be noted that even in this case the city still seems to have possessed some say in the choice of type. The Telephors type employed by the other participating cities is unknown on the coinage of Thyateira. There is also significant variation in the iconography of the other small denominations even at the mints associated with the Herakles/ lion or Telephors issues. For example the bee and standing stag motifs found at Akrasos do not appear at Thyateira: BMC Lydia 6, 10.
615 For example SNG Leybold 1258 20mm 4.10g and SNG Aul 3204 3.75g.
616 I am aware of two specimens of this type: SNG Leybold 1256 14mm 1.48g and SNG München 583 1.54g
617 The lion walking and eagle with closed wings reverse types are only paired with the Athena/Roma bust on the 14 mm denomination.
618 RPC II 940-1: Obverse portraits of Domitian and Domitia could also be used to articulate this denominational relationship RPC II 942 and 944, however since 17mm issues in the name of Domitian (RPC II 943) are also known this rule was not absolute.
least three denominations. Moreover, the obverse portrait types of the Emperor often adorned a wide range of denominations. The flexibility of the imperial obverse portrait type is illustrated by the case of Septimius Severus, whose image appears on issues ranging in weight from 3.54g to 46.55g. Nevertheless, the general tendency for the senior Augustus to dominate the largest denominations, more junior members of the imperial household to appear on mid-range denominations and for the smallest denominations to be pseudo-autonomous is clearly apparent at Thyateira. The issues adorned with the image of Julia Mamaea range from 22-29mm in diameter, while those of her son the Emperor Severus Alexander could be as large as 46mm in diameter.

It is also undeniable that reverse types played a significant role in the identification of denominations. This is particularly true in respect to the smallest denominations. Perhaps the neatest example of the significance of reverse types as denominational markers is that of the two eagle types. From the Antonine period, the type of eagle with spread wings denoted a denomination of c.22-24mm in diameter and c.3.7-6.43g, but the standing eagle with folding wings is consistently used to signify a smaller denomination c. 2g in weight and 14mm in diameter. The denominational significance of other reverse types is not so obvious. The Apollo, column and snake type serves as a good example. From this type’s first appearance on the coinage of Thyateira in the Trajanic

619 35 mm (Imhoof-Blumer (1897) no. 28; Plate XVI. 2): 30mm (Imhoof-Blumer (1897) no. 27): 20/21mm (SNG Leypold 1295 21mm 4.33g cf. SNG Cop 614 4.5g: Plate XIII. 11).
620 SNG Aul 3221, SNG München 641 (Septimius Severus): obverse types of 34 (BMC Lydia 89), 29 (BMC Lydia 90: Plate XVII. 2) and 19mm (BMC Lydia 92) in diameter are known, apparently the same denominations as those in the name of his son and junior Geta.
621 Julia Mamaea: BMC Lydia 134-6, Severus Alexander: Imhoof-Blumer (1897) no. 30 (Plate XVI. 4).
622 For examples of the eagle with spread wings type see Heuchert 1094, 1099, 1100, SNG Leypold 1294 (Plate XIV. 7), BMC Lydia 52. For specimens of the closed wing type see SNG München 583 and SNG Aul 3207. A further example of the closed wing type is known from the Antonine period (Heuchert 1101); this specimen is slighter larger than the later examples of this type (16mm, 2.38g), but still significantly smaller than contemporary open winged types.
period the Apollo with snake motif was most frequently associated with a diameter of c.30 mm. However, around the years AD 178-80, the type was paired with an obverse portrait of Commodus 36 mm in diameter and weighing 25.07g. The difference in weight and diameter signify that we are clearly dealing with a larger denomination. Thus the Apollo type was usually associated with a particular denomination, but could also on occasion be used in conjunction with a flan of an entirely different value. The same is true of the common standing Athena with lance, shield and phiale type. From this type’s first appearance in the Trajanic period until the end of the reign of Septimius Severus, the Athena with phiale motif is most commonly associated with a particular denomination measuring c.27-9mm in diameter, but c. 169-77 a larger denomination piece of 38mm (28.9g) was also adorned with this motif. From the reign of Caracalla the same standing Athena motif is also applied to a smaller 19-20mm denomination, and although production of the 27mm Athena with phiale type becomes less common it continues to be struck alongside the 20mm pieces.

The confusing and complex interaction between iconography and denomination at Thyateira contrasts with the practice at some other mints, where the relationship was more systematic. However, in spite of the flexible relationship between iconography and value, certain distinct trends are visible. Therefore, it would appear that the denominational value

---

623 See BMC Lydia 73 (before AD 112), Heuchert 1051 (AD 161(probably 169)-175, BMC Lydia 143 (Salonina).
624 Heuchert 1065.
625 For example Imhoof-Blumer (1897) no. 35 (Trajan); Heuchert 1063, 1068, 1081, 1090, SNG Cop 605 (Septimius Severus: Plate XIII. 8) and Heuchert 1055 (38mm).
626 Under Commodus a 20mm standing Athena with phiale is known, but the motif is modified with the addition of a flaming altar, a modification with possible denominational significance (Heuchert 1092). The production of 20 mm Athena and phiale types (without altar) does not become common until the early third century: BMC Lydia 101 (Caracalla), SNG München 657 (Diadumenianus Caesar), SNG Leypold 1259, BMC Lydia 30 (both early third century) and SNG Aul 3204-5 (late Severan). However, production of the larger Athena denomination continued until the reign of Gordian III (RPC VII 195).
of a particular specimen was recognised by a combination of factors. First and foremost among these was the weight and diameter of the specimen, although badly prepared flans of inconsistent size and weight often undermined this distinction. Further indication of value may have been gleaned from the relationship between the flan size and the combination of both the obverse and reverse types. Such a system may appear unnecessarily complicated to modern sensibilities, but in the light of the importance of small change in everyday small-scale economic interactions an intuitive understanding of the system would have developed very quickly. This tendency naturally limited the choice of types, particularly in respect to the smaller denominations whose iconography tended to be more limited.

**LAODIKEIA**

**The City of Laodikeia**

The conclusions attained with respect to Thyateira may now be compared with the evidence of the mint of Laodikeia on the Lykos. This city was located between two streams (the Asopos and the Kadmos), to the south of the river Lykos. Today this area is located 7 kilometres to the north of Denizlli, in the area between the villages of Eskihisar and Goncali. Antiochos II founded the city as a military colony in honour of his wife Laodike on the site of a village, which was first named Diospolis, then Rhoas.

---

627 Our understanding of the denominational system of the Roman Provincial coinage is hampered by the inconsistency in the weight and even diameters of individual specimens. Old and worn and used flans were frequently recycled and even new flans were carelessly prepared: Johnston (2007), 29.
629 Pliny the Elder *NH* 5. 105.
Eponyms and Laodikeia

The pattern of the distribution of Laodikeian eponyms contrasts starkly with that of Thyateira. From 133 BC, the names of local officials adorned cistophori produced in the name of the city, although between 58-48 BC the name of the local official in Greek was augmented by either the name of the proconsul (often of Kilikia) or praetor in Latin. The pseudo-autonomous bronze coinage produced contemporaneously with the cistophori did not bear eponyms, until the issues signed by Seitalkas dating to the mid first century BC. Thereafter eponyms were a regular feature of the imperial coinage of Laodikeia during the first century AD. In the reign of Augustus the eponyms Zeuxis, Sosthenes and Antonios Polemon are attested. Eponyms continued to be frequently attested on the coinage of the Julio-Claudian and Flavian periods. Throughout this period the majority of the names of the eponyms were inscribed in the nominative case and less frequently in the genitive case. The ἐπι + genitive formula occurs in relation to two types of Antonios Zenon and the διὰ formula is utilised for the entire Domitianic series of Kornelios Dioskourides. During the period from Trajan to Hadrian the practice of adorning coinage with the names of eponyms goes into rapid decline. Only the eponym Agrippinos

630 BMC Phrygia lxxiv-lxxv
631 This Seitalkas is also attested on a cistophoros of C. Fabius M. F. (57 BC): SNG Aul 3802.
632 BMC Phrygia lxxvi-lix, RPC I 2892 (Plate XXXVI. 1).
633 RPC I 2893-5 (Zeuxis: Plate XXXVI. 2-4), 2896-7 (Sosthenes: Plate XXXVI. 5-6) and 2898-2900 (Polemon: Plate XXXVI. 7-8).
634 Tiberius: Pythes Pythou RPC I 2901-5 (Plate XXXVI. 8-12) and 2908-10 (for the second time: Plate XXXVI. 15-17), Dioskourides 2906-7 (Plate XXXVI. 13-14) and 2911 (for the second time: Plate XXXVI. 20); Claudius (AD50-4): Antonios Polemon son of Zenon: 2912-16 (Plate XXXVI. 21-25; Nero: Gaios Postomos 2917-18, Krateros nomothetes (c. AD 60) 2919, Ioulios Andronikos and Ioulia Zenonis (c. AD 62) 2920-5, Aine(i)as 2926-7, Antonios Zenon the son of Zenon 2928; Vespasian: Ioulios Andronikos RPC II 1269-70; Titus: Gaios Ioulios Kotys and Klaudia Zenoris 1272-80 (Plate XXXVII. 14, XXXVIII. 1-11); Domitian: Kornelios Dioskourides 1281-96 (Plate XXXVIII 12-14).
635 The legend of RPC I 2914 is of particular interest: ΕΠΙΕ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ Π(Ο) ΥΙ ΤΟ Δ; see also 2912. It is one of the few known instances of this formula from Laodikeia during the first century AD. The same formula is found in conjunction with a proconsular name Marcellus: RPC II 1271.
can be associated with this period with any certainty. With the exceptions of the two enormous issues signed by P. Klaudios Attalos and P. Ailios Dionysios Sabianios, eponyms are absent from the Antonine output of Laodikeia. Once again, Dionysios and Attalos sign their issues in the nominative case, which is not unusual for the mint of Laodikeia, but relatively uncommon for provincial coinage of this period as a whole. Attalos makes frequent but not ubiquitous use of the word ἀνέθηκεν, specifying that the issue was a special dedication to the city on behalf of the eponym. The ἀνέθηκεν formula is entirely absent from the issues of Dionysios, nevertheless the nominative case of the legend may imply Dionysios’ series was also dedicatory in nature. Two eponyms are recorded in the Severan period. The coinage and background of Ailios Pigres have been treated in greater detail in the preceding chapter. His issues are notable for their emphasis on imperial ideology and it was argued that their iconography could have been intended to celebrate Pigres’ personal connection to the Emperor during Caracalla’s visit to Asia in AD 214/215. In addition, another eponym is known from a single issue in the name of Iulia Domna. The penultimate eponym occurs on a homonoia issue with Ephesos from the reign of Elagabalus, although the majority of the name is obscured and only the letters

636 Agrippinos is associated with obverse types of Hadrian and Sabina. He signs all but one issue with the ἀνέθηκεν formula (Mionnet IV 741) and is accorded the title of grammateus as well as ‘of the generals’: ἈΓΡΙΠΠΕΙΝΟΣ ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΩΝ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ ΛΑΟ∆ΙΚΕΩΝ: Mionnet IV 741-2: Sup VII 450 cf. 736. Several unpublished specimens of the Agrippinos issue are held in the BNF: Paris 1555-1558, SNG Munchen 387 records an illegible inscription, which may be the name of the eponym, but no definitive reading of the legend is possible.

637 P. Kl. Attalos c. AD 139-44 (Heuchert 2300-37), Po. Ailios Dionysios Sabianios c. AD 137-147 (Heuchert. 2338-48).

638 For the date of the imperial visit of Caracalla to Asia Minor see Leschhorn (1993), 384.

639 This issue is unpublished and is known from a single specimen recorded in the Tkalec AG 26th March 1991, lot 330 (Plate XLVI. 1). The reading of the legend recorded by the catalogue is ΕΠΙ ΑΙΛ ΠΕΙΣΩΝΗΣΙΑΡ ΛΑΟ∆ΙΚΕΩΝ ΝΕΩΡΚΟΡ. Leschhorn reads the name of the legend as ΠΕΙΣΩΝΕΙΝΑ, although the damaged condition of the legend precludes a definitive reading: Leschhorn (2009), 1031.
AΔP are visible. The final eponym from Laodikeia signs an issue with an obverse portrait of Otacilia Severa. The reverse legend reads: ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΩΣ ΤΟΥΣΚΙΑΝΟΥ ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΩΝ ΝΕΩΚΟ. He is known only from his coinage.

The pattern of the distribution of eponyms at Laodikeia is anomalous for the province as a whole, but less so in respect to Phrygia. Only the issues of Ailios Pigres, Adr[ ] and Ail(ios) Peison[ ] made significant use of the common ἐπί + genitive formula and even in the case of Pigres the ἀνέθηκεν formula is also attested: Λ ΑΙΛ ΠΙΓΡΗΣ ΑΣΙΑΡΧΗΣ Γ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΝ. The majority of the remaining signed issues of Laodikeia were signed by the eponym in the nominative case. Other Phrygian cities display similar legend formula distribution patterns. The ἐπί + genitive formula is entirely absent on the coinages of Dionysopolis, Temenothyrai Flaviopolis and Kolossai, where the nominative case is ubiquitous and ἀνέθηκεν formula is common. It should also be stressed that although a relatively small number of eponyms signed coinage during this period, they were often responsible for comparatively large issues. In the absence of detailed die-studies the absolute size of issues of coinage is very difficult determine. However, it is clear simply from the number of types employed that the issues of Klaudios Attalos, Ailios Dionysios and Ailios Pigres were particularly large.

640 Franke and Nollé 1116.
641 BMC Phrygia 254: Sammlung consul Eduard Friedrich Weber, Hamburg Monday 16th November 1908 Hirsch XXI 1908, 3581 (Plate XLVI. 4) records a type of Philip, to which the legend ΑΡΧΙΕΡΩΜΕΝΥ ΤΟΥΣΚΙΑΝΟ was attributed. However, the legend is highly corroded and this interpretation is probably a misreading of the legend known from BMC Phrygia 254. 642 BMC Phrygia 227 see also Burrell (2004), types 7-8 (ΕΠΙ Λ ΑΙΛ ΠΙΓΡΗΤΟΣ ΑΣΙΑΡ). 643 von Aulock (1987), 16-17 (Dionysopolis), 26-7 (Kolossai): BMC Phrygia cii-iii (Temenothyrai). 644 Heuchert records that Klaudios Attalos signed at least thirty-eight different types. The issue signed by Dionysios was substantially smaller at eleven types, but still significant. I know of at least 12 types in the name of Pigres.
Furthermore, with the single exception of the Adr[ ] and ‘Touskianou’ issues eponyms are almost entirely absent on the Laodikeian coinage of the mid-third century. Currently we lack the necessary evidence to explain this pattern convincingly. One approach out of this impasse may be to interpret the use of the nominative case as evidence for special dedicatory issues, possibly produced and financed differently from the majority of the issues of Laodikeia. If this line of reasoning is followed, then the signed types may be seen as privately financed issues in the context of an increasingly ‘publicly’ funded coinage. Thus the absence of eponyms may be explained in terms of a shift away from private financing in the mid-third century. However, attributing the abandonment of the use of eponyms to a decline in private financing is problematic and much concerning the pattern of eponym citation at individual mints remains obscure. Eponyms continued to sign coinages during the latter part of the third century at other mints. For example at Kolossai the ἀνέθηκεν formula continued to be employed on coin legends until the very end of the mint in the time of Gallus.645 Temenothyrai eponyms continued to record eponyms in the nominative case until the reigns of Valerian and Gallienus.646 This decline cannot be totally attributed to a decline in the number of high denomination issues, which were more likely to be signed. The peak of coin production in the name of Laodikeia occurs in the vast ‘year 88’ coinage under Caracalla; thereafter coin production was on a much smaller scale. However, large denomination pieces continued to be produced: for example, the large issues of homonoia coinage struck in the time of Philip I and II span 28-34 mm in diameter.647 Since eponyms are frequently attested at other mints in the third century, it is

646 BMC Phrygia ciii.
647 Franke and Nollé 1124-47, 1255-62.
possible that private financing at these mints continued for a longer period than at Laodikeia.\textsuperscript{648}

In addition to the civic eponyms there are also two known cases of proconsular eponyms. The legend OMONOIA EΠΙ ΜΑΡΚΕΛΛΟΥ ΑΝΘΥ is inscribed within a laurel wreath on a pseudo-autonomous issue attributed to the reign of Vespasian.\textsuperscript{649} In this case the unusual legend (\textit{concord in the time of the proconsul Marcellus}) firmly indicates that the type was honorific by nature. The ideological declaration of civic harmony is linked directly with the tenure of the proconsul. However, the legend would also have served as a date, since the \( \epsilon \pi \iota \) + genitive formula was the dominant means of dating events in the region. The second instance of a proconsular coin eponym occurred in the joint reign of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus (AD 161-9, probably c. AD 162/3). Since the iconography of the three reverse types signed in the name of the proconsul is entirely conventional, it seems that the primary function of the proconsul in this context was to express the date.\textsuperscript{650}

However, references to proconsuls are very rare on the coinage of Laodikeia and this device did not develop into anything more than an occasional chronological indicator. Of far greater significance for our understanding of the coinage of Laodikeia is a vast issue from the reign of Caracalla adorned with the formula: ΤΟ ΠΗ (to express the

\textsuperscript{648} Similar gaps may be witnessed elsewhere. At Synnada eponyms were a common feature of local coinages from Augustus to AD 169. In the period between AD 169-238 issues continued to be produced in the name of Macrinus and Elagabalus, but were left unsigned. The practice of inscribing coins with eponyms was not revived until Alexandros in the reign of Gordian III. Subsequently, eponyms occur on the later third century coinage in the name of Trajan Decius and Gallienus, as well as pseudo-autonomous issues: BMC Phrygia xcvi-c.

\textsuperscript{649} RPC II 1271.

\textsuperscript{650} Heuchert 2353 (depicting Zeus Laodikenos flanked by Marcus and Lucius Verus): 2354 (depicting Marcus and Lucius, togate, clasping hands Plate XLII. 1): 2355 (Tyche with rudder and cornucopia: Plate XLII. 2): all three types are signed using \( \epsilon \pi \iota \) + genitive, thus strengthening the chronological connotations of the legend.
‘year 88’). Since Imhoof-Blumer this date has been identified with a civic era initiated with the imperial visit of Hadrian to Laodikeia, which Leschhorn has convincingly attributed to the year AD 128/129, thus the ‘year 88’ corresponds to AD 215/216.\textsuperscript{651} The same dating system was employed for two mid-third century AD countermarks, dating to AD 235/236 and 248/249 respectively.\textsuperscript{652} The only epigraphic reference to the Laodikeian era is the phrase τοῦ ρκζ ὑτους (the year 127, AD 254/255) on a funerary inscription.\textsuperscript{653}

The adoption of such an unusual dating device on this coinage requires explanation. Leschhorn has convincingly sought to associate the adoption of the Hadrianic era on the early third century coinage of Laodikeia with the benefactions received by the city from the Emperor, possibly during the imperial visit of the preceding year.\textsuperscript{654} Caracalla certainly granted the city neokorate status in respect to his own cult and probably revived the revoked \textit{neokoria} of Commodus.\textsuperscript{655} Since a Greek inscription from Rome (dated to AD 213/214 on the strength of the description of Caracalla as thrice imperator) appears to describe Laodikeia as \textit{neokoros} the restoration of the \textit{neokoria} of Commodus

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{651} Imhoof-Blumer (1890), 217: who interprets the Laodikeian era as beginning in the year AD 123/4; Leschhorn (1993), 384.
\item \textsuperscript{652} Howgego (1985) \textit{cmks} 631 ‘P H’ (year 108) and 638 ‘TO PKA’ (year 121).
\item \textsuperscript{653} \textit{I.Laodikeia} 72.
\item \textsuperscript{654} Leschhorn (1993), 385 cf. Howgego (2005), 10.
\item \textsuperscript{655} For a discussion of the revocation of the \textit{neokoria} of Commodus, after the former’s assassination at the end of AD 192, see Robert (1969), 281-9. It is certain that temples of the cults of Commodus and Caracalla were established in Laodikeia. A coin type from the reign of Elagabalus depicts two tetrastyle temples and bears the legend: ΚΟΜΟΔΟΣ ΚΕ ΑΝΤΩΝΕΙΝΟΣ ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΩΝ ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ: Burrell (2004), 123, type 11 (Plate XLV. 9). A similar type, but this time depicting three temples is found among the ‘year 88’ issues; two of the temples probably correspond to the two imperial temples of Caracalla and Commodus and the third temple probably represents a temple of a prominent deity in the civic pantheon, possibly Zeus or Asklepios: \textit{SNG} Aul 3858 (Plate XLV. 2). Yet, in spite of the compelling evidence for two imperial cult temples at Laodikeia, Burrell argues that the absence of the formula ‘\textit{twice neokoros}’ on the coinage indicates that although the Caracalla and Commodus cults occupied different temples, they were actually unified into a single cult: Burrell (2004), 123. This arrangement would be unprecedented, but it should be noted that cities with multiple \textit{neokoroi} (Ephesos, Smyrna and Pergamon in particular) tended to celebrate this fact vociferously in their official titles, so the absence of this title in Laodikeia is noteworthy. The cults of Commodus and Caracalla may have been synonymous because of the circumstances of the revival of the Commodus cult by Caracalla.
\end{itemize}
probably preceded the imperial visit of Caracalla to Asia in AD 214/215.\textsuperscript{656} However, it remains probable that further benefactions were granted to Laodikeia in the context of the imperial visit to the province.\textsuperscript{657} Some indication of the privileges bestowed on Laodikeia by Caracalla is provided by iconography of the ‘ΣΠΙΝ’ issues themselves. In addition to the common Laodikeian types, for example Tyche Pantheia (\textit{SNG} Aul 3859), a significant portion of the series is devoted to the celebration of local agonistic festivals: the Asklepieia, the Komodeia, and the Antonina.\textsuperscript{658} Burrell no. 4 depicts three prize crowns sitting on an agonistic table. The central crown is labelled ΑΝΤΩΝΙΑ, the right hand crown is labelled [ΚΟ]Μ[ΟΔΙΑ] and the label on the left hand crown is illegible, beneath the table (labelled [...]ΕΙΑ on its edge) stand three amphorae.\textsuperscript{659} Moreover, a prize crown sitting between two purses is displayed on Burrell 5. The crown is inscribed ΑΝΤΩΝΗΝΑ and the table is labelled ΑΣΚΛΗΠΕΙΑ, beneath the table an amphora contains two palms and is labelled ΠΥΘΙΑ.\textsuperscript{660} Consequently it may be assumed with some confidence that Caracalla

\textsuperscript{656} \textit{IG} urb\textit{Rom} 37 (\textit{IGR} I 130): Burrell (2004), 120: this supposition is confirmed by the existence of a coin with the legend ΔΕΙΑ ΚΟΜΟΔΙΑ displaying an agonistic type (an agonistic table supporting prize crowns and two palm wreaths, beneath which is an amphora) and an obverse portrait depicting Geta Caesar: \textit{SNG} München 397 (Plate XLVI. 2).

\textsuperscript{657} For a discussion of the possibility that Caracalla visited the city of Laodikeia itself see page 128.

\textsuperscript{658} The ‘year 88’ issues also incorporated \textit{homonoia} types celebrating the relationship of Laodikeia with Ephesos (\textit{BMC} Phrygia 280, Wadd 6312, \textit{SNG} Cop 612), Pergamon (Weber 7155 (cf. \textit{BMC} Phrygia 279), \textit{SNG} Aul 3874) and Smyrna (Weber 7153, \textit{BMC} Phrygia 283-4, \textit{SNG} Aul 3878), three of the most famous neokorate cities in Asia. It seems plausible to infer that the newly \textit{neokoros} Laodikeia wished to proclaim its new status by associating itself with other prominent neokorate cities.

\textsuperscript{659} Burrell records the label as reading ‘ΑΛΒΩΝΙΑ’, rather than ΑΝΤΩΝΙΝΑ as would be expected: Burrell (2004), 121. However, since there is no evidence for an ‘Antonia’ festival at Laodikeia, it is probable that this is a mistake on the part of the die cutter.

\textsuperscript{660} Other types celebrating these agonistic events include: Wadd 6310 (depicting an agonistic urn with the legend: ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΩΝ ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ ΤΟ ΠΗ ΚΟΜΟΔΕΙΑ): Wadd 6311 (the same type, but with the legend: ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΩΝ ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ ΤΟ ΠΗ ΑΝΤΩΝΙΝΑ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΕΙΑ ΠΥΘΙΑ): Burrell (2004), type 6 (depicting a prize crown labelled ΑΝΤΩΝ between two purses standing on a table bearing the legend ΚΟΜΟΔΕΙΑ, beneath which is an amphora containing two palms. As Robert rightly noted (\textit{contra} Ramsay), the term ΠΥΘΙΑ in these circumstances does not refer to a games dedicated to Apollo, but rather indicates that the games were \textit{isopythian}: equal in rank to the Pythian games.
bestowed the right to hold agonistic contests in association with his own cult. Robert assumed that ΑΝΤΩΝΗΝΑ and ΚΟΜΟΔΙΑ referred to a single game jointly celebrating the cults of Caracalla and Commodus under the name Αντωνίνα Ασκλήπεια Πυθια. However, since Burrell no. 4 depicts three prize crowns, one must assume that Laodikeia hosted three agonistic festivals, the names of which probably correspond to the ΑΝΤΩΝΗΝΑ, ΑΣΚΛΗΠΕΙΑ and ΚΟΜΟΔΙΑ. The origins of the Asklepia are obscure, but the nomenclature is consistent with a Caracallan foundation date and thus this festival should be viewed in the context of this Emperor’s generosity to Laodikeia. Therefore it is difficult to reject Leschhorn’s view that the revival of the Laodikeian era on the coinage, which was inaugurated in honour of Hadrian’s earlier visit to the city, may have been intended to place the liberality of Caracalla in the context of the precedent established by Hadrian.

Head also noted the connection between the date ‘ΤΟ ΠΗ’ and agonistic imagery and assumed that the ‘ΡΗ’ (year 108) countermark also must be related to the monetary requirements of a religious festival. Head linked these Laodikeian specimens with two issues of Dionysopolis and Hyrgaleis from the year AD 222. The precise time of the

661 It is possible that the games associated with the cult of Commodus were revived before the neokoria of Commodus, since a coin attributed by Babelon to the reign of Septimius Severus bears the legend: ΔΕΙΑ ΚΟΜΟΔΙΑ ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΩΝ: Wadd 6295.
663 Robert interpreted the legend of Wadd 6311 (ΑΝΤΩΝΙΝΑ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΕΙΑ ΠΥΘΙΑ) as signifying the full name of the games. However, in the list of agonistic victors from Delphi, a flautist is recorded as having been the victor of the Ασκλήπεια Πυθια εν Λαοδικείᾳ β with no reference to the title Antoneinia: Fouilles des Delphes, III 1, no. 550, 28. In spite of this discrepancy Robert’s hypothesis that the Asklepeia of Laodikeia originated as benefaction of Caracalla remains sound. The parallel case of a great Asklepeia Sotereia Antoneinia at Ankyra demonstrates that such a grant would not have been unusual for the time: Robert (1969), 294-5. Moreover, the fact that the festival is celebrated on the ‘year 88’ issues, firmly places the Asklepeia in the context of Caracalla’s benefactions to Laodikeia. The choice of Asklepios would have been appropriate for Caracalla, who had paid special devotion to the cult of Asklepios at Pergamon in AD 214: Robert (1969), 294.
664 Leschhorn (1993), 385.
manufacture of these issues was emphasised by the addition of era dates, much like the year 88 issues of Laodikeia. Since Head accepted Imhoof-Blumer’s suggestion of AD 123/4 as the beginning of the Laodikeian era, he dated the ‘year 88’ coins to AD 211/3, around ten years before the issues of Dionysopolis and Hyrgaleis. Therefore, he reasoned that the era dates of Laodikeia and Hyrgaleis-Dionysopolis were connected by the need to produce coinage for a rotating decennial festival. However, this reconstruction is clearly impossible. Leschhorn’s re-dating of the start of the Laodikeian era takes the Laodikeian issues out of the chronological sequence and the discovery of the ‘TO PKA’ (year 121) countermark from Laodikeia further undermines the decennial pattern. Moreover, the festivals commemorated on the year 88 issues were local agonistic contests connected to the establishment of neokoros temples in this city; therefore these contests were probably confined to Laodikeia.

