

Local Elites and local coinage: Elite Self-Representation on the Provincial Coinage of Asia 31 BC- AD 275.

Robert George Bennett, Wadham College.

Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Oxford: Trinity Term 2010.

Abstract

**Local Elites and local coinage: Elite Self-Representation on the Provincial Coinage of Asia
31 BC- AD 275.**

Robert Bennett, Wadham College.

**Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Oxford:
Trinity Term 2010.**

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.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations	5-11
1. Introduction	12
Critical Survey	18
Structure and Methodology	22
2. Local Elites	26
The Role of the <i>boule</i> in Elite Self-definition	26
Elites and Magistrates in Roman Asia	28
Provincial Offices and Local Coinages	35
Roman Citizenship and Equestrian Status	41
Honorific Titles on Provincial Coinage	45
Conclusion	49
3. Eponyms and the Production of Coinage	51
Eponyms in Hellenistic and Roman Asia	52
Eponyms in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods	57
The Meaning and Significance of Coin Eponyms in the Roman Imperial Period	
A. The Form of Augustan Coin Legend Formulae	65
B. The Development of the <i>ἐπί</i> + genitive formula	68
C. Eponyms and the Financing of Coinage: the Evidence of Epigraphy and the <i>ἀνέθηκεν</i> Formula	76
D. Eponyms and the Financing of Coinage: the Evidence of Alternative Formulae	86

E. Conclusion	109
4. Personalised Iconography	113
Personal Iconography in the Hellenistic Period	113
Personal Iconography in the Roman Imperial Period	121
Conclusion	138
5. The Mints of Laodikeia and Thyateira	150
The City of Thyateira	152
The Coinage and Eponyms of Thyateira	152
The Prosopography of the Eponyms of Thyateira	157
Eponyms and Iconography	166
The ‘Workshop’ System and Thyateira	176
Denomination and the Iconography of Reverse Types	185
The City of Laodikeia	191
Eponyms and Laodikeia	192
The ‘Workshop’ System and Laodikeia	208
Denomination and the Iconography of Types	211
Comparison with Other Mints	213
Conclusion	223
6. Coins and Monumentality	227
Monumentality and Coinage at Rome	227
Monumentality and Coinage in Asia	229
The Origin and Development of the Monumental Mentality in Asia	
Minor	231

Portable Monuments	239
The Context of Coin Production	249
Distributions and Local Coinages: The Epigraphic Record	250
Distributions and Local Coinages: The Numismatic Record	253
Developments in the Hadrianic Period and the Issue of Polemon at Smyrna	255
Distributions and the Pattern of Coin Production	265
Conclusion	269
7. Conclusion	272
Eponyms and Civic Coinage: a Summary	272
Epilogue: Eponyms and the End of Civic Coinage	278
Bibliography	289
Catalogue of Attested Eponyms	321
Concordance of Heuchert Numbers	334
Plates	

Abbreviations

<i>ACGC</i>	C. Kraay, <i>Archaic and Classical Greek Coinage</i> (Oxford 1976).
<i>AM</i>	<i>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung.</i>
<i>BCH</i>	<i>Bulletin de correspondance hellénique.</i>
<i>BMC Aeolis</i>	W. Wroth, <i>Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Troas, Aeolis and Lesbos</i> (London 1894).
<i>BMC Central Greece</i>	R. S. Poole, <i>Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Central Greece (Locris, Phocis, Boeotia and Euboea)</i> (London 1884).
<i>BMC Karia</i>	B. V. Head, <i>Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Caria, Cos, Rhodes.</i> (London 1897).
<i>BMC Ionia</i>	B. V. Head, <i>Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Ionia</i> (London 1892).
<i>BMC Lesbos</i>	W. Wroth, <i>Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Troas, Aeolis and Lesbos</i> (London 1894).
<i>BMC Lydia</i>	B. V. Head, <i>Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Lydia</i> (London 1901).
<i>BMC Mysia</i>	W. Wroth, <i>Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Mysia</i> (London 1892).
<i>BMC Pamphylia</i>	G. F. Hill, <i>Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Lycia, Pamphylia and Pisidia</i> (London 1897).
<i>BMC Peloponnesus</i>	P. Gardner, <i>Catalogue of the Greek Coins, Peloponnesus (excluding Corinth)</i> (London 1887).
<i>BMC Phrygia</i>	B. V. Head, <i>Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Phrygia</i> (London 1906).
Campanile	M. D. Campanile, <i>I sacerdoti del koinon d'Asia (I sec. a.C.-III sec. d.C.): contributo allo studio della romanizzazione delle élites provinciali nell'Oriente greco</i> (Pisa 1994).
<i>CIG</i>	A. Boeckh, <i>Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> (Berlin 1828-1877).
<i>FGrH</i>	F. Jacoby, <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> (Leiden 1950-1963).
Franke and Nollé	P. R. Franke and M. Nollé, <i>Die Homonoia-Münzen Kleinasiens und der thrakischen Randgebiete</i> (1997).

- GRIA R. A. Kearsley and T.V. Evans, *Greeks and Romans in Imperial Asia. Mixed Language Inscriptions and Linguistic Evidence for Cultural Interaction until the end of AD III* (Bonn 2001).
- Halfmann H. Halfmann, *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum: bis zum Ende des 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* (Göttingen 1979).
- Herrmann-Malay P. Herrmann and H. Malay, *New Documents from Lydia* (Vienna 2007).
- Heuchert Heuchert (Thesis): V. Heuchert, *Roman Coins from the Province of Asia in the Antonine Period (AD 138-192)*, Thesis for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Oxford, Michaelmas Term 1997.
- Hunterian G. MacDonald, *Catalogue of Greek Coins in the Hunterian Collection: University of Glasgow. Vol. II. North Western Greece, Central Greece, Southern Greece and Asia Minor* (Glasgow 1901).
- I.Aph 2007 J. Reynolds, C. Roueché, and G. Bodard, *Inscriptions of Aphrodisias* (2007) (<http://insaph.kcl.ac.uk/iaph2007>).
- I.Ask. C. Habicht, *Altertümer von Pergamon VIII. 3: Die Inschriften des Asklepieions* (Berlin 1969).
- I.Didyma A. Rehm, *Didyma. Band II. Die Inschriften* (Berlin 1941).
- I.Ephesos I H. Wankel, *Die Inschriften von Ephesos. Teil I.* (Bonn 1979).
- I.Ephesos II C. Börker and R. Merkelbach, *Die Inschriften von Ephesos. Teil II.* (Bonn 1