Agonistic motifs were not confined to the ‘year 88’ issue. The Deia Komodeia was celebrated on a reverse type struck during the reign of Philip the Arab. In this case the legend refers to both the local Komodeia and the koina Asias (ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΩΝ ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ ΔΕΙΑ ΚΟΜΟΔΕΙΑ (beneath the table) ΚΟΙΝΑ ΑΣΙΑΣ). The fact that the type depicts two prize crowns on a table may refer to the fact that both local Komodeia and the provincial festival of the koinon were held in Laodikeia either together or in quick succession. However, a type produced in the reign of Elagabalus is of even greater interest. The reverse type depicts four prize crowns sitting on an agonistic table, beneath which is an amphora. The legend reads: ΝΑΟΙ ΑΓΩΝΕΣ ΔΟΓΜΑΤΙ ΣΥΝΚΛΗΤΟΥ

---

665 ‘TO O’ (year 70) at Dionysopolis and ‘TO Τ ζ’ (year 306 of the Sullan era) at Hyrgaleis: BMC Phrygia lv, lxxii.
666 BMC Phrygia lxxx-i.
667 BMC Phrygia lxxii.
668 SNG Aul 8422 (Plate XLVI. 3), SNG Cop 606 (two prize crowns sitting on a table).
The presence of four prize crowns was interpreted by Burrell as signifying that Laodikeia must have been granted a fourth ‘worldwide’ festival at this time. Unfortunately, there is no evidence relating to circumstances of its foundation or even the name of the contest. Nevertheless, such imagery indicates that coin types continued to be a medium for the display of civic prestige by means of the number and scale of its agonistic contests in the mid-third century.

The agonistic types were not the only types of interest amongst the ‘year 88’ coinages. Other large denomination types dealt with the theme of the geographical position of the city. The two most important watercourses of the city, the Kapros and the Lykos were represented as two recumbent figures flanking the civic Tyche (who holds a cornucopiae and a statue of Zeus) on another of the ‘year 88’ types: ΛΥΚΟΣ ΚΑΠΡΟΣ ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΩΝ ΤΟ ΠΗ. Another type depicted the enthroned city goddess supporting a statue of Zeus in her hands. She is flanked by representations of Phrygia (holding a sceptre? And two ears of corn) and Karia (holding a cornucopiae): ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΩΝ ΝΩΚΟΡΩΝ ΦΡΥΓΙΑ ΚΑΡΙΑ ΤΟ ΠΗ. In this way the city articulated its position on the border between these two historic regions. This theme is reprised under Philip the Arab. The legend ΦΡΥΚΙΑ ΑΝΑΝΕΩΕΙΚ ΚΑΡΙΑ ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΩΝ ΝΩΚΟΡΩΝ (Phrykia (Phrygia?) Karia revival) is juxtaposed with an image of the seated city-goddess holding cornucopiae and statuette with torch (Demeter?). The city goddess is flanked by two

---

669 SNG Aul 8414 (Plate XLVII 6).
670 Burrell (2004), 123.
671 SNG Aul 8419 (Plate XLIV. 5); the same motif appeared on an unsigned type from the reign of Antoninus Pius: Heuchert no. 2349.
672 SNG Aul 3856 (43.91g: Plate XLIV. 4).
673 The position of Laodikeia on the frontier of these regions is reflected in the literary sources. Polybios (V 57), Strabo and Pliny treat Laodikeia as Phrygian. Ptolemy places it in Karia. Philostratos mentions that Polemon was born in Laodikeia in Karia (VS I. 25), but later states that the city was associated with Phrygia: Ramsey (1895), 37.
female personifications, one of which is one presenting the city goddess with a statuette (؟), while the other is holding cornucopae and rudder (؟).\textsuperscript{674} The iconography of this type is based on the prototype from the time of Caracalla, but the unique legend is of special interest, because at some point in the mid-third century Karia and Phrygia were separated from the rest of Asia to form a new province. In her review of the evidence Rouché asserted that this change took place either under Philip the Arab or Trajan Decius.\textsuperscript{675} Laodikeia must still have been a part of Asia c. AD 244-7, since the \textit{koina Asias} is mentioned on an agonistic coin type of Philip II as Caesar.\textsuperscript{676} However, the unprecedented use of ‘\textit{ANANEΩΕΙC}’ (revival/renewal) on a coin type celebrating both Phrygia and Karia from this period is potentially significant, since the ‘revival’ celebrated on the coin may refer to the creation of the new province of Karia and Phrygia in the mid third century AD. This administrative change would provide the perfect context for a type focused on a ‘renewal’ of Karia and Phrygia. This is the only known occasion in which the term ‘\textit{ANANEΩΕΙC}’ was employed on coinage and so it is probable that it refers to a specific event. If this interpretation is correct, it has significant consequences for our understanding of the chronology of this process. The obverse type of the coin depicts a laureate bust of Philip the Arab. Thus, if this coin does refer to the creation of the new province, this

\textsuperscript{674} Hecht (1968), 30 no. 9 (Plate XLVII. 3).
\textsuperscript{675} A milestone found near Dorylaion dating from the time before the declaration of the sons of Trajan Decius as Caesars in the name of a \textit{υπατικός (consularis) acting as ίγγυον (praeses): Frei-Korsunsky (1986), 91-95. Thus indicating that at this time Phrygia was no longer part of Asia province: Roueché (1989), 1-2. The name of the official cited in this text has been identified with Q. Fabius Clodius Agrippianus Celsinus, who recorded as governor of Phrygia and Karia in an honorific inscription from Alia: French (1991), 57-9 (cf. \textit{SEG} 41 1174). Dmitriev has put forward the argument that the separation of Karia and Phrygia from Asia was a temporary measure designed to meet the military emergency of the Gothic incursions of the 250’s and early 260’s: Dmitriev (2001), 468-89. However, evidence relating to Celsinus not only indicates that he served as \textit{praeses} of Karia and Phrygia (\textit{γυον Φρυγίας και Καρίας, SEG} XLI. 1174), but also that he served his term of office early in the reign of Decius. Thus, province predates the Gothic incursions.
\textsuperscript{676} \textit{SNG} Aul 8422, \textit{SNG} Cop 606.
reorganisation is likely to have occurred in the final part of the reign of Philip and not under Decius.

The Prosopography of the Laodikeian Eponyms

The prosopography of many of the eponyms of Laodikeia is inextricably linked with the distinguished Zenonid family, whose political prominence and wealth were to have a profound impact on the prosperity of their homeland in general and on Laodikeian coinage in particular. The origin of the success of this family lay in the privileges accorded to Zenon ‘the orator’ for having organised the defence of his homeland during the Parthian incursion under the renegade Roman general Labienus into Asia Minor in 40 BC. As a reward for this service to the Roman interest, Polemon the son of Zenon was appointed as tetrarch over a domain encompassing parts of Lykaonia and Kilikia Tracheia in 39 BC and thereafter he obtained the kingdom of Pontus c. 37/6 BC. Moreover, two of the children of Polemon were to ascend to kingships in their own right. However, M. Antonios Polemon, the other son of Polemon is of greater numismatic relevance to Laodikeia. For this Polemon, who bore the title of philopatris, was the eponym responsible for a small issue of coinage c. 5 BC. The iconography of Polemon’s coinage, depicting Zeus Laodikenos and an eagle is entirely conventional, but both the career and the coin iconography of the issues produced in the names of his descendents is of far greater significance. His son, L. Antonios Zenon (I) was one of the first notables from the Greek-speaking world to pursue a military equestrian career (legio XII Fulminata) before retiring.
to the province and attaining the office of asiarches.\textsuperscript{679} This Zenon is accepted as responsible for an important issue of five types produced around AD 50-4.\textsuperscript{680} This identification is confirmed by the fact that on two issues the name Polemon is abbreviated to a monogram of Π and Ο, while Zenon is invariably written in full, thus implying that the name Zenon was of greater significance.\textsuperscript{681} Moreover, the fact that the legend of \textit{RPC} I 2914 records that the coinage was produced on the occasion of his fourth tenure as priest, indicating that the issue was produced at the end of a long and distinguished career of public service, strongly favours the Zenon identification.\textsuperscript{682}

The importance of the issue represented by \textit{RPC} I 2912-16 is unconnected with the reverse types, which are conventional.\textsuperscript{683} Rather, the focus of scholarly interest in this material revolves around a single obverse type depicting the \textit{demoi} of Laodikeia and Smyrna facing one another with the legend: ΔΗΜΟΣ ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΖΜΥΡΝΑΙΩΝ.\textsuperscript{684} The direct reference to the \textit{demos} of another city prefigures the development of the phenomenon of the \textit{homonoia} later in the imperial period. Crucially, we may be sure that the nature of the relationship celebrated on the coinage was mediated through the personal influence of this most well connected of Asian families because the same motif is displayed on a Laodikeian issue signed by Zenonid in the reign of Nero. The reverse type of this issue portrays the \textit{demoi} of the Laodikeia and Smyrna clasping hands and holding sceptres with the legend: ΑΝΤΩ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ ΖΗΝΩΝ ΥΙΟΣ ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΩΝ ΖΜΥΡΝΑΙΩΝ ΟΜΗΡΟΣ (\textit{Anto(nios)} Zenon son of Zenon son of the Laodikeians and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{679} Thonemann (Thesis), 144: SEG 37 855; cf. Robert (1954), no. 54: \textit{I.Laodikeia} 53.
\item \textsuperscript{680} Thonemann (Thesis), 144: Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 476 (Zenon), 479 (Polemon).
\item \textsuperscript{681} ΕΠΙ ΙΕΡΕΥΣ ΠΟ ΥΙΟΥ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ (\textit{RPC} I 2912), ΕΠΙ ΙΕ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ Π(Ο) ΥΙ ΤΟ ∆: (\textit{RPC} I 2914)
\item \textsuperscript{682} The name of the priesthood is not mentioned on the coins, but Thonemann has convincingly associated this office with the eponymous priesthood of the city: Thonemann (2004), 144.
\item \textsuperscript{683} \textit{RPC} I 2912-14 depict a standing Zeus Laodikenos with eagle and staff, while \textit{RPC} I 2915-16 portray a serpent and snake motif.
\item \textsuperscript{684} \textit{RPC} I 2912.
Smyrneans homeros). The origin of the Zenoid relationship with Smyrna is obscure, but Thonemann has argued plausibly that Pythodoris the wife of Polemon I of Pontos was Smyrnean by origin, since her mother Antonia is attested in an inscription from this city. Thus Zenonid family may even have retained property in the territory of Smyrna, which eventually passed to Polemon, the great sophist and friend of the Emperors Trajan, Hadrian and Antoninus.

Other less distinguished members of the Zenonid clan also appear on the coinage of Laodikeia, although the precise nature of their kinship to the main branch of this family is obscure. An Ioulia Zenonis, probably the wife of the contemporary eponym Ioulios Andronikos, is known from an issue of coinage roughly contemporary with that of Antonios Zenon, the son of Zenon. However, the Flavian eponyms Gaios Ioulios Kotys and Klaudia Zenonis are of greater interest. Three of the issues of in the name of Klaudia Zenonis bear the reverse type of a standing half naked figure clutching a patera and palm wreath, next to an urn containing a staff and flag. The agonistic motifs, in particular the urn and palm wreath, are references to the completion of a stadium at Laodikeia in the reign of Titus. We know from epigraphic evidence that the cost of the construction project was met from the personal funds of Neikostratos, the son of...

685 RPC I 2928: For a discussion of the meaning of ‘ΟΜΗΡΟΣ’ see note 106.
686 I. Smyrna 614.
687 This Antonia was a member of the local aristocracy and should not be identified with the daughter of the Trimuvir: Thonemann (Thesis), 144.
688 RPC I 2924-5, cf. the coins of Andronikos RPC I 2920-3: for the theory that these types constitute a joint issue of a married couple see Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 476.
689 RPC II 1272-1280 Plate XXXVII. 14, XXXVIII. 1-11), from the reign of Titus: the Thracian origin of the name Kotys is of particular significance. The Zenonids were related to the royal house of Thrace, through the marriage of Antonia Tryphaena, the daughter of Polemon of Pontos with Kotys the king of Thrace: Thonemann (Thesis), 142. However, the influence of the Zenonids was not the only vector through which Thracian nomenclature could enter into the local aristocracy. Settlement of Thracian mercenaries in the region during the Hellenistic period is visible in the Thracian name of Seitalkas on the bronze coinage and Cistophori of the mid first century BC: RPC I 2892 (Plate XXXVI. 1) see also SNG Aul 3802.
690 RPC II 1273, 1275 and 1277 (Plate XXXVIII. 1, 3, 5).
Neikostratos. Therefore this issue of coinage reflects the collective pride of the community in the embellishment of their city, rather than the personal involvement of the eponyms in this project. Kotys and Zenonis appear to have been the last members of the extended Zenonid family to be cited on the coinage of Laodikeia. In the reign of Antoninus Pius, the eponym P. Klaudios Attalos signs a large issue of coinage. However, Jones has rightly concluded that this Attalos should not be identified with Attalos, who was the son of the early second century sophist Polemon, mentioned in Philostratos’ biography of his father.

Little is known of the backgrounds of the non-Zenonid eponyms of Laodikeia with the exception of Zeuxis philalethes, who was the director of the famous medical school situated at the shrine of Men Karou in the territory of Laodikeia. Three of the types of Zeuxis depict the standard standing Zeus Laodikenos with eagle and staff motif, which was to remain the principal type of Laodikeia throughout the life of the mint. However, it is difficult not to attribute the iconography of $RPC$ I 2895, which depicts a serpent entwined around a staff, to the personal choice of the eponym himself. The snake and staff were established symbols of Asklepios, the patron deity of Zeuxis’ profession. The remaining eponyms of Laodikeia are more mysterious and I am unaware of any further attestations of these individuals in either the literary or epigraphical material. The only remaining point of interest is that the Zenonids were not the only notable family to maintain a tradition of involvement with the production of coinage. The name Dioskourides in addition to the monogram KOP is first attested on the coinage of

691 I.Laodikeia 15.
692 Jones (1980), 374-7: Thonemann identifies the eponym P. Klaudios Attalos with the P. Kl. Attalos Philadelphos attested at the sanctuary of Apollo at Klaros (SEG XXXVII 691): Thonemann (Thesis), 149.
693 Strabo XII. 8. 20.
694 $RPC$ I 2893-4.
Laodikeia in the reign of Tiberius.\textsuperscript{695} The same name also appears on a lavish issue of sixteen types produced during the reign of Domitian.\textsuperscript{696} The similarity in nomenclature would indicate the Domitianic eponym was a direct descendent of the first Dioskourides. Moreover, the same KOP monogram occurs in the legend of the issue signed by the Neronian eponym Aineinas.\textsuperscript{697} If KOP monogram is an abbreviation of the \textit{gentilicum} Kornelios, then Aineinas may have been a member of the same extended family.

The evidence from Laodikeia indicates that the eponyms could affect the iconography of the coinage in their name. This is particularly apparent in the very specific iconography of the Pigres issue and the Smyrnean influence of the Zenonids. In cases where the dedicatory \textit{ἀνέθηκεν} formula is employed it is likely that since eponyms probably financed the coinage, they also had significant input into the choice of types, at least for the larger denominations. This may have been true even for standard motifs: P. Klaudios Attalos produced two large denomination types depicting Zeus standing holding an eagle and long sceptre using the dedicatory formula.\textsuperscript{698} However, Zeus was one of the principal deities of Laodikeia and the type was very common throughout the life of the mint. Moreover, with the exception of the unprecedented Pigres coinage, there does not appear to have been significant iconographic differences between signed and unsigned large denomination types. The large denomination unsigned issues of the mid-third century display iconography as elaborate as signed types and are equally as focused on the geography, religion and myth-history of the city. Such types must have been chosen locally, but the identity of those responsible remains obscure. All that can be said is that

\textsuperscript{695} RPC I 2906-7: the same also eponym minted for the second time at a later point in the reign of Tiberius: RPC I 2911.
\textsuperscript{696} RPC II 1281-1296
\textsuperscript{697} RPC I 2926-7
\textsuperscript{698} Heuchert 2326-7 (c. AD 139-44).
such persons would be drawn from the elite strata associated with civic administration in this period.

**The ‘Workshop’ system and Laodikeia**

Like Thyateira, Laodikeia changed workshop over the course of the second and third centuries AD, but less frequently. The later Antonine coinage of Laodikeia has been attributed to the ‘Southern workshop’ on stylistic grounds.\(^{699}\) Laodikeia did strike coinage in the reign of Septimius Severus, but the scale of production appears to have been small and I am aware of only two types in the name of Severus.\(^{700}\) Nonetheless, Kraft placed Laodikeia in the vast supply area of his Apameia workshop, which incorporated large areas of southern Phrygia and Pisidia during the first part of the third century AD.\(^{701}\) Coin production in the name of Laodikeia reached its zenith in the reign of Caracalla with the ‘year 88’ and Pigres issues. At this time Laodikeia belonged to the supply-area of the ‘Ephesos workshop’, which was to supply Laodikeia for the majority of the remainder of life span of civic coinage at Laodikeia.\(^{702}\) In the reign of Philip, Laodikeia was responsible for relatively large issue of coinage including a handsome series of *homonoia* coins. Kraft attributed coins from this period to both the ‘Ephesos’ and ‘Sardeis’ workshops, speculating that although the earlier issues were the product of the ‘Ephesos’ workshop, Laodikeia switched supplier in the latter part of the reign.\(^{703}\) Johnston noted a possible factor that may help to explain this decision. Her study of the impact of the workshop

---

\(^{699}\) This attribution was made on the strength of external stylistic similarities (Heuchert 2301, 2353): Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 806.

\(^{700}\) *SNG* Aul 3850 (Plate XLIV. 1) and Wadd 6295.

\(^{701}\) Kraft (1972), 55.

\(^{702}\) Kraft (1972), 29.

\(^{703}\) Kraft (1972), 32.
system at Sardes led her to conclude that the scale of production at the ‘Sardes’ workshop changed during the period from the second issue of Gordian III until the reign of Philip. During this period the ‘Sardes’ workshop supply area expanded to incorporate Germe in the north and as far as Themisonion in the east, thus encompassing large sections of Phrygia. Moreover, Johnston noted that the geographical spread of die-links focused more on Laodikeia than Sardes. 704 She suggested that during this period production may have taken place in or very close to Laodikeia, and so it would have been natural for the civic authorities to turn to the most local workshop for dies at this time. However, even if this reconstruction is correct the stay of the ‘Sardes’ workshop in Laodikeia must have been short-lived. The subsequent issues of Laodikeia once again fall into the style of the ‘Ephesos’ workshop. 705

Now that Laodikeia’s place within the workshop system has been established, it is necessary to evaluate the impact of this system on the choice of coin iconography. Kraft himself argued that the Hekate triformis types appearing on the coinage of Laodikeia, Themisonion and Phrygian Ankyra in the name of Otacilia is indicative of the power of the workshop system to facilitate the movement of types between cities. He reasoned that once the characteristic types of particular cities became incorporated into the iconographic repertoire of a workshop, the same motif could spread to the other cities of the supply area. 706 Since the Hekate Triformis type was known at Laodikeia from c. AD 139-44, it is possible that we have an example of a ‘Laodikeian’ type spreading to its neighbours. 707

705 Kraft observed a stylistic affinity between obverse types of Samos and Laodikeia (plate 24, 125 and 126). Kraft also noted that the denominational pattern of the last issues of Laodikeia were characteristic of the ‘Ephesos’ workshop: Kraft (1972), 33
706 Kraft (1972), 94.
707 Heuchert 2352 cf. Wadd 6298.
The Otacilia issue is only the occasion of which I am aware that a Hekate type is found at Ankyra. However, the same cannot be said of Themisonion, because same type is known from an issue of Maximinus Thrax (AD 235-8).

Kraft also saw the influence of the workshop system in the spread of the pseudo-autonomous obverse type of the head of Serapis across many of the cities of the ‘Apameia’ supply area during the reign of Septimius Severus. He identified an obverse die-link between Aphrodisias and Themisonion and associated these issues with similar obverse types from other Asian cities, including Laodikeia. Thus, it would appear that in this case the workshop system could have a significant impact on the iconography of small change. However, as with Thyateira, the workshop should not be seen as the driving force behind the choice of the majority of coin types. The most popular themes for the coin types continued to be drawn from the myth-history and religious identity of the city, in particular the cult of Zeus Laodikenos. Even in the case of pseudo-autonomous small denominations, where relatively generic types, for example cornucopiae and clasped hands, are common, types with specific associations are also frequently attested. For the early Severan period, types depicting a boar or wolf resting its front foot on an overturned water vase, representing the local Kapros and Lykos rivers, are common.
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708 BMC Phrygia 53.
709 SNG Aul 4021 (Plate XLVII. 1).
710 Kraft (1972), 94.
711 For the die link see Kraft (1972), plate 115, 17a-b (both feature standing Isis reverse types). Similar Serapis obverse types are attested at Bria (SNG Aul 3520, SNG Cop 224, standing Isis), Herakleia Salbake (SNG Aul 2543, SNG Cop 395 (standing Isis), Hierapolis (SNG Aul 3623, SNG Cop 426 (standing Isis), Hyrgaleis (SNG Cop 482 (standing Isis), Laodikeia (SNG Aul 3828 (Plate XLVI. 6), SNG Cop 543 (cornucopiae), Prymmessos (BMC Phrygia 6 (Asklepios with staff and serpent), Saitta (BMC Lydia 33 (Tyche), Synnada (SNG Cop 716, Amaltheia holding the infant Zeus), Trapezopolis (SNG Aul 2737, bullock) and Tripolis (SNG Aul 3311, standing Isis).
712 BMC Phrygia 111-3, SNG Leypold 1654 (Plate XLVII. 8).
Denomination and the Iconography of Types

As was the case with Thyateira, the relationship between denomination and reverse iconography is complex, but patterns are nonetheless discernable. If we take the output of *homonoia* coinage as an example, we find that the iconography of reverse types could play an important role in the identification of denominations. In the case of the *homonoia* issues it is apparent that deities representing the relevant communities possessed denominational significance. Reverse types depicting the relevant civic Tychai correspond to Heuchert’s 31mm/ 17g denomination, while those portraying deities (e.g. Zeus Laodikenos for Laodikeia, Artemis Ephesia for Ephesos) fall into the large 36mm/ 25g denomination. Nevertheless, this denominational distinction appears to have been short-lived. By the time of the next big issue of *homonoia* coins of Laodikeia under Caracalla as part of the ‘year 88’ issues, the use of types depicting the civic Tychai and the relevant civic deities were both produced to a standard very similar to Heuchert’s 33-32mm/ 19-17g denomination. The final large issue of *homonoia* coins from Laodikeia occurred in the reigns of Philip I and II, and once again two separate denominations are clearly visible: a larger denomination of c. 27g and a smaller c. 17g denomination. However, the neat correlation between reverse type and value apparent in the Antonine issues is absent. The

---

713 For example, Heuchert 2357 depicting Zeus Laodikenos with the two Nemeseis of Smyrna weighs c. 26g and measures 39 mm in diameter. Similarly, Heuchert 2372 (Plate XLIII. 4) portraying Zeus Laodikenos and Artemis Ephesia measures 37 mm and c.25g. However, another *homonoia* issue with Pergamon depicting the two relevant Tychai weighs only 19.02 g and measures 33mm: Heuchert 2360.

714 Weber 7155 celebrating *homonoia* with Pergamon depicting Zeus Laodikenos and Asklepios weighs 17.22g and measures 32mm in diameter (see also SNG Aul 3872-3874, BMC Phrygia 283-4). The same denomination was employed for a *homonoia* issue with Nysa depicting Zeus Laodikenos and Men Kamareites in the reign of Hadrian: SNG Tübingen 4153.
civic Tychai motif is employed in connection with the smaller denomination, but so is the representation of civic deities such as Zeus Laodikenos and the Nemeseis of Smyrna.\textsuperscript{715}

A degree of denominational fluidity also existed for other reverse types. For example, early third century AD pseudo-autonomous issues displaying a reverse type of two clasping hands employed a fairly consistent weight-standard of c. 3.43-4.13g.\textsuperscript{716} The same weight standard remained in use for this type until the end of the coinage of Laodikeia, when this type is found on an issue in the name of Trajan Decius c. 4.23g in weight.\textsuperscript{717} However, certain issues displaying this type produced in the reigns of Elagabalus and Severus Alexander were manufactured to a much heavier standard.\textsuperscript{718} Once again, we encounter a situation whereby a particular type could possess strong associations with a particular denominational value, but the same types could also be employed outside of this context. Sometimes the denominational significance of a type could change over time. In the reign of Antoninus Pius c. AD 139-44, the reverse type depicting Zeus Aseis holding the infant Dionysos in one arm while holding his other hand over the head of a goat was reserved for a relatively large denomination issue.\textsuperscript{719} Yet by the early third century the same type was adorning much smaller denomination issues.\textsuperscript{720}

\textbf{Comparison with other Mints}

The situation at Laodikeia and Thyateira may be contrasted with that known from other mints. Unfortunately, until the publication of all the \textit{RPC} volumes it is impossible to

\textsuperscript{715} See Franke- Nollé 1129-42, depicting the Tychai of Ephesos and Laodikeia (c/ 17.73g), and 1255-65, depicting Zeus and the Nemeseis (c.18-15g), for further details.
\textsuperscript{716} Weber 7135, \textit{SNG} Cop 544 (Plate XLVII 4), 546 6 and \textit{SNG} Aul 3833.
\textsuperscript{717} \textit{SNG} Leake 4985 (9.72g) and \textit{SNG} Cop 600 (13.32g; Plate XLVII. 2).
\textsuperscript{718} Heuchert 2301 (38mm 22.28g) and 2312 (35 mm and 26.19g).
\textsuperscript{719} \textit{SNG} Leypold 1653 (22mm 6.5g: Plate XLVII. 7) and \textit{SNG} Cop 542 (7.42g).
compare Thyateira and Laodikeia with the full range of provincial material. Nevertheless, several detailed studies have been carried out on the output of specific cities. In particular the mints of Smyrna, Aphrodisias and Magnesia on the Maiandros have been the subjects of comprehensive studies. Close examination of this material reveals many of the same patterns displayed by the evidence of Thyateira. If we look at the chronological pattern of eponym citation at Smyrna and Magnesia we find clear parallels with Thyateira. Before the mid second century AD the pattern of eponym citation employed at Smyrna was inconsistent. In the first century AD the name of a local eponym could appear alone or supplemented by the name of the proconsul. During the same period the names of two local eponyms could be attested, possibly representing a strategos and stephanephoros. In one instance three eponyms, two local and a proconsul are attested in the same legend. On other occasions only the proconsul was recorded. From the mid second century AD the practice of eponym citation became more regular. Only a single name of a local notable was inscribed on the larger denominations, usually the strategos in the genitive case preceded by the preposition ἐπί. In respect to Thyateira it was argued that the movement towards the ‘workshop’ system could have encouraged greater regularity in the practice of eponym citation. It is possible that the same factor had affected Smyrna. Moreover, at Magnesia with two exceptions from the Augustan period, eponyms were not
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722 For example Menophanes and Aviola (proconsul) AD 37-8 RPC I 2471.
723 Rhegeinos and Myrton is one example of the practice of paired eponyms: RPC II 1015-17.
724 Rhegeinos, Myrton and Frontinus: RPC II 1012-14.
725 Lucius Mestrius Florus c. AD 87/8 RPC II 1018.
726 Some variation in the formulæ remains. Theudianos (c. AD 147) employed the ἀνέθηκεν formula and under Severus Alexander the eponym G. Kl(audios) Diogenes was a stephanephoros (Klose (1987), 298).
a regular feature of the coinage until Antoninus Pius. Once again the development of the 'workshop' system may have encouraged standardisation of this practice.

The mid second century AD not only witnessed the development of a more regular pattern of eponym citation at Smyrna. At this time iconography also become tightly interwoven with denomination. Klose identified seven denominations employed by Smyrna at this time; a 'halbe' (15-17mm), an 'einer' (17-19mm), a 'zweier' (21-24mm), a 'dreier' (24-7mm), a 'vierer' (c.30mm) and a 'sechser' (c.35mm). In addition to these regular denominations, larger pieces were also occasionally struck, which Klose categorised as 'medallions'. The practice of adorning the reverse legends with eponyms was largely confined to the larger denominations. Eponyms were attested most frequently on the 'dreier' denomination and above, although rare examples of signed 'zweier' types are attested. In contrast to Thyateira unsigned issues of even the largest 'sechser' denomination could be left unsigned, although this was not the standard practice. For example a type from c. AD 212-17 celebrating the three neokoros temples of Smyrna belonging to the 'sechser' denomination is known. The same type, depicting three temples surmounted by wreaths, was employed on a 'sechser' issue signed by Tiberios Klaudios Kretarios (c. 212-215), which itself was probably derived from a 'medallion' (c. AD 211-14) struck in the name of Aurelios Charidemos. Similarly Klose records a 'sechser' type displaying the legend ΣΜΥΡΝΑΙΩΝ Γ ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ ΤΩΝ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩΝ

---

727 Schultz (1975), 22-3.
729 See Klose (1987), 286.
730 The vast majority of the 'sechser' and 'veier' denomination were signed, as were a large proportion of the 'dreier' denomination. The eponym Tiberios Klaudios Kretarios (AD 212-15) is known to have signed a 'zweier' type: Klose (1987), 291.
732 The only difference between the Charidemos and Kretarios types is that in the former the temples are labelled as the temples of Tiberios, Roma and Hadrian: Klose (1987), 285-6.
ΠΡΩΤΩΝ ΑΣΙΑΣ ΚΑΛΛΕΙ ΚΑΙ ΜΕΓΕΘΟΙ within a wreath.\textsuperscript{733} However, such cases are exceptional and overall Smyrna tends to follow Thyateira in having eponyms sign the majority of the larger denominations, while leaving the smaller denominations predominantly unsigned. The same pattern is visible for Magnesia, where eponyms start to become a regular feature of the large denomination coinage from the time of Antoninus Pius.\textsuperscript{734} From this point the majority of the large denomination pieces were signed, but exceptions were not unknown. Issues of even the largest denominations (Schultz’s ‘sechser’, c. 34-6mm and ‘fünfer’ c. 27-32mm) were occasionally left unsigned.\textsuperscript{735}

The same cannot be said of Aphrodisias as eponyms are attested sporadically even on the largest denominations. Under Lucius Verus and Marcus Aurelius the eponym Tiberios Klaudios Zelos signed types of the 30, 30, 25, 22 mm denominations.\textsuperscript{736} In the reign of Septimius Severus the eponyms Menippos, Tiberios Klaudios Zenon, Menestheus Isobounos and Phl. Perit[...] are all attested on the 35mm and occasionally on 30mm pieces.\textsuperscript{737} However, large denomination issues in the reigns of Macrinus, Elagabalus, Severus Alexander, Maximinus and Gordian III are all left unsigned. Eponyms are not attested again at Aphrodisias until Po. All(ios) Apollonianos under Philip the Arab.\textsuperscript{738}

Thereafter the eponym Stratonikianos is known from the reign of Trajan Decius and Ioulianos and Ant(..) Kelsos are attested under Valerian and Gallienus respectively. The absence of a coherent pattern makes it difficult to determine why the eponyms did not become a regular feature on the large denomination coinage of Aphrodisias during the

\textsuperscript{733} Klose (1987), 298 (c. AD 222-35).
\textsuperscript{734} Schultz (1975), 22-25.
\textsuperscript{735} Examples of unsigned ‘sechsers’ and ‘fünfers’ include Schultz no. 110 (‘sechser’, Marcus Aurelius: Plate XXV. 2), 130-32 (‘sechser’ Lucius Verus: Plate XXV. 4-6), 224 (‘fünfer’ Elagabalus: Plate XXVI. 2) and 288 (‘fünfer’ Iulia Mamaea).
\textsuperscript{736} Heuchert 2103-2119.
\textsuperscript{737} Johnston (1995), 95-6.
latter part of the second century AD or even why the practice of eponym citation was revived during the reign of Philip. It may be relevant that the eponyms Zelos, Menippos and Zenon all signed their coinage in the nominative case frequently using the dedicatory ἀνέθηκεν formula, indicating privately financed dedicatory issues. Moreover, Johnston noted that the types specifically designated as dedicated with the ἀνέθηκεν formula were of a higher artistic standard, implying that greater concern and capital was lavished on their production. Consequently, the absence of eponyms from the mid third century may have been in part the result of an absence of comparable benefactions. From the late second to the early third century AD the ἐπὶ formula is rarely attested, although this does become the standard legend formula at Aphrodisias from Po. Ai(lius) Apollonianos under Philip the Arab. The ἐπὶ formula is most frequently attested legend formula from Asia during the third century, but the reasons for its sudden adoption at Aphrodisias are unclear. It cannot be explained in terms of a switch of ‘workshop’, since the city seems to have used the same local die supplier in the reign of Gordian III. One possible explanation is that responsibility for the organisation of coin production shifted away from single benefactors to the board of archontes. All these later eponyms were accorded the title of archon, with the exception of the neokoros and hippikos (equestrian), P. Ant Kelsos. However, we know that in the time of Septimius Severus and Julia Domna types were produced with the legend: ΕΠΙ ΤΩΝ ΠΕΡΙ ΜΕΝΕΣΘΕΑ ΙΣΟΒΟΥΝΟΝ (In the year when Menestheus
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739 Heuchert 2103-2119 (Zelos: Plate XXVIII. 6-9) and MacDonald 89-107 (Menippos and Zenon).
741 In this period the ἐπὶ formula is used by Phl. Periti(...) on a homonoia issue with Ephesos: MacDonald 109 (c. AD 201-9).
743 For the later eponyms of Aphrodisias see MacDonald 198-199 (Apollonianos), 200-2 (Stratoneikos), 212 (Ioulianos), 221 (P. Ant(...) Kelsos) and 222 (An(...) Apellas). It is worth noting that eponyms who sign using ἐπὶ formula are known from far fewer types indicating that such issues were on a much smaller scale.
Isobounos was first of the board of archontes).\textsuperscript{744} Therefore, it is probable that some type of relationship between civic coinage and the board of archontes was long standing. The upsurge in the frequency with which archontes were mentioned on coinage may indicate that the relationship between the office and coin production became closer in this period, but we know so little about the nuances of municipal administration in third century Aphrodisias that this hypothetical change in administrative responsibility remains speculation.

The relationship between eponyms and high denominations found at Magnesia and Smyrna is broadly similar to Thyateira. The situation at Aphrodisias is less straightforward, but when eponyms do occur, they too are usually associated with the larger denominations. Now it is necessary to discuss the interaction between denomination and iconography at other mints. Klose found that at Smyrna from c. AD 147 particular types became associated with particular denominations and that once a type had acquired denomination connotations, it was rarely ever used in conjunction with another denomination. The one exception is the two Nemeseis motif, which is found on both the ‘dreier’ and ‘sechser’ denominations. An element of flexibility did remain in this system, since over the course of the latter second and third centuries AD, new types were introduced and older ones were occasionally discontinued.\textsuperscript{745}

\begin{tabular}{ccc}
‘einer’ & ‘zweier’ & ‘dreier’ & ‘vierer’ & ‘sechser’ \\
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{744} MacDonald 82-5.
\textsuperscript{745} The table is derived directly from Klose (1987), 108.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Griffin (AD 147-180)</th>
<th>Herakles (AD 141-268)</th>
<th>2 Nemeseis standing</th>
<th>three temples (AD 212-268)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lion (AD 147)</td>
<td>Tyche (AD 161-268)</td>
<td>enthroned</td>
<td>legend (AD 198-268)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyche temple (AD 198-268)</td>
<td>Kybele (AD 147-268)</td>
<td>enthroned</td>
<td>Kybele and Amazon (AD 193-211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asklepios (AD 161-177)</td>
<td>enthroned Zeus (AD 147-268)</td>
<td>2 Nemeseis (AD 193-268)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygeia (AD 162-177)</td>
<td>Roma (AD 212-268)</td>
<td>The dream of Asklepios and Alexander (AD 147-249)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygeia (AD 193-95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus denomination was biggest single factor determining the structure of coin iconography at Smyrna, although the possibility remains open that the local authorities (possibly the eponym himself) chose particular types from the established denominational repertoire and some eponyms could even have facilitated the introduction of new types. This is especially true for types that appear to have been employed on only specific issues. Not all the later coinage of Smyrna was adorned with the standard types. For example, c. AD 175-77 P. Ailios Arizelos signed a unique ‘vierer’ piece depicting an enthroned Amazon wearing a mural crown holding a model of a temple in her left hand and a pelta and bipennis in her
left with a prow at her feet.\textsuperscript{746} A further ‘vierer’ type of interest signed by Klaudios Rouphinos depicted Caracalla being crowned by Nike.\textsuperscript{747}

At Aphrodisias from the mid-second century AD Johnston identified several types with strong denominational associations.\textsuperscript{748}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
20mm & 22mm & 25mm & 30mm & 35mm \\
\hline
Eros & Dionysos & Aphrodite & three Charities & Emperor \\
Hermes & recumbent river & standing & Tyche & riding \\
 & deity & Men & Pantheistic & temple \\
 & Leafless tree & & & goddess \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

The only type at Aphrodisias used consistently for several denominations was the cult statue of Aphrodite type.\textsuperscript{749} Other examples of specific types being used in conjunction with more than one denomination are rare and often associated with a change in the denominational system. For example, the same Aphrodite holding Eros and a long sceptre type is used on 32mm and 26mm pieces signed by the eponym Tiberios Klaudios Zelos.\textsuperscript{750} However, the large issue signed by Zelos represents the creation of a new denominational system for Aphrodisias. In particular the series of Zelos marked the introduction of a new large 35 mm piece and an intermediate 22mm piece.\textsuperscript{751} Thus denominational distinctions between types would not have been fully developed at this point. However, as at Smyrna, certain issues deviated from the standard types. This was particularly true of the largest denomination, on which the displays of imperial and homonoia types were especially

\textsuperscript{746} Heuchert 1382.
\textsuperscript{747} Klose (1987), 284 (AD 211/2-217).
\textsuperscript{748} Johnston (1995), 67.
\textsuperscript{749} This type is attested on 22, 30 and 35 mm denominations: Johnston (1995), 67.
\textsuperscript{750} Johnston (1995), 94.
\textsuperscript{751} Johnston (1995), 67.
Other external factors could affect the iconography. The foundation of the Gordionea Attalea Capitolia was commemorated on the coinage under Gordian III. Agonistic types adorned the reverse types of 35mm (prize crown on an agonistic table flanked by purses, behind which are two palms), 30mm (three nude athletes standing around a ballot urn, one of whom holds a palm and sceptre), 25mm (prize crown containing a palm sitting on a table flanked by purses) and 22mm (prize crown containing a palm sitting on a table flanked by purses) denominations of the c. AD 240-4 issue. Similarly, many of the large denomination types of Klaudios Zelos were concerned with the commemoration of the epinikian games established to celebrate the victories of Lucius Verus over the Parthians. Heuchert 2105 depicts the Emperor erecting a trophy while being crowned by Nike. The imperial theme is continued by reverse types showing both Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus raising their hands in relevance to Aphrodite: Heuchert 2103. In such circumstances it is probable that Zelos played a role in the choice of these types. Not only is the iconography focused on a particular theme, but also the use of the ἀνέθηκεν formula strongly emphasises the personal connection between the eponym and the coinage.

The regular relationship between iconography and denomination found at Aphrodisias and Smyrna contrasts with the practice at Laodikeia, Thyateira and Magnesia, where the connection between denomination and iconography was less rigid, but still significant. At Magnesia reverse types often possessed denominational connotations. The type depicting Leto carrying her children in her hands was employed at Magnesia from

---

752 Under Macrinus the standard Emperor riding type (Macdonald 161) was supplemented with a type depicting the Emperor next to the civic goddess (158) and riding in a quadriga (159). Homonoia issues were relatively common; for example homonoia was celebrated with Antiochea under Severus Alexander: Johnston (1995), 97, Macdonald 175-176.

753 Johnston (1995), 98: Johnston further argued that since subsequent examples of agonistic iconography can be dated tentatively to four-yearly cycles (c. AD 242, 245, 249, 257, 261, 265?), it is possible that issues were struck in conjunction with the games (Johnston (1995), 81).
Hadrian to Otacilia Severa. Throughout this time this type was exclusively associated with the ‘fünfer’ denomination.\textsuperscript{754} However, other types were employed less consistently. During the third century Magnesia produced a type depicting a standing Apollo wearing a radiate crown and holding a kithara. Examples of this type corresponding to both Schultz’s ‘fünfer’ and ‘vierer’ denominations are attested.\textsuperscript{755} The standing Athena holding a spear (sometimes also next to an altar) type displays a similar denominational flexibility.\textsuperscript{756}

It is difficult to know why denominational discipline was greater at Smyrna. It is possible that because Smyrna was such a large mint and important economic centre that denominational clarity was given a greater priority, but this supposition cannot as yet be proved. What is apparent is that in spite of the more rigid correlation between iconography and denomination, the type of signed high denomination display pieces that were a feature of Thyateira are also attested from Smyrna. For example c. AD 147 the eponym Theudianos signed a type depicting Pelops and Hippodamia in a biga. This type is unique at Smyrna and since Theudianos signs this type using the \textit{ἀνέθηκεν} formula, it seems reasonable to assume that the eponym was responsible for the choice of type.\textsuperscript{757} Eponyms not using the \textit{ἀνέθηκεν} formula signed other large denomination types of interest.\textsuperscript{758} The eponym Klaudios Stratonikianos is attested on a ‘sechser’ type depicting Caracalla,

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{754} Schultz 74 (Hadrian), 116 (Marcus Aurelius), 147 (Septimius Severus Plate XXVI. 9), 152 (Julia Domna), 233 (Julia Maesa: Plate XXVI. 3), 298 (Julia Mamaea: Plate XXVI. 8), 428 (Gordian III) and 483 (Ozacilia Severa).
\item\textsuperscript{755} Schultz 247 (Severus Alexander, ‘vierer’), 290-291 (Julia Mamaea, ‘fünfer’), 342 (Maximus, ‘fünfer’), 402 (Gordian III, ‘fünfer’) and 489 (Philippus II, ‘vierer’).
\item\textsuperscript{756} Schultz 296 (Julia Mamaea, ‘fünfer’), 306 (Maximinus, ‘sechser’), 342 (Maximus, ‘fünfer’: Plate XXVI. 9), 413 (Gordian III, ‘fünfer’) and 468 (Gordian III, ‘zweier’).
\item\textsuperscript{757} The legend reads: ΘΕΥ∆ΙΑΝΟΣ ΣΤΡΑΤ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ ΣΥΜΡΑΙΟΙΣ ΠΕΛΟΨ: Heuchert 1339.
\item\textsuperscript{758} This formula falls out of use at Smyrna after Theudianos. Thereafter the \textit{ἐπὶ} + genitive formula dominates, although occasionally the preposition is omitted. This denotes either that no subsequent eponym was as heavily involved in coin production or that some of the connotations of the dedicatory formulae was absorbed into the \textit{ἐπὶ} + genitive formula. The latter scenario is not impossible. Once a particular formula became established as normative, its sheer ubiquity may have discouraged the use of other legend types.
\end{itemize}
Septimius Severus and Geta seated on curule chairs. The centrally positioned figure is identified as Severus by the laurel wreath and the scroll and globe that he holds in his hands, the junior position of Caracalla is emphasised by the lack of a globe (c. AD 209-11).\textsuperscript{759} Another ‘sechser’ type signed by Klaudios Stratonikianos depicts Roma being crowned by Nike while shaking hands with the Amazon Smyrna (c. AD 209-11).\textsuperscript{760} Such types display clear signs of being very carefully and thoroughly thought out. Thus it is tempting to attribute this process to the person who is named so prominently in the legend.

The larger denomination pieces of Magnesia were also a medium for the display of elaborate iconography. For example, a type depicting the Artemis cult image crowned by two Nikai flanked by reclining figures of the Maiandros and Thorax is found on the ‘sechser’ denomination.\textsuperscript{761} Nevertheless, it must also be noted that at both Smyrna and Magnesia even the very the largest denominations were associated with their own standard types. Thus denominational factors were often the most significant factor in the choice of types even in respect to the largest denominations. At Magnesia the type depicting Artemis in wheaten crown holding a torch while riding a biga pulled by winged snakes is usually associated with the ‘sechser’ denomination, and so it is likely that this and other such types served as denominational markers.\textsuperscript{762} However, at Smyrna in particular we have seen that non-standard types were a regular feature of the large denomination coinage. Moreover even the standard types such as the dream of Alexander (two Nemeseis appearing to a sleeping Alexander the Great, inspiring him to re-found the city) and the three neokorate

\textsuperscript{759} Klose (1987), 271: a similar motif depicting Maximinus and Maximus is found on a ‘sechser’ type signed by M. Aurelios Publius Proklianos (Klose (1987), 304).
\textsuperscript{760} Klose (1987), 270.
\textsuperscript{761} Schultz 110, (Marcus Aurelius), 143 (Septimius Severus), 159 (Caracalla).
\textsuperscript{762} Schultz 100-1 (Antoninus Pius), 237 (Severus Alexander): although under Gordian III this type is associated with the ‘fünfer’ denomination (414).
temples were employed as means of articulating detailed elements of civic ideology. As at Thyateira the names of notable individuals was a significant aspect of this form of civic display.

The pattern of the evidence at Aphrodisias differs from Smyrna and Magnesia in that eponyms were cited less regularly on second and third century AD civic issues. Moreover, there often appears to be little difference between signed and unsigned large denomination pieces. The case of the issue of signed by Zelos is exceptional, since this coinage marked an important watershed in the history of Aphrodisian coinage and therefore it is possible that Zelos was deeply involved in this reorganisation of the local denominational system. However, as at Laodikeia, it is clear that the iconography of unsigned pieces of the same denomination could be just as elaborate. For example all the agonistic types produced to celebrate the foundation of Gordionea Attalea Capitolia were unsigned. Such types were clearly chosen at a local level to display civic ideology, but it is unclear by whom. Conversely, standard types were signed using variant formula explicitly linking the eponym to the coinage. An issue of Menippos and Zenon dedicated to their fatherland (ΜΕΝΙΠΠΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΖΗΝΩΝ ΤΗ ΠΑΤΡΙΔΑ) was adorned with the standard type of a member of the imperial family riding down enemies.\footnote{MacDonald 90.}

\textbf{Conclusion}

It was the aim of the chapter to place the phenomenon of eponyms within the context of the total output of two mints. The mints of Laodikeia and Thyateira are of interest because the pattern of eponym citation changes over time. For both mints there are periods during
which eponyms were not a regular feature of the coinage, although at Laodikeia eponyms become rare after the reign of Caracalla, while at Thyateira eponyms are not attested until the reign of Antoninus Pius. The different pattern of eonym citation may be explained by several factors. At Laodikeia it was suggested tentatively that the evidence of coin formulae indicates that the abandonment of eponyms may be explained in terms of a decline in the financing of coinage by the local elites, a process which may have been exacerbated by the adoption of the local civic era as a dating mechanism on the ‘year 88’ issues and subsequent local countermarks. At Thyateira the adoption of eponyms may have been facilitated by the emerging workshop system and the resultant impetus to fall into line with the general pattern of legend formulae employed by the other cities in the supply area. In both cases eponyms were generally the preserve of the larger denominations, but not all large flan coins were adorned with eponyms. Small denomination issues were generally unsigned, but it is possible that they were produced in conjunction with and so were therefore part of the same issue as the signed coinages.

From the evidence assembled in this chapter it is clear that structural factors such as the denomination and the development of the workshop system had a significant impact on the processes governing the choice of iconography. Particular obverse and reverse types appear to have developed particular denominational connotations, although in respect to both Thyateira and Laodikeia these associations were applied less rigorously than was the case at Smyrna and Aphrodisias. Moreover, the evolution of the workshop system led to the introduction of iconographic motifs from outside the usual repertoire of specific civic imagery in a limited number of cases. The utilisation of the Serapis/standing Isis for a large number of cities within the supply area of the ‘Apameia’ workshop during the reign
of Septimius Severus provides a compelling example of the potential for the ‘workshop’ to not only act as a vector for the introduction of new motifs into a civic coinage, but also for the development of regionalised denominational systems defined by iconography. Yet, the evidence of Laodikeia and Thyateira suggests that the impact of the workshop system was felt most strongly on the pseudo-autonomous small denomination pieces. The larger denomination pieces with their more elaborate iconography tended to focus on the specific religious identity of the relevant city. Motifs drawn from the civic repertoire occur throughout the life of the mint, usually irrespective of the current workshop supplying the city, although the ‘workshop’ would still have influenced the artistic style and models employed for the type.

The evidence for the conclusion that denomination could still play a role in the choice of types for even the largest value coinage is also compelling. The ‘year 88’ coinages of Laodikeia reveal that elaborate iconography was not the preserve of issues signed by eponyms at this mint. The absence of eponyms in this case raises questions concerning the supervision of production and role of individuals in the financing of coinage. At Laodikeia the ubiquity of the nominative case and the popularity of the ἀνέθηκεν formula may indicate the high degree of personal involvement in the production of coinage by the eponyms. Moreover, it was argued in chapter three that eponyms in the rest of the province often held some degree of administrative responsibility over the production of coinage and that private financing of civic coinage was relatively common. Thus, we may tentatively conclude that the ‘year 88’ issues were paid for and supervised by different means than the near contemporary issues signed by Ailios Pigres, although the question of how the year 88 types were chosen must remain open. In areas were eponym
citation was more regular it is possible that eponyms were responsible for the choice of
types. Even in cities such as Smyrna, where the relationship between iconography and
denomination was strong, eponyms may still have played a role in this process by choosing
from within a standard cannon of types with denominational significance. The difficulty
with this hypothesis is that such a practice would leave no discernable evidence in the
numismatic record.

It should also be noted that at the uppermost extreme of the denominational
spectrum, types were at their most elaborate and in some cases, such as those of Pigres the
issue, were entirely unique. The relationship between iconography and flan size is
unsurprising, as the larger diameter allowed greater freedom to develop more elaborate
iconography. Small denomination issues offered a far smaller canvas and so less attention
was lavished on their iconography and less specific motifs were readily adopted. However,
another factor may have played a role in this process. The dedication formula found on
some of the large denomination types implies that these pieces were intended for public
presentations via distributions. In such a context it would be unsurprising if greater
emphasis was placed on the visual impact of such coinage. Conversely, the small
denomination pieces may have played a lesser role in these circumstances and so greater
priority was given to denominational clarity. The relationship between coinage and
distributions will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.
6.

Coins and Monumentality

This chapter will analyse the role of local elites in the production of coinage from the perspective of monumentality. It will be argued that the monumental potential of coinage was exploited within the context of the Graeco-Roman city. In this respect coinage could be conceptualised in terms similar to other media of elite display, such as inscriptions, buildings and sculpture. Questions concerning the origins of this mentality will be discussed in detail and it will be determined whether we are dealing with a continuation and development of the Hellenistic tradition or whether we can find evidence for the adaptation of Roman attitudes towards coin iconography in the East. In order to fully explore the implications of these questions, two phenomena with particular significance for monumentality will be studied in detail: the evidence for public cash distributions as a motivating factor for the production of coinage and the portrait types of Mytilene.

Monumentality and Coinage at Rome

In their groundbreaking article of 2001, Meadows and Williams set out the thesis that the paradigm shift towards the practice of employing rapidly changing coin types in Rome during the 130’s BC may be explained in terms of the contemporary conception of coins as ‘monumenta’ (monuments).\textsuperscript{764} This thesis rested on three main foundations. The first of these is that the location of the Roman mint at the temple of Juno Moneta was of great symbolic importance. ‘Juno Moneta’ and ‘Moneta’ possessed particular associations with

\textsuperscript{764} Meadows and Williams (2001), 27-49.
memory and the certification of records. Thus coinage was linked conceptually to the idea of memory and memorialisation, and so came to be viewed as an outlet for monumental display. Secondly, this change took place in the context of a rise in the Roman elite’s interest in the history and development of the built environment of Rome.\footnote{Meadows and Williams (2001), 33-37.} Meadows and Williams suggested that this process was facilitated by two main factors. The first was the Roman elite’s desire to retrench traditional values in a society subject to rapid social and political change. The second was the pressure to express noble status in a competitive political environment through the display of ancestral achievement. Meadows and Williams also placed particular emphasis on the upsurge of antiquarian and historiographical writings emanating from this period, which paralleled the concern lavished on the depiction of ancestral achievement evident from the coin types.\footnote{As evidence for the upsurge in antiquarian interest Meadows and Williams cite the example of Cn. Gellius, who wrote a history of Rome to 216 BC in 30-33 books. This may be compared with Cato and L. Cassius Hemina’s early second century histories, which covered the period up to the second Punic war in just four books. Similar antiquarian tendencies were demonstrated by Sempronius Tuditanus (cos. 129 BC) and M. Iunius Gracchanus, who wrote works on the Roman Magistracies: Meadows and Williams (2001), 45-46. The late second century BC work of L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi (cos. 133 BC) is also indicative of the relationship between antiquarianism and monumentality: Rawson (1976), 706-710. The emphasis on the topography and monuments of the city found in the surviving fragments of Piso reflect the interest in monuments displayed by late second century BC coinage.} These phenomena were products of a society that defined nobility in terms of the public display of ancestral achievements.

The work of Meadows and Williams interprets the monumental conception of coinage as a product of wider social and cultural processes occurring at Rome during this period. One may therefore conclude that ‘monumental coinage’ was the product of a very specific set of historical circumstances and of very little relevance to the study of the provincial coinages of Asia during the first three centuries AD. However, the material examined in this thesis suggests that there were significant parallels between the way in
which the Roman notables of the late Republic viewed coinages and the conception of coinage held by the provincial elites of the imperial era, even though the social contexts were very different. At Rome itself coinage continued to be viewed in monumental terms after the establishment of the Principate, although the production of coinage became a monopoly of the imperial house. Imperial military successes were glorified, imperial virtues were extolled and imperial beneficence was celebrated.

**Monumentality and Coinage in Asia**

The relationship between civic coin iconography and monumentality in Asia was more complex. Imperial authority and power was widely acknowledged through the adoption of obverse portrait types. Moreover, imperial themes were increasingly appearing on civic reverse types, although other reverse types continued to be concerned with the articulation of civic identity. The latter could be expressed in terms of relevant local cults, prominent geographical features, local mythology, famous local historical figures and the personifications of civic institutions.\(^{767}\) Such expressions of identity were mediated through the interests and ideology of the local elites, who controlled the apparatus of civic administration, including the production of coinage. The imagery and themes employed in coin types were drawn from the standard repertoire of civic self-representation. The type depicting a seated Aphrodite riding on the back of a Capricorn produced at Aphrodisias may serve as an example of this process.\(^ {768}\) This motif was not ‘invented’ to adorn the civic coinage, but was a standard element found in the civic iconography of Aphrodisias adapted to serve as a coin type. Evidence from monumental reliefs indicates that the image

---

\(^{767}\) For a fuller discussion of the relationship between local mythology and coinage see Price (2005), 115-124.  
\(^{768}\) Heuchert 2137.
of Aphrodite riding a Capricorn was woven into the garments of the cult statue of Aphrodite of Aphrodisias.\textsuperscript{769} Therefore this example affords us the opportunity to see the extent to which coin iconography was dependent on the iconographic repertoire of other media. This dependency is especially clear at Aphrodisias, whose archaeology and sculpture is exceptionally well explored and published. Similarly, coinage could serve as a vehicle for the commemoration of important civic events. In the case of Thyateira we have already seen that the grant of isopythian status to the Augousteia festival by Elagabalus was celebrated by the production of several commemorative coin types.\textsuperscript{770} At Pergamon the imperial visit of Caracalla was commemorated by an elaborate series of reverse types depicting the Emperor participating in the civic ceremonial surrounding his \textit{adventus}.\textsuperscript{771} In such circumstances it is legitimate to view many coin types as a kind of monument affirming the collective memory of an important event for the civic identity of the community.

In addition to the commemoration of collective civic identity, there is also evidence that coin types could also function on a personal level for the eponym. We have seen in chapter 4 that in at least some cases there are grounds for the identification of personalised iconography. At Laodikeia the \textit{asiarches} Ailios Pigres produced a type depicting Caracalla standing before a temple enclosed by a columns on three sides distributing wreaths.\textsuperscript{772} The unique and specific nature of the iconography of this type led to the conclusion that it is commemorating a specific occasion, in which Pigres himself played a prominent part. This is an extreme example. Some types adorning provincial

\textsuperscript{769} MacDonald (1992), 28, Fredrich (1897), 361-380.
\textsuperscript{770} BMC Lydia 112; SNG Cop 616; SNG Aul 3231; SNG Cop 621 (Plate XIII. 12).
\textsuperscript{771} Harl (1987), 55-8.
\textsuperscript{772} BMC Phrygia 227.
issues can be interpreted as having particular personal references, but generally these were not as explicit as those of their Roman counterparts.\textsuperscript{773} The study of the coinages of Laodikeia and Thyateira in chapter 5 emphasised that the denomination and even the workshop system (only in the case of the smallest denominations) played a significant role in the choice of coin iconography. However, this need not preclude the existence of such a monumental mentality in Asia. It is surely significant that ἀνέθηκεν and all the other various legend formulae found on the provincial coinage of Asia were adapted from a pre-existing vocabulary of euergetism and monumental dedication. The adoption of such terminology should be understood in the context of a paradigm shift in the Greek conception of the nature of coinage. Only if coins came to be seen in monumental terms, could the application of vocabulary already employed for other media be appropriate.

**The Origins and Development of the Monumental Mentality on Coinage in Asia Minor**

The degree of monumentality displayed by the civic coinages of the imperial period did not emerge out of a vacuum. Antecedents of this mentality are visible in the numismatic output of the Hellenistic period. Long before the imperial period, civic coin types were chosen for their particular associations with the city. Most famously, the Athena head obverse and owl

\textsuperscript{773} For example Roman Republican coins could portray an image of an ancestor, or symbols of ancestral achievement relevant to the particular moneyer. A type in the name of L. Pomponius Molo depicted the king Numa Pompilius sacrificing a goat: \textit{RRC} no. 334, \textit{ca} 97BC. This level of personalisation was not shared by the civic elites in Asia. However, local the coinages could make direct iconographic references to Roman officials. Nikomedia in Bithynia produced an obverse type of Hera Lanoia in honour of the Lanuvian origins of the governor Thorius Flaccus (\textit{RPC I} 2063). The reason for this discrepancy is not hard to see. The exposition of ancestral achievements is not an uncommon theme in the monumental epigraphy of the Antonine period, but it was not the principal characteristic of a well-defined concept of nobility (\textit{nobilitas}). For example the tomb of Ioulios Aurelios Charidemos Ioulianos at Aphrodisias enumerates the career and achievements of the builder’s father and grandfather: \textit{I.Aph} 2007 12.909, (\textit{MAMA VIII} 564); for a French translation see Puech (2002), 169-171.
reverse of Athenian coinage reflected the central position enjoyed by the Athena cult in that city. Similarly, some of the coinages of Magna Graecia were adorned with the image of the mythological founders of the community.\textsuperscript{774} Cult statues representing prominent civic deities had been a feature of coin iconography since its origin.\textsuperscript{775} In the Hellenistic period the repertoire of civic symbols appearing on coinage was expanded to include the images of famous citizens, often poets and intellectuals from the distant past.\textsuperscript{776} However, it is noticeable that this phenomenon becomes more pronounced in the Roman imperial period and reaches its peak in the late second century AD.\textsuperscript{777} Moreover, it is also apparent that profound changes in civic coin iconography occurred in the Roman imperial period. The editors of \textit{RPC} I and II noted that the number and variety of reverse types employed by civic mints was much greater in the Julio-Claudian period than had been the case in the time before Augustus.\textsuperscript{778} The variety of reverse types continued to increase over the course of the first two centuries AD, reaching a peak in the Severan period.\textsuperscript{779} Not only did the number of reverse types increase during this time, but also entirely new iconographic themes emerged. In particular buildings appeared for the first time on the coinages produced by the Greek cities.\textsuperscript{780} Scenes from the civic myth-history were lavishly depicted on numerous coin types.\textsuperscript{781} The image of the Emperor and Imperial house began to

\textsuperscript{774} For example the city of Kroton produced a type depicting Herakles as the civic oecist sitting on a rock, holding his club with a bow and quiver by his side, holding a laurel branch over a flaming altar: Kraay (1976), 628-629.
\textsuperscript{775} For the example Zeus Ithomatas at Messene: \textit{BMC} Peloponnesus xliii.
\textsuperscript{776} The image of Homer appears at Smyrna c. 188/80 BC and 110 BC, Archilochos at Paros c. 75 BC, Bias at Priene c. 150 BC, Korina at Thespiae c. 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC, Stesichoros at Himera c. 100 BC, Anaxagoras at Klazomenai, Hippokrates at Kos c. 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC, and Eukleides (?) at Megara c. 100 BC: Schefold (1943), 172, Bürchner (1882), 109-137.
\textsuperscript{777} Heuchert (2005), 52.
\textsuperscript{778} Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 43 and Burnett, Amandry and Carradice (1999), 33.
\textsuperscript{779} Heuchert (2005), 49.
\textsuperscript{780} Burnett (1999), 158.
\textsuperscript{781} Heuchert (2005), 51-2.
permeate even reverse types. Later in the second century and particularly in the third, motifs relating to agonistic contests became extremely popular.  

These changes are integral to our understanding of the nature of civic coinage in this period. Why did these changes occur, what was the extent of Roman influence on this process and what can they tell us about the civic elites’ attitude to coinage? It is logical to begin by dealing with the first and second of these questions, since they are intimately related. Roman coinage had been notable for its diversity and multiplicity of types since the late second century BC and it is probably no coincidence that the diversity of civic types in Asia increases after the denarius had become an established part of the monetary system of the province. Moreover, some of the new types were derived directly from Roman models. Depictions of buildings and temples were a common feature of pre-imperial Roman coinage, but were entirely absent from Greek civic coinages until the early imperial period. Burnett argued that the concept of depicting buildings on coins was mediated through the imperial cult, since the earliest depictions of buildings were generally confined to temples of the imperial cult. Other civic coin types were adopted directly from known Roman coin or medallion types. Unsurprisingly such adaptations were largely confined to the imperial image. For example a Phokaian type is known depicting Faustina II holding two male twins (her sons and imperial heirs Commodus and Aurelius Fulvus), surrounded by four female figures representing her daughters.  

783 Klose (2005), 125-135 and Weisser (2005), 141.  
784 For a discussion of the importance of the denarius in Asia in the mid first century BC see Kinns (1987), 112.  
786 For the Faustina types see RIC III: 347 nos. 1673-7 (Plate XLIV. 3) and Heuchert 1276. All examples are derived from Heuchert (2005), 53.
However, the number of civic reverse types based closely on imperial prototypes is very small in proportion to the total output of civic reverse types. Civic iconography continued to focus on the cultural and religious identity of the relevant city. Roman influence was usually felt only indirectly in this sphere. It was contact with the Roman practice of frequently changing types that encouraged the civic elites of Asia to expand the thematic diversity of their coin iconography. The civic elites then exploited the opportunities this afforded to express their own ideological priorities and agendas. Even the imperial image was not immune from this process. The Emperor was frequently co-opted into the civic sphere. Typically this was achieved by depicting the Emperor greeting or worshiping one of the primary civic deities or making a formal entry into the city on horseback (the *adventus*). In this way the image of the Emperor became a badge of civic prestige. The city asserted its own importance as a religious and political centre by means of its alleged good relations with the dominant political authority. Similarly, Burnett has argued that buildings on provincial coins could function differently to those on the coinage of Rome and the Western Mediterranean. In the Roman tradition the depiction of the building tended to commemorate the act of dedication or restoration of the building by the moneyer, or one of his ancestors (later the Emperor). In the East the pattern of the depiction of buildings appears to have been quite different. On occasion it is possible that coins were employed to record the act of dedication or restoration, or even the grant of a

---

787 The proportion of such types could vary in light of the political context. Heuchert calculated that the image of Lucius Verus and Marcus Aurelius clasping hands occurs at least once at 15% of the Greek cities minting coinage during their joint reign: Heuchert (2005), 53-4. However, joint imperial rule was unprecedented and the desire to depict this situation was atypical.
788 For a detailed discussion of the representations of the imperial image on civic coinage see Harl (1987), 38-70.
790 For example a fine series of sestertii depicting a artificial harbour surrounding several ships was produced in the reign of Nero commemorating the completion of the harbour complex at Portus: *RIC* I 88-104.
However, in many cases the constant repetition and reproduction of specific images is too generic to be explained in these terms. In such circumstances it is probable that such images had been co-opted as badges of civic prestige. For example, the three neokorate temples type of Smyrna was in use for a sustained period between AD 212-268. The constant reproduction of this image throughout this time served to emphasise Smyrna’s exalted status within the hierarchy of Asian cities and the extent of imperial favour it enjoyed.

These processes simultaneously produced two contradictory phenomena. Some coin types became more specific. Inter-city competition drove various cities to produce elaborate types emphasising their unique claims to mythological and historical significance. The Phrygian city of Apameia is famous for producing coinage claiming two important myth-historical events. The first of these depicts Athena’s discovery of the reed pipe, which according to local tradition occurred on the banks of Lake Aulutrene in the territory of Apameia. However, another famous type of this mint depicted two scenes from the narrative of Noah. The first shows Noah and his wife standing in a box structure riding the waves. Above the ark are two birds, one of which grasps an olive branch in its beak symbolising the end of the inundation. The next scene depicts the disembarked couple standing on the ground and raising their arms in the orans gesture of prayer. The identity of

---

791 The city of Hierapolis (in the conventus of Kibyra) received neokorate status under Elagabalus. Burrell type 2 (Plate XLVIII. 1), produced at this time, depicted a hexastyle temple, the pediment of which was decorated with a bust with a crescent at the shoulders. Inside the temple stood a statue of the Emperor in military dress holding a patera over an altar. The contemporary Burrell type 3 displayed the same statue inside a two-column temple shown in three quarter view: Burrell (2004), 136.
792 Howgego (2005), 4.
793 Klose (1987), 108.
794 For example BMC Phrygia 164 (Septimius Severus: Plate XLIX. 5).
the male figure is confirmed by the addition of the label ΝΩ. This type has attracted significant scholarly attention on account of the Judaeo-Christian origin of the motif, although for our purposes it is sufficient merely to emphasise that Apameia was invoking this image as part of a wider claim to prestige through mythological antiquity. Such claims were often also mediated through the depiction of civic foundation myths and founders. Such foundation motifs were predominantly a feature of the second and third centuries AD, although some examples from the early Flavian period are attested. In the second century the Phrygian city of Synnada claimed decent from both Athens and Sparta via the heroes Akamas, the son of Theseos, and Thynnna, who were proudly depicted on the city’s coinage. Similar motifs were employed in other regions of Asia Minor. The city of Laranda in Lykaonia depicted the image of a wolf carrying a human hand in its fangs, a reference to Lykaon, the Arkadian founder of the race. According to legend Lykaon following the oracle of Apollo founded his city in the place where he saw this rather gruesome sight. This new repertoire of complex coin images required greater artistic imagination. Coinage from pre- and early-imperial western Asia Minor was emblazoned with static compositions depicting civic deities and their attributes. However, complex mythological scenes required the creation of a sense of movement and dynamism. For example at Abydos Leandros was depicted swimming across the Hellespont and the Noah

---

795 The coins themselves may be divided into six issues under six different emperors: Septimius Severus (AD 193-211) Madden (1866), 198; Macrinus (AD 217-18) Madden (1866), 198; Wadd. 5723; Severus Alexander (AD 222-35) SNG Aul 3506 (cf. Wadd. 5730); Gordian III (AD 238-44) RPC VII 701; Philip the Arab (AD 244-9): SNG Glasgow 2030; BMC Phrygia, 101, 182; Wadd 5731; SNG Aul 3510 (Plate XLIX. 3) and 8348; Trebonianus Gallus (AD 251-3) SNG Aul 3513 (note that the image on this issue is reversed: Plate XLIX. 4): Thonemann (Thesis), 62-3.
796 Heuchert (2005), 51-2; for further discussion of the significance of civic founders on coins see Weiss (1984), 179-208.
798 For the foundation legend of Larande see Weiss’ analysis of Eustathios’ commentary on Dionysios Periegetes 857: Weiss (1990), 222-3.
coins of Apameia created a sense of narrative by juxtaposing scenes from two different points in the story.\textsuperscript{799} The workshop system may have played a role in this process by widening access to the most skilled and creative die-engravers.

Conversely some types also became more generic. Common deities represented in standardised poses became a common feature of coin types across the eastern Mediterranean. The popularity of generic reverse types grew exponentially in the second century AD. Heuchert’s analysis of the frequency of generic coin types from Asia found that the standing Asklepios type was found at just one mint during the Julio-Claudian period and seven during the Flavian period, but is attested at one hundred and ten mints (out of a total of 371) during the Antonine period. The popularity of this deity cannot wholly be explained in terms of the Antonine plague. The process was already underway in the reign of Antoninus Pius and other popular reverse types show similar rates of growth. Heuchert has convincingly interpreted this phenomenon in terms of the degree of religious and cultural homogeneity between the Greek speaking cities of the eastern Roman Empire.\textsuperscript{800}

This homogeneity reflected the increasingly international outlook of the local elites. These elites were no longer predominantly confined to operating within a specific civic context, but could now interact on a regional scale. Intellectual and religious pursuits were popular means for the elite to widen their social horizons while also demonstrating their philhellenism. The famous sophist Polemon, whose coinage will be discussed in

\textsuperscript{799} Heuchert (2005), 55.
\textsuperscript{800} The seated Kybele type is attested at five mints from 44 BC–AD 69, eleven from AD 69-96 and fifty-seven from AD 138-192. The reclining river god goes from one mint in \textit{RPC} I, to six in \textit{RPC} II, to one hundred and fifteen during the Antonine period. The standing Tyche type was more common in the Julio-Claudian (19) and Flavian (16) periods, but its popularity still increases massively in the Antonine age (163). Other common types displayed distinctively regional distribution patterns. The types depicting the Anatolian deity Men were characteristic of the cities of Phrygia and Karia, reflecting the importance of this cult in these areas: Heuchert (2005), 49.
greater detail later in the chapter, relocated to Smyrna in order to pursue his sophistic career, although he was careful to maintain ties with his homeland Laodikeia. His sophistic reputation and the extent of his favour with Hadrian also permitted Polemon to act on a Pan-Hellenic level and he was accorded the honour performing the oration at the sacrifices celebrating the completion of the Temple of Olympian Zeus at Athens. Polemon’s son Attalos continued to be resident at Smyrna, but dedicated a coinage to his two fatherlands, Smyrna and Laodikeia on the Lykos: Ἀτταλὸς σοφιστής ταῖς πατρίσι Σμύρ Λαο (‘Attalos (the) sophist to his fatherlands Smyr[na and] Lao[di(e)ia]). Moreover he married a native of Phokaia. Other eponyms also operated within Pan-Hellenic elite cultural networks. The eponym M. Oulpios Appouleios Eurykles served as Aizanoi’s representative at the Panhellenion in Athens, ultimately achieving the position of archon. Later he was appointed as the curator (logistes) of the gerousia of Ephesos c. AD 162/3 by the proconsul. In addition to this Eurykles twice served as high priest of the koinon of Asia, the first of which is mentioned on his coinage. Polemon and Eurykles represent extreme examples of cosmopolitan success. Only a minority of eponyms reached the office of asiarches or attained high-office at the Panhellenion.

---

801 He apparently visited his ancestral estates transported in a silver bridled Phrygian or Galatian chariot accompanied by a full retinue of slaves, hunting dogs and pack animals (Philostrophos VS 532): Thonemann (Thesis), 146-8. For a recent discussion of the career of Polemon see Quet (2003), 401-443.
802 Philostrophos VS 533.
803 Heuchert 1366-1372.
804 Attalos married Kallisto the daughter of Rouphinianos and celebrated his new connection with Phokaia with the dedication of a coinage (Heuchert 1271-1276): Thonemann (Thesis), 149.
805 The career of Eurykles is illuminated by a series of letters. Originally there were five such letters, although only three of these texts survive having been set up in his homeland: OGIS 504-7, Spawforth and Walker (1985), 89.
806 I.Ephesos I 25.
807 For a more detailed discussion of the career of Eurykles see Spawforth and Walker (1985), 89-90; Kearsley (1987) 49-56; Robert (1971), 519; Reynolds (1982), 185-9; Levick and Mitchell MAMA IX p. 14 and no. 31. For the dedicatory inscription of an equine statue of Eurykles at Aizanoi to mark his first term as asiarches see IGR IV 564. For the publication of more recent epigraphic discoveries at Aizanoi relating to Eurykles see Wörle (1992), 336-376.
However, they serve as examples to illustrate the significant shift in the nature and scale of the cultural aspirations harboured by the elite strata of civic society.

**Portable Monuments**

The overall effect of the prevalence and diversity of civic coin iconography was, as Weiss has emphasised, equivalent to each citizen carrying a miniature gallery of civic images within their ‘purse’.\(^{808}\) Weiss’ concept of coin types as acting as galleries of civic images is perhaps most clearly visible in the portrait types of Mytilene. At this city significant civic benefactors and prominent citizens were honoured with obverse portraits on coins, one of the very few examples of this practice from Asia.\(^{809}\) The first of these were produced in the name of Theophanes and Archidamis. The obverse type depicts a bare male head surrounded by the legend: ΘΕΟΣ ΘΕΟΦΑΝΗΣ ΜΥΤΙ; while the reverse type shows a veiled female bust encompassed by the legend: ΘΕΑ ΑΡΧΙΔΑΜΙΣ.\(^{810}\) The name of Archidamis is otherwise unattested, but since her name appears on the reverse type of the Theophanes issue with an equivalent title, it is generally assumed that she was the wife of the great historian. The divine honours accorded to the couple indicate that the issue was

---

\(^{808}\) Weiss (2004), 85-86.

\(^{809}\) Portrait types depicting famous citizens were not unusual on the Roman provincial coinage of Asia and elsewhere in Asia Minor. Such types usually depicted famous philosophers and poets from the distant past. The poets Sappho and Alkaios and the lawgiver Pittakos are attested on the Antonine coinage of Mytilene, whom were all active during the sixth century BC. The Kilikian city of Pompeiopolis even produced a double portrait type depicting the stoic philosopher Chrysippus on the obverse and poet and astronomer Aratos on the reverse: Imhoof-Blumer (1898b), 167-8. The most notable of these figures is Homer, whose prestige is reflected in the fact that he appears on the coinages of eight cities: Ios (Achaia), Magnesia on the Maiandros (Asia), Synnada (Asia), Aigion (Achaia), Tralleis (Asia), Aizanoi (Asia). Heuchert has provided the most recent discussion of the Homer types and the number and location of prominent citizens appearing on coinage in general: Heuchert (2005), 52. Very occasionally more contemporary figures were also honoured. In the Antonine period Kos produced types honouring one of its most famous sons: the doctor Klaudios Xenophon, the physician of Claudius (*BMC* Karia 212-16, Heuchert 1972: Plate XXVIII. 3); Bürchner (1882), 125-6. The Xenophon type was produced less than 200 years after the subject’s death. In addition there are the two unidentified portrait heads from the late first century BC from Laodikeia on the Lykos: see pages 109-109. However, in general this practice was rare outside of Mytilene.

\(^{810}\) *RPC* I 2342 (Plate III.1).
posthumous, produced sometime between his death (between c. 44-36 BC) and AD 33, when the descendents of Theophanes were executed by imperial order.\(^\text{811}\) The depiction of contemporary civic benefactors on local coinages is highly unusual and the explanation for this phenomenon should be sought in the extraordinary prominence and influence attained by Theophanes in his lifetime. Plutarch records that Theophanes was able to obtain freedom for his city through his influence over Pompey the great.\(^\text{812}\) The epigraphic evidence from Mytilene itself records the honours and titles accorded to Theophanes for his services to the city. Amongst these was a statue group commemorating Pompey, Theophanes and Potamon (the other leading intellectual of late first-century BC Mytilene). The honorific inscription accompanying the statue of Theophanes describes him as saviour, benefactor and second founder of the fatherland.\(^\text{813}\) Moreover, the opening three lines of the text (\(\Theta\)\(\epsilon\)\(\omega\) \(\Delta\)[\(\iota\)\] \(\epsilon\)\(\lambda\)\(\varepsilon\)\(\theta\)\(\iota\)\(\omega\) \(\phi\)\(\lambda\)\(\omega\)\(\pi\)\(\alpha\)\(\tau\)\(\iota\)\(\delta\)\(\iota\)\| \(\Theta\)\(\epsilon\)\(\omega\)\(\phi\)\(\alpha\)\(ν\)\(η\)) emphasise both the posthumous divine honours accorded to Theophanes and his role in securing freedom for Mytilene.\(^\text{814}\) In this context, the commemoration of this individual on the coinage becomes explicable. The great prestige and achievements of Theophanes were such that he was able to transcend the permeable barrier between human and divine benefaction and become the recipient of divine honours. It was therefore appropriate to depict such a potent symbol of civic prestige on the coinage. Furthermore, it should be noted that the legend of the issue places considerable emphasis on the divine nature of both Theophanes and Archidamis. Since local deities had long been a feature of Greek coin iconography, Theophanes’ divine

\(^\text{811}\) Salzmann (1985), 252, Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 396: for the purging of Theophanes’ descendents see Tac \textit{Ann.} VI. 18. \\
\(^\text{812}\) Plutarch, \textit{Pompey} 42. \\
\(^\text{813}\) \textit{IG XII} 163 b. \\
\(^\text{814}\) Labarre (1996), 93.
honours probably played a significant role in facilitating the adoption of the image of Theophanes in this context.

The precedent set by the Theophanes issue had a profound effect on the coinage of Mytilene. From this period until the reign of Septimius Severus, a number of other civic benefactors were also depicted on the coinage. An issue assigned by *RPC* I to the Flavian period followed closely the precedent set by the Theophanes issue. The obverse type depicts a bareheaded clean-shaven male and the reverse type portrays a female bust. The obverse and reverse legends read ΣΕΞΤΟΣ ΝΕΟΣ ΜΑΚΑΡ and ΑΝΔΡΟΜΕΔΑ ΝΕΑ ΛΕΣΒΩ respectively.815 In the early second century AD the Dada/Pankratides issues elaborated the basic formula of juxtaposed male and female obverse and reverse busts. These honorific issues retained the obverse portrait type, either a female head (resembling Matidia) with the legend ΔΑΔΑ ΜΥΤΙ or a youthful male head with the legend ΠΑΝΚΡΑΤΙΔΗΣ, but the reverse types depicted in full whoever was omitted on the obverse.816 The reverse types of Pankratides depicted a naked male youth with either his right hand resting on a serpent entwined column or a standing before a snake with his right

815 *RPC* II 914 (Plate III. 2): the authors of *RPC* II date this issue to the Flavian period on the grounds that Andromeda’s hairstyle and appearance is similar to that of Iulia: Burnett, Amandry and Carradice (1999), 143. A Sextos also appears on the coinage of the Antonine period. However, the later Sextos is depicted bearded and thus it is unlikely that *RPC* II 914 formed part of the same issue. Wroth established the correct interpretation of the legend. This type refers to the legendary Lesbian King Makar and his wife Lesbos. Thus Andromeda and Sextos are honoured as latter-day founding figures of the community: Wroth (1902), no. 28, 334-5.

816 Pankratides is thus far unattested in the epigraphic record. The name Dada daughter of Dies does appear in the inscriptions of Mytilene. Hodot produced a stemma for the family, in which he argued that Dada was the wife of Lesbonax, the son of the rhetor Potamon: Hodot (1976), 27-8. For the compelling arguments against Hodot’s hypothesis and in favour of the identification of Dada with the wife of Lesbonax, the father of Potamon, see Parker (1991), 125-8 cf. Labarre (1996), 146-7. Parker further argues that the Dada of the coins should be identified with the Dada daughter of Dies: Parker (1991), 125. However, since Dada is so closely associated with Pankratides on the coinage, it is probable that he was a close relative, possibly a husband or son. None of the inscriptions of Dada make any reference to a Pankratides, even though we know the identity of her husband and at least one son. It remains possible that the Dada on coinage may be synonymous with the Klaudia Da[da] mentioned in *IG* XII 228, whom Parker tentatively identifies as the daughter of Klaudios Diaphernes, the son of Potamon: Parker (1991), 124-5.
hand lowered, resting his left elbow on a column covered by a *chlamys*.\textsuperscript{817} The Dada reverse type portrays a standing female figure wearing a *chiton* holding a short staff in her right hand.\textsuperscript{818}

This phenomenon continued to develop into the Antonine period, when this practice reached its apogee; as many as seven individuals were honoured with portrait types at this time (Phlabia Nikomachis, Ioulia Prokla, Deinomachos, Sextos, Nausikaa, Lesbonax the philosopher, Lesbonax ‘new hero’). Wroth has argued convincingly that the Phlabia Nikomachis should be identified with the benefactress and foundress Phl. Pouplikia Nikomachis, who is attested on a second century AD inscription from Mytilene.\textsuperscript{819} The same inscription records that Phlabia Nikomachis was the daughter of Dinnomachos and Prokla.\textsuperscript{820} Wroth suggested that this Prokla is synonymous with the Ioulia Prokla also celebrated on several portrait types. Moreover, since the publication of Wroth’s article a further portrait type celebrating Deinomachos has emerged.\textsuperscript{821} The similar nomenclature suggests that Deinomachos should be identified with the Dinnomachos, who is attested epigraphically as the father of Nikomachis.\textsuperscript{822} The portrait of the ‘hero’ Sextos is found in conjunction with that of Nikomachis, indicating some degree of association, possibly matrimonial, between the two notables.\textsuperscript{823} The depiction of local notables on the coinage of Mytilene is so common in this period that the reference to Nausikaa (\textit{ΝΑΥΣΙΚΑΑ ΗΡΩΙΔΑ}) is more likely to refer to a distinguished lady of

\textsuperscript{817} \textit{BMC} Lesbos 161-2 (Plate III. 4-5).

\textsuperscript{818} \textit{BMC} Lesbos 163 (Plate III. 7).

\textsuperscript{819} Heuchert 772 (Plate VI. 6) and 776 (Plate IV. 10): Ephemeris epigraphica ii p7 no. 1, \textit{IG} XII. 2 240.

\textsuperscript{820} Heuchert 766-9 (Plate IV. 1-3).

\textsuperscript{821} Wroth (1894), 226-7, Heuchert 752 (Plate III. 6).

\textsuperscript{822} Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 1036.

\textsuperscript{823} Wroth (1894), 226-7 cf. Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 228.
Mytilene than the legendary daughter of Alkinous. In addition two further portrait types from this period depicting the bearded Lesbonax the philosopher (ΛΕΣΒΩΝΑΚΤΑ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΟΝ) and the youthful ‘new hero’ Lesbonax (ΛΕΞΒΩΝΑΞ ΗΡΟΣ ΝΕΟΣ) are known. The differences in the portrait types indicate that we are dealing with separate honours for two distinct homonymous individuals. The portrait of the philosopher is draped and bearded, while that of the ‘new hero’ is youthful, clean-shaven and crowned with the ivy wreath of Dionysos. It is generally assumed that one of these types represents Lesbonax, the father of the influential intellectual Potamon and a substantial thinker in his own right. The identity of the second ‘new hero’ Lesbonax is not so obvious. However, Parker’s suggestion that we identify the ‘new hero’ with the second century AD Lesbonax of Mytilene mentioned in the Lucianic de Saltatone (69) is plausible.

The final examples of honorific portrait types from Mytilene occur in the early Severan period and it is perhaps fitting that a obverse portrait bust of Theophanes, paired with a reverse type of Artemis riding a deer, is among the last examples of this phenomenon. In addition Wroth records a specimen from the British Museum collection dating to roughly the same period. The obverse legend is not fully legible ([E?]ΠΙΛΑΕ); however, the youthful male bust obverse type indicates that we probably dealing with another honorific portrait bust. The reverse type bears the legend ΛΕΥΚΙΠΠΟΣ ΜΥΤΙ and depicts a male figure standing in a himation.

824 Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 228.
825 Heuchert 771, 774-775 (Plate IV. 5, 8-9).
826 Parker (1991), 126.
827 Parker (1991), 126.
829 BMC Lesbos 176 (Plate III. 3): since the obverse legend is obscured, it is not possible to ascertain the identity of the male bust. The reverse type may depict the Leukippos mentioned in the legend. The identity of this Leukippos is obscure. Wroth suggested that Leukippos could refer to the Leukippos recorded as accompanying Makareus’ colonisation of Rhodes from Lesbos by Diodoros Siculus (V. 81). Alternatively
Why should Mytilene choose to commemorate its most illustrious citizens in this way? The precedent set by the Theophanes portrait types was certainly a significant factor. It established the acceptability of such portraits as subjects for coin iconography. The Theophanes issue also appears to have influenced the form of many of the later honorific types. Unfortunately in most instances we lack the detailed prosopographical information, which has contributed so much to our understanding of the nature and context of the Theophanes issues. Phlabia Nikomachis was the subject of an honorific inscription. Yet this text provides only the briefest biographical details. We know that Nikomachis held the titles of ‘benefactress’ and ‘foundress of the city’ and was made prytanis for life, but this inscription reveals no more details about her or her family, except that she was the descendent of benefactors. However, it is irrefutable that Nikomachis and her family received this honour in connection to her services for the city; just as Theophanes’ many services for the city were rewarded with the title ‘second founder’.830

Thus we may conclude that the precedent established by Theophanes led the city to honour important civic benefactors, particularly those granted the status of civic ‘founder’, with coin portraits. The local coinage acted as portrait gallery of local notables exhorting others to display similar levels of civic generosity. In this way the coin portraits of Mytilene fulfilled the same function as the more familiar honorific inscriptions and sculptures. A statue group erected in Perge in Pamphylia during the Hadrianic period depicting civic founders both ancient and modern provides a direct sculptural parallel to

---

Wroth tentatively suggested that Leukippos may be identified with the famous fifth century atomist philosopher, although there is no known connection between this man and Lesbos: BMC Lesbos lxxv. Thus Leukippos probably either refers to the associate of Makareus or an otherwise unattested local notable.

830 IG XII. 2 163 b. 5.
the portrait types of Mytilene.\textsuperscript{831} Seven inscriptions record the names, patronymics and ethnics of mythical founders, all honoured with the title \textit{ktistes}.\textsuperscript{832} However, in addition to celebrating the mythological antecedents of the city, the other half of the statue group depicted the Plankioi, a local extended elite family of senatorial status and prominent civic benefactors.\textsuperscript{833} The names of [M]. Plankios Ouaros and G. Plankios Ouaros are accorded the title of \textit{ktistes} on the extant statue bases.\textsuperscript{834} The importance of the Plankioi to the continuation of civic prosperity through their benefactions was presented in terms of equivalence with the mythological progenitors of the civic community. The same ideological link between generous civic benefaction and foundation provided the impetus for the production of the portrait types of Mytilene. Moreover, the familial emphasis of the Perge statue group also has parallels in the close kinship ties displayed by many of the subjects of the Antonine portrait types. Nikomachis was daughter of Prokla and Dinnomachos. It has also been plausibly suggested that Sextos was the husband of Nikomachis.\textsuperscript{835} Therefore these coins, in much the same way as many honorific inscriptions and familial portrait groups, stressed the continuation of the familial tradition of benefaction.

The emphasis on foundation was supplemented by the frequent appearance of heroic symbols, indicating that such portraits may have often been produced

\textsuperscript{831} The contrast between ancient and modern founders is also present on the Antonine coinage of Mytilene, where leading literary and poetic figures of the archaic age were depicted: Alkaios, Pittakos and Sappho: Heuchert (2005), 52.

\textsuperscript{832} \textit{I.Perge} 101 (Kalchas), 102 (Labos), 103 (Leonteus), 104 (Machaon), 105 (Minyas), 106 (Mopsos), 107 (Rhixos): for an extended discussion of the history of these founders see Weiss (1984), 182.

\textsuperscript{833} For a discussion and hypothetical reconstruction of the monument see \textit{I.Perge} p. 141-44. Further prosopographical information on the Plankioi is provided by Jameson (1968), 54-8, Mitchell (1974), 27-39, and Şahin (1996), 107-167.

\textsuperscript{834} \textit{I.Perge} 108-9.

\textsuperscript{835} The fact the portrait of Nikomachos is juxtaposed with that of Sextos adds considerable strength to this supposition: Wroth (1894), 226-7
The heroic portrait types placed their subjects in the context of the continuum of Mytilene’s mythological and religious history. Many of these figures were not represented as ordinary citizens or even as founders, but new heroes, whose contribution to the city was comparable to the ancient figures of the city’s distant past. The coin legend of Nausikaa accords heroic status to her (ΝΑΥΣΙΚΑΑ ἩΡΩΙΔΑ). Lesbonax is accorded the title ‘new hero’ and his portrait is adorned with the ivy crown, a divine attribute of Dionysos. Furthermore, the Pankratides reverse types incorporate heroic attributes. In particular a snake is depicted either entwined around a column or before the youthful figure of Pankratides. The snake had long been established as an attribute of heroic status in sculpture. Therefore in this context, where heroic references were so common, the snake probably refers to heroic status, rather than to Asklepios. In the case of Sextos and Andromeda, two local notables were overtly styled as the modern counterparts of ancient heroic founders of the city, in much the same way that the Plankioi of Perge were equated with the heroic founders of their own city. Theophanes and Archidamis are explicitly described as divine. The application of heroic titles in this context is consistent with the developments in honorific and funerary inscriptions. By this period public hero cults had became another form of civic honour bestowed on euergetai in

836 It is the position of Price that the vast majority of such honours were posthumous: Price (1984a), 35 n. 48. However, others have argued that modern scholarship has underestimated the extent to which this title was applied to the living: Hughes (1999), 172 and Sherwin-White (1978), 366-367.
837 For a discussion of the depiction of mythological founders on coinage see Weiss (1984), 182-187.
838 Hallet (2005), 31, 32-33; Barr (1996), 136-7; Salapata (1993), 194.
839 For an example of the snake and column motif in the heroised funerary iconography of Hellenistic Smyrna see Schmidt (1991), no. 16 (1st century BC).
840 Similarly IG XII.2 235 from Mytilene accords Markos Pompeios Makreinos the title of ‘new Theophanes’, once again associating a modern benefactor with the civic heroes of the past: Shields (1917), 91-2. For the stemma of Makreinos see Labarre (1996), 153.
recognition of their service and love of the state. At Thyateira the heros euergetes Ioulios Xenon was honoured with the Xenoneon by the demos in recognition of the services he performed, not only for his fatherland, but for all Asia. In addition Xenon is accorded titles emphasising his beneficence: soter, euergetes, ktistes and pater patridos.

Several public hero cults are attested in the epigraphic record of Mytilene. Thus the heroic titulature and imagery displayed on the coinage served to emphasise further the extreme beneficence of their subjects by placing it in the context of the great figures of the civic past, at a time in which interest in such figures was on the rise.

In addition to the name of the individual honoured with a portrait types, some of the reverse types of these issues were adorned with the name of an ancillary eponym. The eponym Apolloni(os) is attested on the reverse legend of the Prokla coins, while Hieroitas occurs on types of Lesbonax the philosopher and Nausikaa. This and the fact that at least some of the portrait types are likely to have been posthumous indicate that in some cases the subject of the portrait was not responsible for the actual production of the type. In other instances the absence of overt heroic symbols indicates that the coin types could have been contemporary with the life of benefactor. Therefore the possibility that the subject of the portrait type was responsible for the issue him or herself cannot be dismissed. For example,

---

841 For a discussion of whether such titles referred to full cult honours or were simply employed as an honorific title see Sherwin-White (1978), 366-367.
842 TAM V. 2 1098: Hughes (1999), 172: for an example of a public hero cult to Gaios Ioulios Eurykles Heraklanos at Sparta AD 136/7 see Spawforth (1978), 250-1.
843 Six men are honoured by the demos in a series of sepulchral inscriptions possibly belonging to a public monument from the south of the city, four of which make reference to heroic status: Leukios Antonios Kapiton (IG XII. 2 289, Labarre (1996), 134), Kallikles (IG XII. 2 290), Matrokles (IG XII 2 291), Stratippos (IG XII 2 292): Shields (1917), 93. Kludia Dada is accorded heroic status in IG XII. 2 228. IG also records a first or second century AD altar decorated with the serpent motif dedicated to the hero Aristandros Kleoteimos by the demos: IG XII.2 286). In addition to such publically recognised hero cults, private grave monuments also display heroic pretensions: IG XII. 2 259, 367, 414 and 436.
844 For a discussion of renewed civic interest in antique hero cults in the period from the first century BC to the second century AD see Hughes (1999), 173-4.
845 Heuchert 766-771 (Plate IV. 1-5).
the Nikomachis types neither allude to heroic status nor record the name of an eponym. Such types may even have been produced by the figure honoured on the coinage or a close relative. Whoever was ultimately responsible for the choice and production of these types, the ideological assumptions underpinning the iconography are clear. Those so honoured had been elevated by means of their civic generosity to founder or heroic status, and on account of this distinction they were immortalised on the civic coinage. The citizen population would see their images as they conducted their everyday commercial activity, just as if their image had been erected in stone in the agora.

Thus the coin portraits of Mytilene reflected the honours paid to civic benefactors in other media, but the extension of this practice to coinage was a phenomenon largely confined to Mytilene. One of the very few parallel examples is that of Klaudios Xenophon at Kos from the Antonine period. Xenophon was imperial physician to Claudius, whose favour he exploited to win freedom for his homeland. However, the depiction of relatively recently deceased private individuals was not a common feature of provincial coinage. The reluctance to strike portraits of contemporary notables may have been a product of long established cultural traditions. Coin portraiture had traditionally been the preserve of Hellenistic royalty and this practice continued for the imperial house. In the late first century BC and early first century AD some of the cities of Asia Minor had adorned their coinage with the portrait of the proconsul. However, this practice was confined to a limited number of cities and soon went into terminal decline. The last known instance of a proconsular portrait on coinage from Asia occurs at Kibyra c. AD 15/16.

---

846 Heuchert 1972: for a discussion of the date of this type see Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 667 and Bürchner (1882), 125-6.
847 L. Arruntius *RPC* I 2887 (Laodikeia), although the phenomenon is attested as late as AD 49-54 in Galatia: Annius Afrinus at Ikonion (*RPC* I 3543).
Coin portraiture came to be seen as an imperial monopoly and therefore it may have been considered inappropriate to honour contemporary non-imperial figures in this way. Only at Mytilene, thanks primarily due to the precedent set by the Theophanes issue, was this reluctance overcome.

The Context of Coin Production

The case of Mytilene is an extreme manifestation of the wider changes occurring in coin iconography during the Roman imperial period. Coin types were put to new uses. Civic identity was depicted on coinage in newer and ever more complex ways. Thus far the reasons for these changes were sought in the shifting attitudes of the local elites, whose appreciation of the potential of coin iconography was stimulated by contact with Roman imperial coinage. However, functional factors also may have served to facilitate this development. Why did the cities of Roman Asia actually strike coins? There is no one single answer to this question and it is probable that several factors lay behind the decision to mint.848 The necessity to provide small change for local markets was clearly very important, but by no means the only factor in this process. In some cases the desire to produce cash to be formally distributed amongst the citizen body or at least part of the citizen body was a further motivating factor. Such distributions are frequently attested in the epigraphic record.849 In practice, however, it is often very difficult to associate particular issues of coinage with specific instances of cash distributions. Moreover many

848 For a discussion of these factors see Howgego (1985), 83-94.
849 The number of inscriptions describing distributions of cash is too vast for this subject to be dealt with in any detail here. However, it is worth citing a few examples of this practice. I.Magnesia 179 from AD 7 records that Apollonios made a distribution of cash to celebrate the erection of a statue in his honour. Another occasion frequently associated with a cash distribution was appointment to a prestigious priesthood. The prophets of Didyma L. Aphidianos Kallikrates is attested as making a distribution to the council and all the citizens: I.Didyma 254 (AD 130-8).
distributions were structured in the form of an annual lottery, financed by the interest from a sum of money specifically invested. In such cases it is unlikely that new coinage was specially produced. The extant epigraphic and numismatic evidence relating to such cash distributions is discussed in the following two sections.

**Distributions and Local Coinage: the Epigraphic Record**

In spite of the frequent references to distributions in the epigraphic record, it is difficult to connect particular instances with individuals named on civic coinage. Very few of the inscriptions mentioning coin eponyms make any reference to cash distributions. At Thyateira Laibianos Kallistratou is recorded as having made donations of cash to the city and **boule**. The same individual was probably also responsible for an issue of coinage, although the text is too vague to determine whether Laibianos’ own bronze coinage was used for this purpose. The most compelling epigraphic evidence for the participation of coin a eponym in a distribution is provided by the case of Klaudios Aristeas of Karian Stratonikeia c. AD 198-209. This man signed a series of types predominantly depicting Hekate and Zeus Panamaros, the deities associated with the important extramural sanctuaries of Lagina and Panamara. A Tiberios Klaudios Aristeas Menandros is

---

850 *LApH* 2007 1. 179 records that Markos Aurelios Zenas was honoured for dedicating the sum of 250 denarii to finance an annual lottery. In addition *LApH* 2007 12.534 records the dedication of 2370 denarii to the most sacred **boule** by Aurelia Ammia for the institution of a lottery: Dmitriev (2005), 133. The most complete discussion of such foundations in Asia Minor is found in Laum’s two volume work on financial foundations: Laum (1914).

851 TAM V 982, 983.

852 See page 147.

853 Zeus Panamaros is depicted riding before an altar carrying a sceptre over his shoulder: SNG Aul 2664. Hekate is presented standing face on holding a torch and **phiale** in each hand, while at her feet stands a deer: SNG Aul 2665, 2667, SNG Cop 502 and Wadd 2577. Perhaps the most interesting type portrays a man in a **chiton** and **chlamys** standing on a garlanded platform about to despatch a humped cow with a dagger, behind him a bare tree was depicted: SNG Aul 2666. The final type associated with Aristeas showed Artemis
attested along with his wife Ailia Glykinna in an inscription detailing their tenure as priest and priestess of Hekate. In the course of their priestly office, having already entertained the entire city with a feast, Aristeas and Glykinna gave a donation of two denarii to each of the citizens assembled in the theatre, each deme having been called (to receive their dianome) by means of boards (τὴν τε πόλιν ἱστίασαν πᾶσαν καὶ ἐδωκαν διανομῆς ἑκάστῳ τῶν πολίτων ἀνὰ δηνάρια δύο ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ, ἐκαστὸν δήμον ἐκ τῶν δέλτων καλέσαντες). It is generally accepted that the eponym and the priest are the same man. Therefore, Harl is convinced that the extant bronze coins were produced for distribution at this event. If this interpretation is correct then each citizen present in the theatre received the equivalent of 32 assaria. Based on the weight and diameter of the published pieces, it is probable that each of the coins signed by Aristeas had a value of either 4 or 6 assaria. Thus it is possible that the two denarii denoted by Aristeas and his wife were presented in the form of locally produced bronze coins signed by the eponym himself. However, there is nothing in the wording of the Aristeas inscription that rules out the possibility that the donation, at least in part, took the form of silver coins and thus the bronze coins and the distribution

---

Ephesia standing facing, flanked by two stags, while a star and crescent moon surround her head: SNG Aul 2670 and Wadd 2578(Plate XXIX. 4-5, 7, XXX. 3, XXXII. 2).

854 I.Stratonikeia 701.
855 Şahin (1982), 86, Harl (1996), 266.
856 Harl’s full findings and detailed examination of the Roman period coinage of Stratonikeia are as yet unpublished, but his preliminary interpretation of the Aristeas issue is set out in a number of books and articles: Harl (1987), 28; (1996), 266 and (1997), 228.
857 In his article of 1997 Harl mentions that he considers the Aristeas issue to be composed of 6 assaria pieces: Harl (1997), 228. This valuation is plausible for the larger heavier pieces signed by Aristeas weighing c. 31g (e.g. SNG Aul 2665 and SNG Cop 502). However, SNG Aul also records pieces c. 24-5g in weight (e.g. SNG Aul 2670). This weight standard accords well with Johnston’s recent study of the third century AD denominational systems in use in Asia Minor. She found that c. AD 200 the most common denomination was a 4 assaria piece equivalent to the Roman sestertius weighing approximately 25g: Johnston (2007), 236. Thus the lighter pieces of Aristeas should probably be seen as equal to 4 assaria.

251
could be entirely unrelated; not even Harl is of the opinion that the entire issue of Aristeas was consumed by the distribution. 858

Not only are direct references to the distribution of cash by known eponyms rare, but in general there are few cases in the epigraphic record in which we can be certain that bronze coins formed part of the sum to be distributed. 859 Our best evidence for the formal distribution of bronze coins comes from the religious foundation established by Gaios Ouibios Salutaris at Ephesos in AD 104. Amongst the other numerous provisions of this benefaction the interest of Salutaris’ endowment of 20,000 denarii was set aside to pay for a series of annual cash distributions. Some of the more privileged members of Ephesian society were to receive sums in terms of denarii. For example the members of the boule present in the pronaos of the sanctuary each received one denarius. 860 However, the phlyarchai each received only 125 denarii per annum for a lottery, in which 250 men per phyle obtained the sum of nine assaria. 861 Similarly, the ephebarchos was to conduct a lottery of the ephebes with the winning individuals also receiving a sum of nine assaria. The paidonomoi were to be the recipients of 15 denarii and 13.5 assaria each year in order to finance a distribution of 4.5 assaria to 49 paides chosen by lottery. 862 Not all of these provisions remained in place for very long. By AD 107/8 Salutaris was responsible for a further donation of twenty gilded statuettes of ‘all the gods’, which was financed by the

858 Harl calculated that the issue signed by Aristeas was composed of between 60,000 and 120,000 pieces estimating that the recipients of the donation numbered around 5000 (adult male citizens). Harl reasoned that the total value of the series was between 20,000 and 40,000 denarii, which was between 10,000 and 30,000 more denarii than the value Harl calculated was needed by the distribution: Harl (1997), 228. These calculations cannot be verified until more complete publication of the number of dies used for this issue. In the absence of accurate figures for the citizen population of Stratonikeia the estimate of the number of recipients can only be treated as an approximate order of magnitude.

859 For example I.Tralleis 220.

860 II 223-5.

861 II 249-50.

862 II 273-7.
diversion of capital originally put aside to fund the distributions to the phylai.\textsuperscript{863} However, this text demonstrates that that local coinage could be formally distributed among the citizen population or at least part of the citizen body. In this case the distributions were intended to be annual events funded from the interest derived from an initial capital investment. Thus it is unlikely that specific bronze coins were minted for the occasion. The association of the Salutaris distribution with bronze coins is obvious because the sums distributed were below one denarius in value and therefore could only be expressed in terms of assaria. In cases where values are given in terms of denarii, it is impossible to be certain whether the denarii should be viewed as simply signifying the monetary value of the distribution and not the type of coin distributed or whether the text indicates the donation of a particular silver coin.

**Distributions and Coinage: the Numismatic Evidence**

The most compelling evidence linking the production of coinage with the practice of monetary distributions comes from the coins themselves. This tendency is perhaps most clearly expressed in the legend of the coinage dedicated by king Antiochos IV of Kommagene at Chios. The legend of this issue, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ ΔΩΡΟΝ, explicitly states that the coinage was another of Antiochos’ royal gifts to the city.\textsuperscript{864} The most logical context for the production of a designated ‘gift’ coinage is a public distribution, in which the citizens of Chios publically received their share of the royal munificence. If Antiochos had simply provided bullion to the civic treasury for coin production, there would have been less reason to distinguish this issue from the regular


\textsuperscript{864} RPC I 2415-2416.
output of the mint of Chios through its legend and appearance. The unique commemorative legend is only comprehensible in the context of a cash distribution. Royal generosity was demonstrated by the production of a coinage proclaiming the act of its own distribution. Similar arguments can be made for cases in which the traditional genitive plural ethnic is replaced by the name of the citizen body or a particular division of the citizen body in the dative case, thus indicating that the specified group were targeted as the recipients of the coinage. In such circumstances the most efficient mechanism for the identified recipients to receive their dedication was by a public distribution of cash. Important civic subgroups recorded on coins include the neoi (association of the youths) and the gerousia (association of the old men). However, references to such groups are rare on coinage in comparison to dedications to the citizen body as a whole. The cases of Attalos at Herakleia under Salbake (Neoi) and M. Oulpios Eurykles at Aizanoi (gerousia) are currently the only known examples of this practice. The relative rarity of such focused issues may be explained with reference to the long history of civic coin legends. Traditionally the civic ethnic was recorded in the genitive plural, implying that the issue was a product of the civic community as a collective. The genitive plural ethnic is found on the dedication issue of Statilios Attalos to the youths and the issue of Eurykles carries an abbreviated ethic. Consequently, the focus on one particular subset of citizens on a coin legend may have been seen as inappropriate for an object emblematic of the entire citizen body.

Not all instances of the dative case in legend formulae can be used as evidence for cash distributions: an obverse type produced in Pergamon c. 1 BC depicting a laureate

---

865 For the youths see ΣΤ ΑΤΤΑΛΟΣ ΑΡΧΙΑΤΡΟΣ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΩΤΩΝ ΝΕΟΙ (Heuchert 2178-80, c. AD 139-47: Plate XXXV. 6-8) and the Gerousia: ΕΥΡΥΚΛΗΣ ΤΗ ΓΕΡΟΥΣΙΑ ΑΙΖΑΝ (Heuchert 2653-4, c. AD 161-9).
head carried the legend: ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩΙ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ ΒΟΥΛΑΙΩΙ. The reverse legend records the name and title of the eponym as well as the city ethnic: Α ΦΟΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΕΡΕΥΣ ΓΥΜΝΑΣΙΑΡΧΩΝ ΠΕΡΓΑΜΗΝΩΝ. The use of the dative case on the obverse legend is significant. The legend states that the issue was dedicated to Augustus, who is accorded the epithet of boulaioi, probably by A. Phourios, the eponym mentioned in the nominative case on the reverse. Consequently, in this instance the dative case is unlikely to refer to a distribution, but was an expression of civic devotion to the Emperor through the medium of coinage.

Developments in the Hadrianic period and the issue of Polemon at Smyrna

Before the second quarter of the second century AD the use of the dedication and dative formulae had been rare. However, as we have seen in chapter two, the practice of inscribing such formulae on coins was given significant impetus by the outpouring of interest in the establishment of the cult dedicated to Hadrian’s deceased favourite, Antinoos. Across the Greek speaking provinces of the Empire, the civic elites rushed to monumentalise and commemorate the new deity in a wide variety of media. Some idea of the range of the surviving material may be gained from Meyer’s comprehensive catalogue of the corpus of antique Antinoos images in media ranging from monumental

866 The reverse type depicts a basin (RPC I 2360).
867 Phorios also signed a smaller denomination piece depicting the bear head of Gaius Caesar with the obverse legend Γ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ ΠΕΡΓΑΜΗΝΩΝ and a reverse type of a standing personification of Armenia holding a spear and arrow with the legend Α ΦΟΡΙΟΣ ΓΥΜΝΑΣΙΑΡΧΩΝ: RPC I 2361. Note the further use of the dative case. The same eponym is known from an issue of the Tiberian (?) era: RPC I 2366.
868 For a discussion of this epithet see Burnett, Amandry and Ripollés (1992), 400.
sculpture to gems, cameos and reliefs. The numerous coin types depicting Antinoos from this period should be seen in this context. Not all the Antinoos types are likely to have been dedication issues and many types were produced in regions with little history of coin eponyms. However, the types signed by Gesios at Adramytion and by Hostilios Markellos for the koinon of Achaia and Korinth, combined the ἀνέθηκεν formulae with an ethnic with the dative case, indicating that these were issues dedicated to a particular group.

Of all the potential distribution issues depicting Antinoos that of the sophist Antonios Polemon at Smyrna is perhaps of the greatest interest. The majority of Polemon’s dedicated types carried an obverse portrait of Antinoos with the legend ΑΝΤΙΝΟΟΣ ΗΡΩΣ and the reverse legend ΠΟΛΕΜΩΝ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ ΣΜΥΡΝΑΙΟΙΣ. Four reverse types are associated with this issue: a bull (a crescent is often visible on its shoulder), a standing ram (often standing behind a kerykeion), a panther with thyrsos and the prow of a trireme. However, Klose also records two types signed by Polemon bearing obverse types of Hadrian and the Empress Sabina, which were contemporary with the Antinoos types. The reverse legend of the Hadrian type differs from that found on the Antinoos coins in that Polemon is associated with the office of strategos and the civic ethnic is omitted (ΠΟΛΕΜΩΝ ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΩΝ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ). The reverse type depicts an enthroned Zeus holding a sceptre. This motif does not occur on any of Polemon’s Antinoos issues. The Sabina type is much smaller than either the Antinoos or Hadrian types, corresponding to

---

871 Antinoos types are attested at Bithynion-Klaudiopolis, Tarsos (149-50 nos. 7-9), Tieion (150-1), Alexandria: Blum (1914), 37-51.
872 For Gesios at Adramytton see von Fritz (1913), 35, no. 105 and for Markellos see Blum (1914), 34-37 (nos. 1-2, A-F (Achaia), no. 3 (Korinth) Plate XIX. 3).
873 Klose (1987), 250-4 (Plate XVIII. 4-6, XIX. 1).
Klose’s ‘einer’ denomination. The reverse type depicts the prow of a trireme and bears the legend ‘ΠΟΛΕΜΩΝ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ ΣΜΥΡ’. The legend formulae, denomination and unique iconography of Polemon’s Antinoos issues mark them out from the conventional coinage of Smyrna. Of the types associated with the Antinoos obverse, only the trireme prow had appeared regularly on earlier issues from Smyrna and previously this type was confined to the smaller denominations. The most convincing explanation for these features is that these types constitute a special issue produced for a specific occasion, most probably a distribution. Since there is no documentary evidence relating to this event, the motivation for the production of these coins must be inferred from the coins themselves, which Klose dates to c. AD 134-5.

Both the bull and panther motifs occur frequently on the reverse types of other issues bearing the image of Antinoos from across Asia Minor. The standing right facing bull type is attested with Antinoos obverse types at Nikomedia in Bithynia, Hadrianopolis-Stratonikeia in Lydia, Kios, Mytilene, and at an uncertain mint (possibly Bithynian Iuliopolis). The panther and thyrsos of Dionysos type is also found on the Antinoos coinage of Tarsos in Kilikia and the panther types also occur at Tion in Bithynia and Hadrianopolis-Stratonikeia. The fact that these types were previously unattested at Smyrna but are so widespread on Antinoos issues from across Asia Minor indicates that

---

874 Klose (1987), 250-2 (Plate XIX. 2).
875 Klose categorises the denomination of the Antinoos issues as ‘medallions’, the largest denomination he identified at Smyrna. He associated the piece with the portrait of Hadrian with the second largest denomination (‘the sechser’): Klose (1987), 250-4.
876 See Klose (1987), 142-143, R 50-52.
877 Blum (1914), 45 (Nikomedia), 49 (Hadrianopolis-Stratonikeia (Plate XIX. 6) and Kios), 39 (Mytilene); Kater-Sibbes and Vermaseren (1977), nos. 79 (Iuliopolis) 75 and 80 (further types from Mytilene and Nikomedia)
878 For the panther and thyrsos type see Blum (1914), 52 no. 3, see also no. 2 for a variant of the type depicting a panther resting its paw on a vase. The image of Dionysos-Antinoos riding a panther holding a thyrsos occurs at Tarsos and Tion: Blum (1914), 52 (Tarsos) and 46 (Tion). Hadrianopolis-Stratonikeia produced a type depicting a panther with a raised paw: SNG Aul 3187.
they were chosen for their specific resonance with the Antinoos cult. The link between the panther and thyrsos of Dionysos and Antinoos is consistent with the evidence from other media. Antinoos was often presented in the guise of the youthful Dionysos in the surviving sculpture. The Egyptian origin of this motif is made obvious on an obverse Antinoos portrait type from Tarsos. There the youthful Antinoos is portrayed with both the ivy crown of Dionysos and an Egyptian style crown. In Egypt Dionysos had long been assimilated with Osiris, and when Antinoos drowned in the Nile near the nome capital of Hermopolis he was assimilated into the Dionysos-Osiris cult. As the image of Antinoos spread beyond the boundaries of Egypt, it would appear from the sculptural and numismatic evidence that the association with Dionysos was retained.

The standing bull type should also be interpreted as an allusion to Dionysos. The presence of the crescent moon on the flank of the bull further strengthens the egyptianizing nature of Antinoos iconography. A white crescent appears to have been an attribute of the Egyptian living bull god Apis. It must be conceded that there are discrepancies between the various literary accounts discussing the number and disposition of the markings used by the Egyptian priesthood to identify the Apis bull. Pliny the Elder (NH VIII. 184-6) and Aelian (On the characteristics of animals X. 29) both report that a white crescent on the right shoulder was an identifying feature of the divine animal. Herodotos mentions the markings on the Apis bull, but does not mention a crescent: III. 28.3. However, the

---

879 Meyer (1991), Catalogue I. 39; 60; 67; 74; III 4; 6.
880 Meyer (1991), 149 (based on an Alexandrian prototype: Plate XIX. 5).
881 Meyer (1991), 189-194: it should be noted that one of the civic phylai of the nome of Antinoopolis, founded by Hadrian in honour of Antinoos, was named Oseirantinoeia (Meyer (1991), 216). Our best evidence for the nature of this cult is provided by the hieroglyphic texts inscribed on the Antinoos obelisk, which depicts Osirisantinoos before several deities of the Egyptian Pantheon including Re-Harachte and Thoth: Grimm, Kessler and Meyer (1994).
882 The crescent moon is also visible on the flank of a bull from an Antinoos issue of Hadrianothera: Blum (1914), 48.
identification of Polemon’s bull with the Apis is confirmed by the depiction of the crescent on images of this deity produced in other media from Egypt and the rest of the Mediterranean. Under the Ptolemies, the worship of the Apis bull became assimilated with the Osiris-Dionysos cult. Thus the Apis could serve as an appropriate symbol for Antinoos in the light of his association with Dionysos-Osiris and the Egyptian location of his demise and subsequent deification.

However, the repertoire of Antinoos iconography was not confined to Dionysos imagery. The deified youth was associated with a number of different traditions and attributes. After Dionysos, Antinoos was most commonly represented in the guise of Hermes. For example a reverse type of Hostilios Markellos depicts a naked figure holding a kerykeion leaning against a herm. Furthermore Antinoos is accorded the epithet of ‘son of the Argus slayer’ (according to myth Hermes was responsible for the death of the monster Argus on the orders of Zeus) in the fragments of Pankrates’ poetic account of Hadrian’s Egyptian lion hunt. The assimilation of Antinoos with Hermes is perhaps unsurprising in the light of Hermes’ role in guiding the dead to the underworld and fact that Antinoos drowned near the city of Hermopolis, whose principal deity was Thoth-Hermes. This association provides the context for the depiction of the kerykeion of Hermes on the ram type of Polemon. Moreover, Hermes’ capacity as the patron of pastoralists would explain the presence of the Ram on the coins. Hermes is frequently depicted with a

883 Kater-Sibbes and Vermaseren (1975) nos. 92 and 204 (from Egypt) and II (1975) no. 281 (a fragment from a marble relief found on the Palatine) and 310 (a black diorite statue from Beneventum in Samnium). For other instances in which the crescent is associated with the image of Antinoos see Meyer (1991), 246.
885 Blum (1914), 35 cf. Meyer (1991), 145. At Alexandria the obverse type of Antinoos was frequently paired with a rider holding a kerykeion, identified by Meyer as Thoth-Hermes: Meyer (1991), 150. Meyer also records a statue depicting Antinoos with the wings of Hermes in his catalogue: I 30.
886 P.Oxy 1085; for an English translation of this text see Birley (1997), 241.
ram in sculpture and on painted ceramics and it therefore seems likely that this animal fulfilled the same emblematic function as the bull and panther types. 887

The remaining prow type should also be interpreted as a reference to Dionysos- Antinoos; however, this type may have possessed special significance for Polemon himself. Philostratos records that the right of boarding the sacred trireme in perpetuity was bestowed onto Polemon and his descendents by Smyrna. Philostratos further specifies that in the month of Anthesterion a trireme was processed into the agora and that this ship was piloted by the priest of Dionysos as it came in from the sea. Later on in his narrative of the life of Polemon, Philostratos mentions a statue erected in a coastal sanctuary depicting Polemon performing the sacred rites on the trireme. 888 Thus this text provides evidence that Polemon not only performed this ritual as the priest of Dionysos, but also that this office was sufficiently important for Polemon’s identity as a member of the civic elite of Smyrna that he was depicted in this guise for a commemorative statue. Therefore Polemon made a direct reference to this office in his dedicatory coinage by means of the prow reverse type. This same festival may also have provided the immediate context for the public distribution of the Antinoos types, although this hypothesis is admittedly speculative.

We may conclude that the iconography deployed on the Polemon issue performed a dual purpose. The first and most obvious function was to honour Antinoos as a symbol of traditional ephebic Greek culture while simultaneously making reference to the exotic egyptianizing elements of his cult. However, this process was also imbued with elements of self-glorification. The Dionysos derived types made reference to Antinoos’

887 For example LIMC 257, an Athenian red figure vase from c. 470 BC, depicts Hermes riding on the back of a ram cf. LIMC 287 and 289.
888 Philostratos VS 531; 523.
assimilation into the Egyptian Osiris-Dionysos cult, but also evoked Polemon’s own priestly office. Moreover, the image of the prow integrated Antinoos with the local traditions of Dionysos worship. The element of self-glorification would have been more obvious in the context of the act of distribution, where Polemon’s role of civic benefactor would have been played out in public. The case of Aristeas at Stratonikeia testifies to the public and ritualised nature of many such distributions. Aristeas’ act of distribution was performed in front of the citizens gathered in the theatre. The central role in this ritualised expression of civic ideology was occupied by the benefactor himself, whose personal generosity and love of his country (philopatria) was demonstrated before the assembled citizens. In this context we can see how the personal resonances of Polemon’s coin iconography would complement the self-glorification inherent in such acts of munificence. It must be conceded that there is no direct evidence for Polemon himself undertaking such a distribution in either Philostratos or the epigraphic sources. However, the unusual iconography and denomination of the series indicate that Polemon’s issue should be seen as a departure from the usual practices of coin production and distribution hitherto employed at Smyrna. Moreover the explicit use of the formula ‘Polemon dedicated to the Smyrneans’ in the reverse legend is consistent with the interpretation that this issue was produced in order to be formally distributed to the citizen body. The silence in the literary and epigraphic sources is not fatal to this line of argument. The achievements of Polemon recorded by Philostratos are so many and varied that it would be unsurprising that such a minor act of local importance should be omitted.

Developments in the later second and third centuries AD
The practice of inscribing dedicatory coin formulae reached its peak in the late second century AD, but in the later in the third century the practice goes into decline. The final instance of the dative plural ethnic may have occurred c. AD 253-268 at Kyme. The prytaneis Ailios Hermeias signed a series of types during the joint reign of Gallienus and Valerian with the legend ΑΙΛ ΕΡΜΕΙΑΣ ΠΡΥΤ ΚΥΜΑΟΙΣ. However, the iconography of Hermeias’ issue, in contrast to that of Polemon, largely drew upon the established civic repertoire. Thus aside from the unusual formulae there is little to distinguish this issue from the rest of the output of this mint. However, the case of Klaudios Aristeas of Stratonikeia suggests that distribution issues need not have been differentiated from the great mass of civic coins. Many of the Aristeas issues are signed with the common ἐπί + the genitive formula. Thus not all distribution issues can be separated from other issues by means of their legend formulae, as was the case for Polemon. Consequently the identification of such distribution-coinages is made very difficult and the task of quantifying the proportion of distribution issues impossible. Moreover, once coinage entered into circulation there was nothing to prevent it from being re-used in future distributions.

The complexity of this situation is exemplified by the case of the other Severan eponyms of Stratonikeia. Names attested on coinage from the reign of Septimius Severus include Leon Alkaiou, Phalbios Leon, Hierokles ‘b’, Epitygchanon, Jason Kleoboulou, Iason Kleoboulou, Leon Alkaiou, Phalbios Leon, Hierokles ‘b’, Epitygchanon, Jason Kleoboulou,

---

889 See page 82.
890 SNG Cop 131-2 depicts the ubiquitous standing Tyche with rudder and cornucopiae. Other common types struck in the name of Hermeias include an enthroned Athena with Nike and spear (BMC Aeolis 154, SNG Cop 158) and a standing Athena type with patera and shield, which is known from BMC Aeolis 157 (SNG Cop 159). A veiled cult statue with modius resembling Artemis Ephesia flanked by two deer type is known from BMC Aeolis 156 (SNG Cop 160). Poseidon with one foot raised on a prow holding a dolphin and trident is known from SNG Cop 133. BMC Aeolis 155 and 158 depicts Isis holding a sistrum (cf. SNG Cop 158). A similar smaller denomination type depicted Isis holding a sistrum and her situla: SNG Cop 133-4.
891 Other specimens of this issue bear the ἐπιμεληθέντος formula: SNG Aul 2666-7, 2670.
Zosimos Possitou, Philo?, Nikephoros Dionysos, Ioulia D(?) and Klaudios Dionysos.\textsuperscript{892} The early third century was a period of unprecedented output of this mint.\textsuperscript{893} Harl has plausibly linked this minting activity to the expansion of the Hekate and Zeus sanctuaries at Lagina and Panamara and increased levels of intra-elite competitive benefaction associated with this expansion. The iconography is entirely consistent with this interpretation. The types most commonly attested on these issues are either a standing Hekate with either an altar or hound or Zeus Panamaros riding before an altar.\textsuperscript{894} The epigraphic material also provides ample evidence for the importance of munificence on the part of the priests serving at these sanctuaries.\textsuperscript{895} Therefore Harl has argued that other Severan eponyms of Stratonikeia were responsible for the type of distribution conducted by Klaudios Aristeas.\textsuperscript{896} The difficulty with this hypothesis is that Aristeas is the only eponym from Stratonikeia who has been convincingly associated with an epigraphically attested distribution. This discrepancy may be the result of the non-survival of the evidence. Many of the eponyms are not represented in the epigraphic record. Others are possibly attested, but positive identification is hampered by the repetition of names across extended families. We do not possess a comprehensive biography for even the best-attested

\textsuperscript{892}SNG Tübingen 3487, SNG Aul 2668-9 (Plate XXIX. 6, XXX. 6), 2671 (Plate XXIX. 8), 2674 (Plate XXXI. 1), SNG Cop 504-6 (Plate XXXIII. 1-2: Leon Alkaiou); SNG Aul 2675 (Plate XXXI. 2: Phla. Leon); SNG Aul 2676 (Plate XXXI. 3: Hierokles); SNG Leypold 850 (Ioulia); SNG Cop 508 (Plate XXXII. 6: Nikephoros Dionysos); SNG Cop 507 (Plate XXXII. 4: Jason Kleoboulou); SNG Cop 511 (Plate XXXIII. 5), BMC Karia 70 (Ioulia); BMC Karia 62, SNG Cop 510 (Plate XXXIII. 4), BMC Karia 44 (Zosimos); SNG Leypold 847 (Plate. XXXI. 5: Philo).

\textsuperscript{893}See Harl (1996), 111-112 (fig. 5.2) for a graph showing the relative coin output of Stratonikeia.

\textsuperscript{894}For example of Zeus see SNG Aul 2668 (Plate XXX. 6) and for Hekate with hound see SNG Aul 2674 and for the altar see SNG Cop 504-5 (Plate XXXIII. 1-2). However, other types are associated with this series: SNG Aul 2676 (Nike with crown and palm) and SNG Leypold 847 (cult image of Artemis Ephesia).

\textsuperscript{895}I.Stratonikeia 672 is just one example of the inscriptions concerned with the generosity of such priests. This text relates to the sanctuary at Panamara. Lines 5-8 mention a gift of two denarii to those men present in the sanctuary: cf. nos. 15, 258 and 1025.

\textsuperscript{896}Harl (1996), 266.
figures. Moreover, although distributions are mentioned frequently in the epigraphic record, the fact that the vast majority of these instances at Stratonikeia relate to non-eponyms indicates that the relationship between distributions and coin production was nuanced. In such cases distributions were probably in the form of silver denarii or existing bronze coinage. The re-use of old bronze in this context may help to explain the preponderance of countermarked specimens. For Harl the countermarks are evidence that civic bronze coins were reissued at subsequent festivals. The types chosen for the countermarks do display an affinity to the sanctuary of Lagina in particular and so the festivities centred on the Hekate cult are the most plausible context for the countermarking. Conversely, the choice of countermark type could have been the result of the importance of Hekate to the civic identity of the city and unrelated to a specific festival. It is therefore difficult to demonstrate categorically that countermarking was conducted in connection with cash distributions, but such a scenario is not improbable.

The nature of the Severan coinage of Stratonikeia must be interpreted in the light of another unusual feature of this mint. In the early Julio-Claudian period and later in the reign of Antoninus Pius Stratonikeia produced a small series of silver drachms and

---

897 Early Severan eponyms who have been associated with figures recorded in the epigraphic record include: Jason Kleoboulos (I.Stratonikeia 275), Klaudios Dionysios (I.Stratonikeia 1226, 1-2, 9-12). Neither of these texts provides any biographical detail.

898 Non-eponyms attested making cash distributions at Stratonikeia include M. Oulpios Asklepiades (I.Stratonikeia 303, 6, 9), Demetrios son of Myronides (I.Stratonikeia 258, 7), Tib. Phlabios Artemisios (I.Stratonikeia 197).

899 Evidence for the distribution of silver is provided by the formula ἐπὶ διδασμῷ ἀργυρίου used in an inscription honouring Tib. Phlabios Menandros and Phlabia Leontis: I.Stratonikeia 15.11.

900 Howgego records three countermarks applied to this series: cmk. 84 (Laureate Caracalla head), 188 (Athena/Roma head, pre AD 210-11 c.214-5.) and 536 (ΘΕΟΥ, pre AD 210-11). Caltabiano associated cmk. 536 with the cult of Hekate, since the goddess is referred to as ‘δεός’ in the epigraphic record. She also presented the evidence for the association of Roma with Hekate at Lagina: Caltabiano (1971-2), 271-3.

901 Harl (1996), 266.
fractions; all of these issues were signed by eponyms. The production of civic silver coinage in the province of Asia during the imperial period is very uncommon. Surviving specimens of these silver issues are rare and so the original issue is likely to have been small. The function of such a small coinage is difficult to infer. However, since the coinage does not appear to have been numerous, it is probable that it did not represent the majority of the silver coinage in circulation at Stratonikeia and its environs. It is therefore attractive to conclude that the motivation for the production of this coinage was not primarily economic. It is more probable that the explanation for these issues lies in the religious activities of the local elites, especially for the Antonine issues. Both Klaudios Aristeas and Phalbios Aristolaos were drawn from influential families with strong ties to the sanctuaries at Lagina and Panamara. Thus, the silver coinages may have been specially struck to discharge a payment on behalf of one of the sanctuaries, or to finance a civic distribution.

**Distributions and the Pattern of Coin Production**

The evidence of the Polemon dedication and coin legends would strongly suggest that at least some local base metal coinages were produced for the purpose of distributions. The difficulty lies in determining the proportion of distribution-coinages in relation to the total

---


904 The name Phlabios Aristolaos is attested in *I.Stratonikeia* 212, 6-8; 214; 126; 1025. 27-9; see *I.Stratonikeia* p. 99 for Şahin’s stemma of the family. Klaudios Aristeas is often associated with the father of the eponym Klaudios Aristeas Menandros honoured in *I.Stratonikeia* 701. Furthermore an *asiarches* by the name of Klaudios Aristeas from the late second century AD is attested as serving as the *neokoros* of the Heraia: *I.Stratonikeia* 674. 20-1.
output of a mint. The paucity of evidence relating eponyms to epigraphically recorded instances of cash distributions necessitates caution. However, the production of coinage for distributions may have been more common than the limited extent of the overlap between the epigraphic and numismatic sources would imply. The case of Aristeas implies that not all distribution issues were differentiated by their iconography or legend formulae. The circumstantial evidence for the formal distribution of Polemon’s Antinoos issue is strong, but the extensive literary and epigraphic sources covering his life are silent on this issue. This may reflect the fact that no such distribution occurred, although it is more likely that such a minor gift by a prominent benefactor was omitted on the grounds of its irrelevance in comparison with his other more substantial works. If the latter reconstruction is correct, then distributions on the part of eponyms may have been relatively common, but were generally omitted in honorific inscriptions. It is notable that in general epigraphic references to the production of base metal coinage are very rare, but the coins themselves demonstrate that elite involvement in this process was extensive. 905 This state of affairs may have been the result of the limited amount of social prestige accrued from this activity. In comparison to the distribution of silver, the production of a dedicatory issue of fiduciary bronze coins would have been far less expensive, since the production costs of base metal coinages are likely to have been much less than the face value of the distribution. 906 A cheaper benefaction would have carried less social prestige. Thus, even in cases where eponyms are relatively well attested in the epigraphic record, involvement in the distribution of base metal cannot be dismissed. Moreover, in the light of the prominence of the name of the eponym in the coin legend, the civic authorities may have

905 Only two brief inscriptions from the Roman imperial period mention the role of an individual in civic coin production, I.Magnesia 164 (Moschion) and IGR IV 769 (Apollodotos Diodorou).
906 For a discussion of the private financing of civic coinages see pages 74-97.
felt it unnecessary to mention this service in honorific inscriptions. This line of argument cannot be taken any further until new evidence emerges relating to the scale of the financial outlay required to manufacture a new bronze coinage and how much, if any, of this burden was met by the relevant eponym. Unfortunately the evidence as it stands permits only very vague conclusions regarding the relationship between eponyms and the distribution of base metal coinages and very little indication of the extent and frequency of this practice is presently available.

Even if coin types were not produced for specific distributions, it remains possible that their potential deployment in this context influenced facets of their production. High demand for the manufacture of large denomination coinages for distributions may help to explain several significant developments of later second and third century civic coinages, especially the move from the dumpy fabrics of the Hellenistic period and first century AD towards larger flans with more elaborate and diverse iconography. The desire to produce large and visually spectacular issues for the purpose of presentation and distribution at civic festivals might also explain the discrepancies in the iconography detected between the large and small denomination coins of Thyateira and Laodikeia. Other factors probably also played a significant role in this process. In particular, the bigger flan size of the high denominations afforded a larger canvass to the die-engraver. Contact with imperial sestertii and their elaborate iconography may have encouraged the imitation of larger denominations with less dumpy fabric.907 However, the fact that the largest denominations usually bore carefully chosen images infused with local resonance, while the iconography of the smaller denominations was often influenced by regional denominational systems, implies that the iconography reflected the economic

---

907 See pages 161-162.
function of the coinage. In respect to the smaller denominations, the priority appears to have been to identify the monetary value of the coin, often across a wider region. Conversely, the larger denominations appear to have been viewed as a canvass for the display of civic history, mythology, and religion and to express loyalty to the imperial authorities. This conception of the nature of large denomination bronze coinage in part may have been motivated by the association of such issues with public distributions and associated civic ritual. Even if coins were not produced for immediate distribution, the possibility that they may have fulfilled this purpose in future remained: thus encouraging the local elites to produce high denomination coinage with an aesthetic emphasis that went beyond simple utility.

The iconographic differences between small and larger denomination pieces may also reflect the different means by which they entered circulation. If larger denominations pieces could enter into the economy via distributions, smaller denominations may have been disseminated by other means. Unfortunately, little evidence relating to the mechanisms by which local coinage entered circulation survives. It is possible that cities discharged some payments in terms of new coins or at least used new coins as change in situations where the city had received payment. However, it was probably more common for new, particularly small denomination, coinage to be sold to the moneychangers. There is no direct evidence for this practice, but the circumstantial evidence is relatively convincing. Moneychangers were vital components in the local economic system. They facilitated the conversion between silver and bronze currencies, for which they received a fixed ratio of the transaction (the agio) as profit. In early second

908 Howgego (1985), 94.
909 Howgego (1985), 94.
century Pergamon the price for moneychangers buying *denarii* was set by the city and confirmed by an epistle of the Emperor at 18 *assaria* when selling and 17 when buying.\(^9\) We possess epigraphic evidence from Pergamon and Mylasa, and the same was probably true in most cities, that the monopoly for converting bronze coinage into silver and vice versa was sold by the city to either a single contractor or a number of contractors.\(^1\) In this scenario access to a supply of new coinage would have been a priority for the moneychangers.\(^2\)

**Conclusion**

It was the intention of this chapter to present the evidence for the nature of the local elites’ conception of coinage during the imperial period. It was argued that the elite attitude towards coinage was bound with a particular monumental mentality. The monumentality inherent in civic coinage lacked the scale associated with other media such as sculpture or public buildings. Moreover in contrast to these media, coins did not occupy a specific site. On the surface the latter deficiency could be seen as having significant repercussions for the monumental function of coinage. The specific location and relationship of a particular monument with the topographical context, especially its interrelationship with surrounding landscape and neighbouring monuments, constituted a significant element of its meaning.\(^3\) However, this flexibility could also be advantageous. Other monuments were confined to particular location, thus limiting the opportunities for interaction, whereas local

---

\(^9\) *OGIS* 484 ll. 8-23.

\(^1\) *I. Mylasa* 605 cf. Broughton (1938), 895-7 for an English translation based on the earlier edition of Dittenberger (*OGIS* 515) and *OGIS* 484 (Pergamon).

\(^2\) Controlling access to unworn coinage may have been particularly important to moneychangers. The Pergamene text records that the moneychangers were profiteering from the exchange of worn coins: *OGIS* 484 ll. 13-15, 24-9.

\(^3\) For a discussion of the Athenian agora in the Roman period as a monumental space see Alcock (2002), 51-8.
coinage was portable and could serve as a constant reminder of civic pride and achievement. Furthermore, the evidence for coin production and cash distributions indicates that coin types were not devoid of context. The images adorning coinages could serve to evoke particular landscapes, both physical and mythological. For example the three temples type of Smyrna extolled the prestige enjoyed by the city through references to the built environment of the city, while the Marysas types of Apameia evoked the mythological associations of Lake Aulutrene.

The most extreme manifestation of this monumental mentality was the portrait types of Mytilene. These images were utilised as another form of honorific device to celebrate prominent civic benefactors. Elsewhere the evidence for personalised iconography, for example the distribution issues of Polemon, suggests that other members of the elite strata manipulated coin iconography to function as markers of personal generosity. However, in most cases the iconographic focus of coin types is on the collective identity of the city, rather than the personal achievements of the eponyms. Even here the coinage could serve a monumental function, commemorating and memorialising important events in civic myth-history, celebrating the achievements of famous citizens and emphasising the religious cults that defined civic identity. The prominent Antinoos motifs of Polemon’s reflected the coinage’s special status as dedicatory issue produced to honour the deceased imperial favourite and strongly suggests that this coinage was intended to be distributed formally. Not all coins were produced for such a specific context and the smallest denomination issues in particular frequently display generic and regionalised images. Nevertheless, the nature of cash distributions would help to explain several characteristics of civic coin production in the Roman imperial period. The public
and ritualised nature of such distributions would have encouraged the production of the high denomination and visually attractive bronze coins now so prominent in private and museum collections. The difficulty in relating surviving coins to particular distributions mentioned in the epigraphic record is problematic for this hypothesis. However, this discrepancy may have been the result of the relatively low status associated with the distribution of base metal or may simply reflect the fragmentary nature of the epigraphic record.
7. Conclusion

Eponyms and Civic Coinage: a Summary

Locally produced base metal coinages proved to be a highly resilient phenomenon in many of the Greek speaking cities of the eastern Mediterranean. For well over two and a half centuries after the civic coinages of the West had come to an end, cities in the East continued to produce their own base metal currency. This coinage obviously possessed an economic function. Yet, function was only one facet of the role played by local coinages in the civic life of the minting cities. Cultural factors did much to affect the form and development of civic coins as objects. The imagery chosen to adorn these issues was utilised as a medium for the display of civic ideology and identity. Images were often chosen on the strength of their particular resonance with civic myth-history and achievement. In this way civic claims to special status and significance were effectively displayed. Other types were generic and appeared on coinages across the Greek speaking world, although even these types may have possessed firmly rooted ideological significance. The very ubiquity of these images is evidence for their ability to communicate particular values to a universal audience. For example the common type depicting the civic Tyche standing, holding a rudder and cornucopia is ubiquitous on the Greek language civic coinage. In part the popularity of such motifs may be explained in terms of their function as denominational markers. In addition the development of the

---

914 For a brief discussion of the evidence for the economic role played by civic coinages see Howgego (1985), 93 and Heuchert (2005), 31-32.
915 Heuchert (2005), 49.
work-shop system in the late second century AD would have also encouraged the spread of types across cities in the same ‘supply area’. However, the very universality of this and similar images might also have possessed a particular attractiveness.\footnote{Butcher (2005), 148-150.} The Tyche was the personification of the city and therefore functioned as visual shorthand for civic ideology. The Tyche was a universal symbol of civic status as it was understood by the local elites of this period and represented shared notions of what it meant to be a city. Through the depiction of generic personifications of the city, a city was able to articulate its status and adherence to these civic values in a very succinct way.

Alongside these wider developments, the majority of the cities in the province of Asia and less frequently in other parts of Asia Minor and the Balkan Peninsula adorned their civic coinages with the names of local eponyms. The form and function of these eponyms developed over the course of the imperial period and this phenomenon was subject to a high degree of regional variation. At the beginning of our period, the majority of eponyms appeared to be very similar to their Classical and Hellenistic antecedents. The names were recorded in the nominative case or in the form of a monogram. Over the course of the first century AD, the form of coin eponyms in Asia, Byzantion and some mints in Achaia began to change. There was a general shift towards the \(\varepsilon\pi\varepsilon\) + genitive formula and it became more common to identify the eponym with a particular office. Other, less frequently attested formulae were also employed. These sometimes referred to the process of placing the proposal of the motion to initiate the production of coinage before the apparatus of civic administration (\(\varepsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\gamma\gamma\varepsilon\iota\lambda\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\sigma, \psi\eta\varphi\iota\sigma\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\nu, \pi\rho\rho\omicron\nu\vartheta\nu\eta\Theta\nu\tau\omicron\sigma, \varepsilon\pi\mu\epsilon\lambda\eta\theta\varepsilon\nu\tau\omicron\omicron\sigma\nu\theta\omicron\varsigma\) and \(\alpha\iota\tau\iota\sigma\alpha\mu\mu\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma\) or indicating that the coinage was a personal dedication.
(ἀνέθηκεν). Since the ἐπὶ + genitive formula clearly had temporal connotations (in the time of), its predominance is indicative of the role of local magistrates in articulating the passage of time. However, the work of Weiss has shown that the eponyms of the Graeco-Roman city cannot be reduced simply to the role of dating mechanisms, although this was an important part of their function. For Weiss the choice of eponym in a specific context was related to spheres of administrative responsibility. 917 The difficulty lies in determining how spheres of responsibility translated in terms of actual involvement with the production of coinage. In particular, it would be helpful to know the extent to which eponyms were expected to supervise and contribute financially towards the cost of production. The few extant epigraphic references and the evidence of the alternative legend formulae imply that such a state of affairs was not uncommon. The primary stumbling block is that our evidence relates to only a tiny fraction of the eponyms and civic coinages produced during this period, although the picture becomes somewhat less opaque when the wider social context is taken into account. Prosopographical analysis of the individuals so named demonstrates that eponyms were drawn from the ranks of the local elites, who increasingly came to dominate civic life during the Roman imperial period. This elite stratum demonstrated its status through the monopolisation of civic office holding and competitive benefaction undertaken at personal expense. These two facets of elite life were inextricably linked as office holding became another opportunity for the demonstration of public generosity. In this context it would not be surprising if private financing was significantly more common than the limited evidence from the epigraphic and numismatic records.

917 Weiss (2005), 57-68.
would indicate, although it remains impossible to quantify accurately the relative proportion of private and publically funded issues.

Elite involvement in the production of coinage was manifested in other ways. In the most extreme cases eponyms were responsible for coinages, the iconography of which made explicit personal references to their career or interests. For example, the priest of the koinon Ionion Kl. Kallistos signed a remarkable type depicting the sacrifice of a bull before a tetrastyle temple, probably that of Apollo Klarios, at Kolophon in the reign of Trajan Decius.918 Thirteen representatives of the member cities of the league are depicted surrounding the sacrifice scene at the temple. The presence of the thirteen figures implies that the coin type commemorates a specific meeting or festival of the koinon held at the city of Kolophon, very possibly during the priesthood of Kallistos himself.919 Such iconography should be seen in the context of the wider cultural role fulfilled by coinage. The evidence of certain legend formulae, particularly those that indicate a recipient in the dative case, suggests that the production of local coinages was frequently connected to the phenomenon of civic distributions. Unfortunately, the overlap between the names of eponyms and the numerous individuals attested as having been responsible for cash distributions is limited. Our best evidence relates to the case of Kl. Aristeas at Stratonikeia, who is known to have donated two denarii to the citizens of Stratonikeia and whose name is attested on a Severan era coinage.920 In part, this discrepancy may be explained in terms of honorific inscriptions often omitting references to relatively minor civic benefactions. The sophist Antonios Polemon of Smyrna is relatively well attested in the epigraphic

918 Milne (1941), 100 no. 255.  
919 Herrmann (2002), 229.  
920 I.Stratonikeia 701, SNG Aul 2664- 2667, SNG Cop 502 and Wadd 2577.
record and is the subject of a biography of Philostratos. He was also responsible for an issue dedicated to the *demos* of Smyrna commemorating Hadrian’s deceased favourite Antinoos. The formula employed on the coinage, ΠΟΛΕΜΩΝ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ ΣΜΥΡΝΑΙΟΙΣ: ‘Polemon dedicated to (the) Smyrneans’, strongly implies that the issue was made in order to be distributed among the populace at a public event, but there is no reference to such a distribution in either the literary or epigraphic record. Therefore, it is possible that coinages were often produced for the purpose of distribution. However, the fragmentary nature of the evidence necessitates caution in attempting to quantify the relative frequency of ‘distribution issues’. In most cases there is no indication in either the iconography or legend that a particular issue was manufactured for this purpose. In chapter 5 it was demonstrated that instances of personalised iconography were relatively rare. Even in the case of Aristeas, *I.Stratonikeia* 701 simply specifies that the populace received two denarii and while it is possible and even likely that this gift was in the form of Aristeas’ own base metal coinage, it remains possible that all or at least part of this donation was in the form of imperial silver denarii. The same is also true for the vast majority of inscriptions relating to distributions, since texts rarely mention sums smaller than one denarius in value. Therefore it is impossible to know whether these texts refer to imperial or civic denominations and so any attempt to quantify the relative proportion of ‘distribution issues’ is futile.

In spite of the uncertainties surrounding the nature and extent of the relationship between civic distributions and the production of civic coinages, the very fact that coinage
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921 *PIR*² A 862, Philostratos *VS*, *I.Smyrna* 697,6; 697, 35; 778, 2-3.
923 One of the very few texts to mention the distribution of sums under the value of one denarius is the Salutaris dedication from Ephesos in AD 104: Rogers (1991), 165-168.
was on occasion employed to reflect personal interests and glorify individual achievements is significant. In this respect coin iconography could function in a similar manner to honorific epigraphy and sculpture as a medium for ‘monumental’ commemoration. The nature of these ‘monuments’ varied according to the nuances of the relationship between the eponym’s own background and the image and legend that appeared on the coinage. The iconographic program of Polemon’s Antinoos issue skilfully played on the visual possibilities offered by the assimilation of the deceased imperial favourite with Osiris-Dionysos. The depiction of the Apis bull referred to the Egyptian emphasis of much of the Antinoos cult, while the panther and prow types integrated Antinoos into local traditions of Dionysos worship, in which Polemon himself was deeply embedded.\footnote{Polemon was priest of Dionysos in Smyrna and as such held the honour of steering the sacred trireme during the festivities of the month of Anthesterion: Philostratos VS 531; 523.} Moreover, the choice of legend formulae placed considerable emphasis on Polemon’s own personal generosity in dedicating a coinage to his homeland. Similarly, the bull sacrifice scene of Kallistos may capture a specific occasion over which the eponym presided himself.

Not all types were imbued with such personal connotations. The differentiation of the various denominations was the driving factor behind the choice of types at a significant number of mints, although eponyms may still have played a role in choosing specific types from within the civic cannon. Even in cases where the dedication formula was employed, types were frequently drawn from the standard civic repertoire of the mint.\footnote{At Smyrna Theudianos uses the dedication formula in conjunction with the common civic type of Kybele enthroned: Klose (1987), 258.} Such types still may have possessed monumental overtones. However, the focus of the commemoration and celebration was the collective identity of the city and much of the imagery and many of the themes employed may have been derived from
monumental sculpture and paintings. The extent of this borrowing is obscured by the non-survival of the vast majority of the non-numismatic evidence, although it is clear from the standardised representation of certain deities at specific locations that coin types were often modelled after famous cult statues. In the case of Aphrodisias, whose sculptural output is particularly well attested archaeologically, the debt owed by coin iconography to other monumental media is more clearly visible. The impetus for the move towards a truly monumental conception benefited from contact with the Roman monetary tradition, which was notable for its iconographic diversity. It is no coincidence that the civic coinages of the Roman imperial period were notable for greater iconographic diversity than their Classical and Hellenistic counterparts, a trend that reached a peak in the early third century. The increase in the number of types was accompanied by the emergence of entirely new iconographic themes. Buildings and scenes from the civic myth-history were lavishly engraved on dies. Even reverse types began to be adorned with images of the Emperor and Imperial house. By the second century and particularly in the third, motifs relating to agonistic contests became extremely popular. The vast majority of these types were not drawn from Roman prototypes. Depictions of local mythology and agonistic festivals clearly reflected local cultural priorities.

**Epilogue: Eponyms and the End of Coinage**

926 For the example of Aphrodite of Aphrodisias see MacDonald (1992), 27. For the popularity of the Artemis Ephesia cult across Asia Minor see Heuchert (2005), 49-50.
927 The type depicting a seated Aphrodite riding on the back of a Capricorn produced was derived from image of Aphrodite riding a Capricorn was woven into the garments of the cult statue of Aphrodite of Aphrodisias: MacDonald (1992), 28.
928 Heuchert (2005), 51-2.
930 Klose (2005), 125-135 and Weisser (2005), 141.
For the majority of the first three centuries AD, locally produced base metal coinages were an integral element in the economic life of the cities of the eastern Roman Empire. Yet, this state of affairs came under serious stress in the third quarter of the third century AD and by the beginning of the 270’s cities in most parts of the eastern Mediterranean had effectively ceased the production of their own coinage. Leschhorn records the number of minting cities in Asia Minor by reign, although in future his figures may require modification after the publication of the third century material by the RPC project.931 The vast majority of the coinages from the province of Asia stop after the death of Gallienus, although since Leschhorn did not differentiate between issues from the joint reign of Valerian and Gallienus (AD 253-260) and the sole reign of Gallienus (AD 260-8), the precise chronology of the decline is unclear. Leschhorn records only one post Gallienus issue, from Mysia in the reign of Claudius II. Outside of Asia, local coinages proved to be more resilient. Three cities in Pamphylia and two in Pisidia were still minting under Aurelian (AD 270-275), and the final civic issue occurs in Pamphylia under Tacitus.932 The pattern of the decline in civic minting identified by Leschhorn indicated that the peak number of operational mints was in the early Severan period, and that thereafter the number of cities producing coinage fell, but that the size of the civic issues was on the increase. However, in the light of Johnston’s criticism of Leschhorn’s methodology his figures must be used carefully.933 Moreover, in many ways looking at the total output of

932 Leschhorn (1981), table 1, 254.
933 Leschhorn attempted to gain an idea of the scale of civic output across the imperial period by analysing the 20,000 pieces recorded in the SNG Aul and BMC catalogues according to their reign. His figures recorded the highest output peaks for Severus/ Caracalla and smaller peaks for Gordian III, Philip, and Valerian/ Gallienus: Leschhorn (1981), 262-264. However, these figures did not take into account the length of the reign and a modified table including preserved specimens per year was produced by Johnston: Johnston (1984), 250. More recently Katsari has built upon the work of Leschhorn to take account of hoard
the civic mints throughout all of Asia Minor is potentially misleading, since, as Leschhorn himself made clear, the pattern of the number of operational mints at any one time varied considerably from region to region. If civic issues displayed relatively confined circulation patterns, it is difficult to determine how an upsurge in coin production in Kilikia might affect significantly the monetary systems of Mysia or the Troas. Of potentially greater significance for our understanding of civic coinages is the fact that its demise was relatively sudden. The peak number of civic mints may have occurred in the Severan period, but a healthy number of cities are still attested in the numismatic record for Gallienus. Leschhorn records 61 active civic mints striking in the name of Gallienus for the regions of Mysia, Troas, Aeolis, Lesbos, Ionia, Karia, Lydia and Phrygia.

934 Leschhorn (1981), 256-258.
935 Our understanding of civic coin circulation patterns is limited by the scarcity of hoard and site evidence. However, MacDonald’s analysis of the site finds from Aphrodisias and selected other cities indicates that civic bronze coins tended to circulate locally: MacDonald (1976), 40-47. The majority of the site finds recorded at Aphrodisias was of Aphrodisian coins. Of the ‘foreign’ coins found in the city, the best represented tended to be located in or around the Maiandros valley: Laodikeia on the Lykos (15), Antiocheia on the Maiandros (27). The exception was the important and prolific mint of Ephesos (22). Coastal cities, for example Phokaia and Erythrai and even inland cities of the Hermos valley (Sardeis) were represented. Even further afield, imperial period issues of Phrygian Eukarpeia and Pisidian Sagalassos were also found. However, the more distant mints tended to be represented by single isolated specimens. Similar local distribution patterns were recorded by Bellinger for Ilion: Bellinger (1961), 156-171. We cannot be sure that all the types recorded from site finds were actually in circulation at their find spot. Some ‘foreign’ coins may not have been acceptable locally and were simply discarded, although it seems reasonable to assume that issues from the most frequently attested ‘foreign’ mints at Aphrodisias were legal tender.

Since it was argued in chapter 3 that eponyms were intimately related to the production of coinage, it might be assumed that the pressures that led to the sudden cessation of civic coinages might be manifested in changes to the strategies of eponym citation from the 250’s. However, in the majority of cases there is little evidence for the decline in civic coinage affecting significantly the ways in which eponyms were presented. At Thyateira eponyms continued to be attested on coinage until the end of the mint and similar patterns are attested at Magnesia on the Maiandros and Smyrna. Thus far, these are the only mints for which comprehensive corpora have been assembled, but similar patterns are visible even in the partial evidence available for other mints.

The only significant change in eponym citation strategy in the third century is the disappearance of the ἀνέθηκεν and dative ethnic dedication formulae. The relative decline of a formulae with connotations of private financing may be a sign that the elite strata were reluctant to invest their resources into the production of coinage at this time.


938 The number of mints continuing to cite eponyms according to the local tradition is too vast to recount fully. However, the patterns displayed by the Lydian mints of Blaundos, Ioulia Gordos and Nysa may be taken as representative of this process. All these cities continued to cite eponyms until the end of their civic mints in the joint reign of Valerian and Gallienus or the sole reign of Gallienus: BMC Lydia xli-xlii (Blaundos), xlviii-xl (Daldis), lvi (Ioulia Gordos), and lxxxi-lxxxii (Nysa). The pattern at these mints is particularly clear because they continue to produce high denomination coinage until relatively late into the third century. Elsewhere, where coinage was produced only intermittently, the pattern may not be so clearly distinguishable. For example, the mint of Appia in Phrygia was sporadically active from Nero to Philip, but even here the name of an eponym with the ἐπὶ + genitive formula was employed on the final issue of coinage under Philip: von Aulock (1980), 48-50, 100-104. The picture is often much less clear-cut in Phrygia, where the patterns of eponym citation were subject to significant local variation. This tendency is exemplified by the case of Laodikeia, where eponyms ceased to be a regular feature of the coinage after the issue of Ailios Pigres: page 182. Similar patterns are visible elsewhere in Phrygia. At Hyrgaleis the final eponym to appear on the coinage (with the ἐπὶ + genitive formula) occurs in the reign of Elagabalus. Thereafter the two largest issues were dated by the Sullan era to AD 222 and AD 241: von Aulock (1980), 60-63, 113-118. However, it must be noted that such patterns are not universal, even in Phrygia. Kotiaion, the largest city in Phrygia Salutaris, produced its final issues of coinage in the name of Valerian and Gallienus citing eponyms using the ἐπὶ + genitive formula.

939 See page 82.
This could be the result of a general decline of privately financed coinage, caused by the contemporary climate of economic uncertainly, fuelled by the political instability of the mid third century and localised devastation caused by the Gothic incursions into Asia Minor in the 260’s. It is surely significant that there is a decline in other media of elite beneficence from the mid third century AD. Across Asia Minor there is evidence for a relative dearth of building activity and from this period the number of monumental inscriptions declines dramatically.\textsuperscript{940} The practice of erecting honorific statues continued long into late Antiquity. However, the general pattern of statue dedication displays a massive fall in the number of dedications c. AD 250, and thereafter the number of dedications remains stable until the late sixth/ seventh century AD.\textsuperscript{941} At Aphrodisias these changes were accompanied by a shift in the identities of the individuals driving local civic construction. The limited surviving epigraphic evidence indicates that from the late third century, when large-scale projects occurred in the city, the driving force was the Roman governor, who now was now the dominant figure in the administration of the city.\textsuperscript{942} The situation at Aphrodisias may be distorted by the fact that it was made the metropolis of the province of Karia in the c. AD 301-305, although the city may have already served as the provincial metropolis for the mid third century province of Karia-Phrygia. Therefore it received a high degree of attention from the Roman governor.\textsuperscript{943} However, the general pattern of the development of role of the local elites in civic life is clear. From the late third century there is a decline in elite interest in civic benefaction. Civic coinage continues to be produced on a relatively large scale until Gallienus, but the decline in the deployment of

\textsuperscript{940} Ratté (2001), 124.
\textsuperscript{941} Smith (1999), 173.
\textsuperscript{942} Roueché (1989), xxiv-xxv.
\textsuperscript{943} For a brief overview of the administrative history of the city see Roueché (1989), 15-16.
dedicatory legend formulae may indicate that the elites were less interested in coinage as a medium for the display of civic beneficence.

The local elites of the third quarter of the third century AD may have been slightly less interested in the monumental possibilities of coinage, but local civic coinages continued to be produced until the phenomenon came to a sudden end at some point in the reign of Gallienus and eponyms continued to be a part of this coinage in the province of Asia until the very end. Our best evidence for the monetary problems that precipitated the end of civic coinages is found in the fabric of civic coins themselves and in the evidence of countermarks. Johnston’s study of the denominational systems employed for the Roman provincial coinages of the third century found that the average weight of each denomination fell throughout the century. This process manifested itself in different ways in different regions, although the dominant pattern in Asia was for the diameter to be kept relatively constant, but for the flan to be made thinner. The effect of this process on the actual buying power of local coinages is unclear, although the fact that base metal coinages were by nature fiduciary may have acted to lessen the impact of the gradual decline in weight standards. This relatively stability could not be maintained indefinitely and from the 250’s the denominational patterns in Asia experienced rapid change. In the late 250’s and 260’s in particular even the diameters of civic coinages began to be reduced. In spite of these difficulties the evidence of the countermarks analysed by Johnston indicates that the relative values of the civic denominations of the 250’s were retained, but the situation could not be maintained into the 260’s. The evidence of the countermarks from this period

944 Johnston observed this pattern in the coinages of Chios, Sardeis and Smyrna and found that the model was also applicable to much of the rest of the province. In other regions of Asia Minor Johnston observed different patterns. At Nikaia in Bithynia both the diameter and weight were reduced in a series of revaluations, while in Pamphylia there appears to have been little decline in denominational modules, but a series of new higher denominations was introduced over time: Johnston (2007), 29-30.
indicates that in many Asian cities the value of each denomination in terms of assaria was
doubled. However, this pattern, although common, was not adopted universally across
the province. Johnston found evidence for the development of a new denominational
system based on multiples of three for some coinages scattered across Karia, Phrygia and
Pisidia. Furthermore, the evidence of the countermarks applied to civic coins at Ephesos
and some other cities of the Maiandros valley after AD 260 is anomalous and does not
show the same strong indication of a doubling of values as is found elsewhere in the
province. Such diversity is not in itself threatening to Johnston’s model of
denominational change in this period. Cities appear to have been free to formulate their
own ‘monetary policy’ and so if an important city chose to deal with their monetary
problems on their own terms, we should not be surprised. Moreover, Ephesos was one of
the most important mints and economic centres in the province, and so the choices taken
there are likely to have exerted considerable influence on the actions of the cities located in
its hinterland.

If Johnston’s wider interpretation of the countermark evidence is correct, this
action was most probably a response to the pressure felt by monetary systems across the
Roman world. The difficulty lies in determining the causes and economic impact of this
monetary disruption. The narrative of the monetary history of the Roman denarius and
aureus in the third century AD is well established and there is little point going beyond a
brief description here. In short, the debasement of the silver denarius by the imperial

946 Johnston presents evidence for this system at Eumenia, Termessos, Koana, Pednelissos, Timbriada: Johnston (2007), 80-82.
947 For a full discussion of the evidence see Johnston (2007), 82-93.
authorities had been a standard response to fiscal shortfalls since the first century AD. However, during the third century this process had accelerated and by the reign of Gallienus the silver content of the dominant antoninianus denomination was negligible and even the fineness of the aureus was not unaffected. A certain level of political stability was restored under the rule of Aurelian (AD 270-275) and the government seized the opportunity to reform the coinage. The purity of the gold coinage was restored to the pre-Gallienus levels and a new 5% silver standard for the billon coinage was introduced and the previously ad hoc minting system was put onto a more formal setting by establishment of a network of imperial mints spread across the Empire.

Since Roman imperial coinages had become so heavily debased and were produced on such a massive scale, it might be assumed that chronic inflation was the natural consequence of these developments. If prices across the Empire were rising rapidly throughout this period, then the effect on the motivation to continue the production of civic coinages must have been severe. According to this model, bronze coinage production could not keep pace with rising prices and so became obsolete in a world where imperial coinage was plentiful and had relatively little buying power. Many of the fundamental assumptions underpinning this model are questioned by the work of Rathbone, whose analysis of the papyrological evidence concluded that there was no discernible evidence for substantial inflation in Egypt before AD 274/5, when prices suddenly rose by a factor of 10. Rathbone explained this jump in terms of the negative impact of Aurelian’s currency reform, in

---

948 Walker established that Roman silver coinage underwent a major debasement under Nero: Walker (1976), 25. The analytical technique employed by Walker has subsequently come under some criticism, but the general patterns of debasement he identified are considered sound: Howgego (1995), 118.
950 Burnett (1987), 124.
particular a re-tariffing of the Alexandrian tetradrachm to the aureus. The link between inflation and Aurelian’s currency reforms, especially those relating to the aureus, has not been accepted uncritically. The main problems with assigning these inflationary problems to a single catastrophic monetary reform by Aurelian are outlined by Howgego. However, the work of Rathbone does draw attention to the dangers inherent in assuming that inflation was an automatic response to debasement. Moreover, the lack of any substantial price data for Asia Minor and the rest of the eastern Mediterranean with the exception of Egypt fatally compromise our understanding of the potential role of inflation in the decline of civic coinages. Since Johnston has established that by c. AD 200 civic coinages were predominantly tariffed in terms of assaria, it is difficult to imagine that civic coinages were unaffected by the difficulties that beset imperial coinage during the latter half of the third century AD. In the civic context imperial ‘silver’ and local bronze issues formed part of the same monetary system. In the light of Johnston’s analysis of the countermarks it is probable that as confidence in imperial ‘silver’ currency fell, it became increasingly difficult to maintain the relationship between the local bronze and imperial coinages. Therefore, the production of bronze coinage may have ceased to have been profitable and the value of the issue may no longer have even covered the production costs. Consequently the civic authorities lost interest in the production of new coins. However, our understanding of the chronology, causes and economic effects of this process are undermined by the almost complete absence of evidence relating to the buying power of local and imperial coinage from Asia Minor in this period. In Egypt, where the abundance

---

951 Rathbone (1996), 337. Even before the work of Rathbone, it had already been demonstrated that the evidence for inflation did not follow the trends in debasement neatly. Callu and Crawford did not envisage a massive increase in prices until the late 260’s: Callu (1969), 394-407: Crawford (1975), 566-568, 571.
953 Katsari (2005), 275.
of papyri offers unparalleled insights into daily economic life, Rathbone has shown that prices were remarkably stable until the reign of Aurelian. However, the evidence of civic coinages from Asia Minor may indicate that the cities were already in serious monetary difficulties in the sole reign of Gallienus. Unfortunately, in the absence of a comparable data source for Asia the implications for this crisis on the economic life of the region are obscure.954

Ultimately, all local coinages in the Roman Empire ceased in the course of a series of reforms in the reign of Diocletian. Even the production of the Alexandrian tetradrachm was halted, bringing to an end the monetary system established by Ptolemy I over five centuries earlier.955 The civic coinages of the eastern Roman Empire were doomed as a result of the combination of the economic difficulties of the latter part of the third century AD and the declining interest of the local elites who were responsible for their production. However, over the course of the preceding centuries civic coinages had been a vibrant part of the economic and cultural life of the cities of Asia Minor. In the province of Asia and less frequently in few other regions, eponyms had been an important element of this phenomenon. The study of the individuals cited on civic coinages in addition to the analysis of the patterns of legend formulae can reveal much concerning the economic, social and cultural history of the Roman Empire. The general pattern of eponym citation accords well with the wider socio-political context, in which elite hereditary status groups increasingly monopolised civic offices. These elites employed coinage as a medium

---

954 A recent attempt to understand the relationship between patterns of and imperial and civic coin production was made by Katsari. She argued that the monetary problems of the mid third century AD caused a partial de-monetisation as people turned to bullion to replace the debased third century imperial coinage. As evidence for this she cites the increasing tendency for funerary inscriptions to announce their fines for tomb violence in terms of bullion rather than coinage: Katsari (2005), 270-279.

for the articulation of civic ideology and occasionally personal glorification. Thus the study of civic coinages sheds invaluable light on the complex interactions between the local elites, the formation of civic identity as well as the central role played by these elites in the functioning of the civic economy. This thesis has attempted to answer at least some of the questions raised by this important source of evidence.
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Ioulia Severa (Akoneia), Nero; *RPC* I 3171; 3173; *MAMA* VI 263; 265: *IJO* II 168; Mitchell, *JRS* (1964), 38; Ramsey (1897), 648-50; van Breman (1996), 336 no. 1.

Ioulianus (Ioulia Gordus) Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus; Heuchert 2736-2738 (=Ioulianos Phloros?) *TAM* V 1. No 693.
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T. Iou. Iouli. Lykins (Synnada), Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus; Heuchert 2906; Campanile 95; *MAMA* VI 373.
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Phl. Diomedes (Stratonikeia), 1st/2nd Century AD; *BMC* Karia 42; *ZPE* xli (1981), 189-91; *I.Stratonikeia* 306; 704. 10; p. 154.

Phl. Eisigonos (Sardeis), Vespasian; *RPC* II 1311-1315; *I.Sardeis* 46 (*SEG* XLVI 1523)

(Phl.) Hermolaos (Hypaipa), Trajan Decius; *BMC* Lydia 62; *PIR*² F 286; Campanile 153;

Keil and Premerstein, *Bericht über dritte Reise in Lydien* (1914) no. 91?

Phl. Ioulianos (Ephesos), Antoninus Pius; Heuchert 1666; *I.Ephesos* 674; 674a; 712b; 3033; 3034; 4342; 6.

Phl. Leon (Stratonikeia), Septimius Severus; *BMC* Karia 51; 55; *SNG* Aul 2675; *SNG* Cop 506; *I.Stratonikeia* 403-404?

T. Phl. Leukios Hierax (Hypaipa), Septimius Severus; *SNG* Cop 197; *SNG* Glasgow 1685; *PIR*² F 308; Campanile 154; *OGIS* 712; *I.Ephesos* 435; 436; 3062; 3244 (brother of T. Phl Menandros, son of T. Phl Menandros).

Phl. Paitianos (Philadelphia), Elagabalus; Münsterberg (1914), 81 (= Wien 34220); *TAM* V. 3 1491; p. 78-79.

Phl Praxeas (Philadelphia), Domitian; *RPC* II 1337-1339; Weiss (2005), 64-65; *TAM* V. 3 1453; *I.Ephesos* 236; Robert (1967), 78.
Phl. Preiskos (Akmonia), Septimius Severus; Mionnet IV 31; Imhoof-Blumer (1883), 391 no. 50; BMC Phrygia 62-67; 74; SNG Cop 37; Campanile 92; IGR IV 653.

Phl. Hylas (Daldis), Vespasian; RPC II 1324; Robert (1967), 78.


Markos Oulpious Karminios Klaudianos (Attouda and Trapezopolis), Antoninus Pius (1), Marcus Aurelius (2), first half of the second century AD (3) (Trapezopolis); Heuchert 2150-2151 (1); 2152-2159 (2) (Attouda); 2167-21689 (3) (Trapezopolis); Thonemann and Ertuğrul (2005), 75-86; Pera (1996), 313-322; I.Aph 2007 12.1111.

Regeinos (Miletos), Hadrian; SNG München 771-772; (=L. Malos Regeinos?) I.Didyma 343.10.

M. Sellios (Smyrna), Commodus; Heuchert 1387-1396; (=Sellios Sulla?) Campanile 107; TAM V. 3 1472?

C. Serouianos Kapiton (Akmonia), Nero; RPC I 3170; 3172; MAMA VI 265; Mitchell, JRS (1974), 34; Ramsay (1897), 648-650.

Skopelianos Zeuxi(dos) (Temenothyrai), Marcus Aurelius; Heuchert 2606=2613; IGR IV 615.
Sokrates Demetriou/ Sokrates Eudoxou (Aizanoi), Claudius; *RPC* I 3091-3094; 3099
*MAMA* IX 27; p. 13.

Sos. Charikles (Saïttaï), Septimius Severus/ Caracalla; *BMC* Lydia 50; Winterthur 3880; 3893; *TAM* V. 1 109.

Statilios Attalos (Herakleia Salbake), Antoninus Pius; Heuchert 2178-2180; Robert (1954), 76-7.

Theudianos (Smyrna), Antoninus Pius; Heuchert 1339-1348; *ISmyrna* 697.

Zeuxis (Laodikeia), Augustus; *RPC* I 2893-2894; Strabo XII. 8. 20.
Concordance of Heuchert Numbers.

49. Kyzikos, *RPC* online no. 2336.
50. Kyzikos, *RPC* online no. 2658.
51. Kyzikos, *RPC* online no. 678.
52. Kyzikos, *RPC* online no. 2322.
53. Kyzikos, *RPC* online no. 2321.
55. Kyzikos, *RPC* online no. 13; Imhoof-Blumer (1901), no. 2; *RPC* online no. 677.
125. Kyzikos, *RPC* online no. 2325.
126. Kyzikos, *RPC* online no. 680.
127. Kyzikos, *RPC* online no. 2331.
128. Kyzikos, *RPC* online no. 2524.
164. Kyzikos, *RPC* online no. 709.
371. Hadrianoi, von Fritz, *Die antiken Münzen Mysiens* (1913) 514; Imhoof-Blumer (1901), no. 2; *RPC* online no. 502.
372. Hadrianoi, von Fritz, *Die antiken Münzen Mysiens* 515-517; *BMC* Mysia 6; *RPC* online no. 503.
373. Hadrianoi, von Fritz, *Die antiken Münzen Mysiens* 518; *RPC* online no. 504.
448. Abydos, Scholz *NZ* (1901), 35, no. 26; *RPC* online no. 26.
450. Abydos, *SNG* Tübingen 2525; *RPC* online no. 28.
451. Abydos, *RPC* online no. 1470.
452. Abydos, *RPC* online no. 2476.
453. Abydos, *SNG* Cop 60; *RPC* online no. 2456.
455. Abydos, Imhoof-Blumer *NOMISMA* v (1910), 29 no. 18; *RPC* online no. 30.
456. Abydos, *RPC* online no. 33.
457. Abydos, *RPC* online no. 31.
458. Abydos, *SNG* Aul 1456; *RPC* online no. 1673.
459. Abydos, *RPC* online no. 21.
460. Abydos, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 33 no. 3; *RPC* online no. 2459.
752. Mytilene, Svoronos *RIN* (1908), 320-322; *RPC* online no. 32.
767. Mytilene, Bürchner ZfN (1882), 116; RPC online no. 3145.
768. Mytilene, BMC Lesbos 165; Forrer RBN (1901), 418 no. 1; Bürchner ZfN (1882), 115; RPC online no. 1785.
769. Mytilene, BMC Lesbos 166; RPC online no. 1786.
770. Mytilene, Bürchner ZfN ix (1882), 128; RPC online no. 1813.
771. Mytilene, BMC Lesbos 167; Weber 5693; RPC online no. 1787.
772. Mytilene, BMC Lesbos 174; RPC online no. 1793.
773. Mytilene, RPC online no. 2647.
774. Mytilene, Bürchner ZfN (1882), 129; RPC online no. 2648.
775. Mytilene, BMC Lesbos 164; RPC online no. 1784.
776. Mytilene, BMC Lesbos 173; SNG Cop 407; RPC online no. 1792.
788. Perperene, RPC online no. 3127.
794. Pergamon, Imhoof-Blumer NOMISMA viii (1913), 16 no. 48; RPC online no. 3176.
795. Pergamon, RPC online no. 3178.
796. Pergamon, BMC Mysia 279; RPC online no. 3179.
800. Pergamon, RPC online no. 3290.
801. Pergamon, Webber 5221.
802. Pergamon, Winterthur 2659; RPC online no. 3201.
804. Pergamon, von Fritz Pergamon 89; RPC online no. 3199.
805. Pergamon, Winterthur 2662; RPC online no. 3202.
806. Pergamon, SNG Cop 452; RPC online no. 3297.
807. Pergamon, BMC Mysia 278; RPC online no. 3183.
809. Pergamon, RPC online no. 3187.
810. Pergamon, RPC online no. 3186.
811. Pergamon, RPC online no. 3094.
812. Pergamon, RPC online no. 3097.
813. Pergamon, RPC online no. 3191.
814. Pergamon, SNG Cop 482-483; BMC Mysia 280; RPC online no. 3192.
815. Pergamon, RPC online no. 3193.
816. Pergamon, SNG Aul 1492; SNG Cop 484; BMC Mysia 281; RPC online no. 3195.
817. Pergamon, RPC online no. 3194.
818. Pergamon, RPC online no. 3196.
819. Pergamon, BMC Mysia 284; RPC online no. 3198.
820. Pergamon, BMC Mysia 283; SNG Cop 485; RPC online no. 3197.
821. SNG Aul 7504, Webber 5219.
822. Pergamon, RPC online no. 3185.
823. Pergamon, RPC online no. 3098.
828. Pergamon, McClean 7726; RPC online no. 3206.
829. Pergamon, BMC Mysia 291; RPC online no. 3205.
830. Pergamon, BMC Mysia 291; RPC online no. 3204.
346. Pergamon, RPC online no. 3225.
905. Pergamon, RPC online no. 3262.
907. Pergamon, RPC online no. 3261.
908. Pergamon, BMC Mysia 306; W. Drexler ZfN (1885), 277; ZfN xiv (1887), 94; RPC online no. 3264.
909. Pergamon, SNG Cop 492-493; RPC online no. 3109.
910. Pergamon, BMC Mysia 301; RPC online no. 3108.
911. Pergamon, RPC online no. 3110.
912. Pergamon, RPC online no. 3265.
913. Pergamon, SNG Tübingen 2482; RPC online no. 3266.
914. Pergamon, von Fritz, Die Antiken Münzen von Pergamon 52; RPC online no. 3268.
915. Pergamon, RPC online no. 3269.
916. Pergamon, RPC online no. 3267.
917. Pergamon, SNG Cop 454; Weber 5206; RPC online no. 3286.
1042. Thyateira, RPC online no. 2866.
1043. Thyateira, Hill, NC (1919), 12; RPC online no. 1533.
1044. Thyateira, RPC online no. 1758.
1045. Thyateira, SNG Cop 599; RPC online no. 1536.
1046. Thyateira, RPC online no. 2872.
1047. Thyateira, BMC Lydia 81; RPC online no. 1538.
1048. Thyateira, RPC online no. 2870.
1049. Thyateira, Imhoof-Blumer (1897), 152 no. 16; RPC online no. 1535.
1050. Thyateira, BMC Lydia 79-80; RPC online no. 1537.
1051. Thyateira, BMC Lydia 23 RPC online no. 1560.
1052. Thyateira, RPC online no. 1564.
1053. Thyateira, *SNG* Cop 577; *RPC* online no. 1573.
1054. Thyateira, *BMC* Lydia 78; *RPC* online no. 1534.
1055. Thyateira, *RPC* online no. 2871.
1056. Thyateira, *BMC* Lydia 24; Imhoof-Blumer (1897), 153 no. 17; *RPC* online no. 1561.
1057. Thyateira, *RPC* online no. 1565.
1058. Thyateira, Imhoof-Blumer (1897), 153 no. 18; *RPC* online no. 1551.
1059. Thyateira, *RPC* online no. 2869.
1060. Thyateira, *BMC* Lydia 84; *RPC* online no. 1541.
1061. Thyateira, *RPC* online no. 1542.
1062. Thyateira, *SNG* Cop 576; *RPC* online no. 1572.
1063. Thyateira, *SNG* Cop 604; *RPC* online no. 1558.
1064. Thyateira, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), no. 1; *RPC* online no. 1557.
1065. Thyateira, Imhoof-Blumer (1897), 154 no. 21; *RPC* online no. 1544.
1066. Thyateira, *RPC* online no. 1543.
1067. Thyateira, *RPC* online no. 2874.
1068. Thyateira, *RPC* online no. 2864.
1069. Thyateira, *RPC* online no. 2240.
1070. Thyateira, Imhoof-Blumer (1897), 155 no. 22a; *RPC* online no. 1556.
1071. Thyateira, *RPC* online no. 2877.
1072. Thyateira, *SNG* Cop 600; *RPC* online no. 1547.
1073. Thyateira, *RPC* online no. 2947.
1074. Thyateira, *BMC* Lydia 28; *RPC* online no. 1571.
1075. Thyateira, *RPC* online no. 1548.
1076. Thyateira, *RPC* online no. 2867.
1077. Thyateira, Imhoof-Blumer (1897), 154; *SNG* Aul 3219; *RPC* online no. 1552.
1078. Thyateira, *RPC* online no. 2875.
1079. Thyateira, *RPC* online no. 1568.
1080. Thyateira, *RPC* online no. 2878.
1081. Thyateira, *BMC* Lydia 27; *RPC* online no. 1570.
1082. Thyateira, *BMC* Lydia 26; *RPC* online no. 1569.
1083. Thyateira, *SNG* Lewis 1367; *RPC* online no. 2946.
1084. Thyateira, *SNG* Aul 3218; *RPC* online no. 1555.
1085. Thyateira, *RPC* online no. 2868.
1086. Thyateira, *RPC* online no. 2908.
1087. Thyateira, *BMC* Lydia 82; *RPC* online no.1539.
1088. *RPC* online no. 2865.
1089. Thyateira, *BMC* Lydia 83; *RPC* online no. 1540.
1090. Thyateira, *SNG* Cop 601; *RPC* online no. 1549.
1097. Thyateira, Imhoof-Blumer (1897), 153 no. 19; *RPC* online no. 1553.
1101. Thyateira, Imhoof-Blumer (1897), 149 no. 8; *RPC* online no. 3188.
1102. Thyateira, Imhoof-Blumer (1897), 149 no. 10; *RPC* online no. 3189.
1103. Thyateira, Imhoof-Blumer (1897), 149 no. 9; *RPC* online no. 3189.
1255. Kyme, Drexler *NZ* (1890), 67b; *RPC* online no. 213.
1256. Kyme, Willems *RBN* (1933), 17-21; *RPC* online no. 3309.
1257. Kyme, *BMC* Ionia 141; *RPC* online no. 1085.
1271. Phokaia, *BMC* Ionia 141; *RPC* online no. 1085.
1272. Phokaia, *RPC* online no. 968.
1274. Phokaia, Kenner *NZ* (1973), 39-42; *RPC* online no. 3310.
1275. Phokaia, *BMC* Ionia 139; *RPC* online no. 1082.
1276. Phokaia, *RPC* online no. 2940.
1328. Mostene, A. Dieudonné *RN* (1900), 33 no. 2; *RPC* online no. 1343.
1335. Smyrna, Klose (1987), XLVII D; *RPC* online no. 234.
1337. Smyrna, Klose (1987), XLVII E; *RPC* online no. 236.
1339. Smyrna, Klose (1987), XLVII A; *BMC* Ionia 342-343; *RPC* online no. 237.
1340. Smyrna, Klose (1987), XLIX A a 13; *RPC* online no. 3087.
1341. Smyrna, Klose (1987), XLIX A a 1-12; *BMC* Ionia 346; *RPC* online no. 239.
1342. Smyrna, Klose (1987), XLIX B; *RPC* online no. 240.
1343. Smyrna, Klose (1987), L A c; *RPC* online no. 245.
1344. Smyrna, Klose (1987), L A b; *BMC* Ionia 349; *RPC* online no. 245.
1345. Smyrna, Klose (1987), L A a; *BMC* Ionia 350; *RPC* online no. 243.
1346. Smyrna, Klose (1987), XIII A a; *SNG* Cop 1297; *RPC* online no. 264.
1347. Smyrna, Klose (1987), XIII A b 3-6; *SNG* Cop 1298; *BMC* Ionia 184-185; *RPC* online no. 265.
1348. Smyrna, Klose (1987), XIII A b 7; *RPC* online no. 2928.
1349. Smyrna, Klose (1987), LI A a; *BMC* Ionia 351-352; *RPC* online no. 250.
1350. Smyrna, Klose (1987), LI A; *RPC* online no. 251.
1351. Smyrna, Klose (1987), XLIX C; *SNG* Cop 1369; *RPC* online no. 241.
1352. Smyrna, Klose (1987), L B a 12-13; *RPC* online no. 3088.
1353. Smyrna, Klose (1987), L B a 14-17; *RPC* online no. 246.
1354. Smyrna, Klose (1987), L B c; *RPC* online no. 248.
1355. Smyrna, Klose (1987), L B d; *RPC* online no. 246.
1356. Smyrna, Klose (1987), L B b; *BMC* Ionia 348; *RPC* online no. 247.
1357. Smyrna, Klose (1987), XIV A a; *RPC* online no. 266.
1358. Smyrna, Klose (1987), XIV A b; *SNG* Cop 1299; *RPC* online no. 2928.
1359. Smyrna, Klose (1987), XIV A c; *RPC* online no. 268.
1360. Smyrna, Klose (1987), XIV B a 5-6; *RPC* online no. 269.
1361. Smyrna, Klose (1987), XIV B a 7; *RPC* online no. 270.
1362. Smyrna, Klose (1987), XIV B b; *RPC* online no. 271.
1363. Smyrna, Klose (1987), XIV B c; Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 96 no. 3; *RPC* Online no. 272.
1364. Smyrna, Klose (1987), XIV B d; *RPC* online no. 273.
1365. Smyrna, *RPC* online no. 2943.
1366. Smyrna, *SNG* Tübingen 3230; Klose LXXIX D a; *RPC* online no. 284.
1367. Smyrna, *BMC* Ionia 514; Klose LXXIX E a 2-3; *RPC* online no. 285.
1368. Smyrna, Klose LXXIX E a 4; *RPC* online no. 286.
1369. Smyrna, Klose LXXX C a 1; *BMC* Ionia 515; *RPC* online no. 290.
1370. Smyrna, Klose LXXX C a 2; *BMC* Ionia 516; *RPC* online no. 291.
1371. Smyrna, Klose LXXIX E b; *BMC* Ionia 511; *SNG* Cop 1432; *RPC* online no. 287.
1372. Smyrna, Klose LXXIX E c; *BMC* Ionia 512-513; *RPC* online no. 288.
1516. Ionian League, Gillespie (1956), no. 24; *RPC* online no. 956.
1517. Ionian League, Gillespie (1956), nos. 1-6; *BMC* Ionia 1; Webber 2744; *SNG* Aul 7812; *RPC* online no. 948.
1520. Ionian League, Gillespie (1956), nos. 15-16; *RPC* online no. 955.
1521. Ionian League, *SNG* Aul 7811; *RPC* online no. 951.
1522. Ionian League, *BMC* Ionia 2; Gillespie (1956), nos. 17-20; *SNG* Tübingen 2757; *RPC* online no. 949.
1523. Ionian League, Gillespie (1956), nos. 21-23; *RPC* online no. 2297.
1524. Ionian League, *SNG* Aul 7814; *RPC* online no. 952.
1525. Ionian League, *SNG* Aul 7815; Gillespie (1956), nos. 26-27; *RPC* online no. 954.
1526. Ionian League, Gillespie (1956), no. 28; *RPC* online no. 958.
1527. Ionian League, Gillespie (1956), no. 29; *RPC* online no. 953.
1528. Ionian League, Gillespie (1956), no. 30; Imhoof-Blumer *NOMISMA* vii (1913), 3 no. 8; *RPC* online no. 2318.
1535. Ionian Metropolis, *RPC* online no. 2686.

1784. Nysa, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 178 no. 3; *RPC* online no. 1487.

1798. Nysa, Regling (1913b), 99; *RPC* online no. 1238.

1808. Nysa, Regling (1913b), 87; *BMC* Lydia 40; *SNG* Cop 317.

1820. Nysa, Regling (1913b), 108; *RPC* online no. 2367.

1838. Anineta, Imhoof-Blumer (1897), 24 no. 8; *RPC* online no. 1166.

1839. Anineta, *BMC* Lydia 2; *SNG* Cop 15; Imhoof-Blumer (1897), 15 no. 9; *RPC* online no. 1167.


1916. Miletos, Temporini 353 no. I. 2; *RPC* online no. 3331.

1918. Miletos, *RPC* online no. 2763.

1920. Miletos, *SNG* Tübingen 3097; *RPC* online no. 3326.


1925. Miletos, *BMC* Ionia 159; Temporini 352 no. I. 4; *RPC* online no. 1074.

1928. Miletos, Fontana *RIN* (1975), 140 no. 5; Fontana *RIN* (1988), 82 no. 13; *RPC* online no. 1072.

1929. Miletos, Temporini 354 no. III. 3; *RPC* online no. 2693.

1931. Miletos, Temporini 353 no. II. 2; *RPC* online no. 1159.

1933. Miletos, *BMC* Ionia 169; Temporini 354 no. III. 3; *RPC* online no. 1071.

1934. Miletos, *RPC* online no. 2695.

1936. Miletos, *RPC* online no. 2765.

1938. Temporini 353 no. II. 3; *RPC* online no. 2696.

1940. Miletos, Temporini 354 no. III. 2; *RPC* online no. 2937.

1941. Miletos, Robert (1967), 44, 48; *RPC* online no. 1158.

1942. Miletos, *RPC* online no. 2766.

1972. Kos, *BMC* Karia 215; *RPC* online no. 2308.


1990. Keramos, Robert (1967), 41; *RPC* online no. 869.


1993. Keramos, *BMC* Karia 8; *RPC* online no. 870.

1994. Keramos, *BMC* Karia 49; *RPC* online no. 1510.

1995. Stratonikeia, *RPC* online no. 2737.
2103. Aphrodisias, BMC Karia 106; MacDonald 60; RPC online no. 36.
2104. Aphrodisias, SNG Cop 120; Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 117 no. 19; MacDonald 62; RPC online no. 38.
2105. Aphrodisias, MacDonald 65; RPC online no. 37.
2106. Aphrodisias, BMC Karia 110; MacDonald 61; RPC online no. 39.
2107. Aphrodisias, BMC Karia 108; MacDonald 63; RPC online no. 40.
2108. Aphrodisias, MacDonald 64; RPC online no. 2440.
2109. Aphrodisias, MacDonald 64; RPC online no. 2441.
2110. Aphrodisias, BMC Karia 109, MacDonald 66; RPC online no. 42.
2111. Aphrodisias, MacDonald 65; RPC online no. 2442.
2112. Aphrodisias, BMC Karia 107; MacDonald 65; RPC online no. 41.
2113. Aphrodisias, SNG Cop 98; BMC Karia 28; MacDonald 67; RPC online no. 43.
2114. Aphrodisias, MacDonald 67; RPC online no. 2417.
2115. Aphrodisias, MacDonald 68; RPC online no. 44.
2116. Aphrodisias, MacDonald 68; RPC online no. 2438.
2117. Aphrodisias, BMC Karia 60, MacDonald 68; RPC online no. 2439.
2118. Aphrodisias, MacDonald 69; RPC online no. 45.
2119. Aphrodisias, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 113 no. 8; MacDonald 70; RPC online no. 46.
2137. Aphrodisias, SNG Aul 2440; Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 114 no. 10; MacDonald 135a; RPC online no. 2058.
2150. Attouda, RPC online no. 854.
2151. Attouda, RPC online no. 853.
2152. Attouda, RPC online no. 856.
2153. Attouda, RPC online no. 855.
2154. Attouda, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 124, no. 7; RPC online no. 859.
2155. Attouda, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 124, no. 8; RPC online no. 860.
2156. Attouda, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 125, no. 9; RPC online no. 861.
2157. Attouda, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 125, no. 10; RPC online no. 862.
2158. Attouda, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 125, no. 11; RPC online no. 863.
2159. Attouda, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 125, no. 12; RPC online no. 2739.
2167. Trapezopolis; RPC online no. 2739.
2168. Trapezopolis; BMC Karia 6; RPC online no. 2418.
2169. Trapezopolis; BMC Karia 7; RPC online no. 2419.
2178. Herakleia Salbake, BMC Karia 25; Robert (1954), 220; RPC online no. 899.
2179. Herakleia Salbake, BMC Karia 26; SNG Aul 2551; RPC online no. 900.
2180. Herakleia Salbake, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 132 no. 4; SNG Lewis 1655; RPC online no. 944.
2185. Herakleia Salbake, Robert (1954), 218 n. 1; RPC online no. 2725.
2224. Kidrama, RPC online no. 946.
2225. Kidrama, RPC online no. 873.
2226. Kidrama, BMC Karia 6; RPC online no. 872.
2227. Kidrama, Svoronos JIAN vii (1904), 383 no. 231; RPC online no. 874.
2263. Keratapa Diokaisareia, von Aulock (1980), 502; Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 250 no. 2; RPC online no. 1843.
2284. Kolossai, von Aulock (1987), 580; Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 261 no. 6; RPC online no. 1884.
2300. Laodikeia, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 270 no. 37; RPC online no. 2087.
2301. Laodikeia, SNG Cop 580; RPC online no. 2095.
2302. Laodikeia, BMC Cop 579; BMC Phrygia 207; RPC online no. 2093.
2303. Laodikeia, SNG Lewis 1606; RPC online no. 1485.
2304. Laodikeia, BMC Phrygia 206; RPC online no. 2092.
2305. Laodikeia, RPC online no. 2062.
2306. Laodikeia, RPC online no. 3320.
2307. Laodikeia, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 271 no. 43; RPC online no. 2098.
2308. Laodikeia, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 271 no. 42; RPC online no. 2097.
2309. Laodikeia, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 526 no. 2; RPC online no. 2099.
2310. Laodikeia, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 270 no. 36; RPC online no. 1701.
2311. Laodikeia, Drexler NZ (1889), pl. I. 14; RPC online no. 2137.
2312. Laodikeia, RPC online no. 1700.
2313. Laodikeia, SNG Aul 3821; RPC online no. 2137.
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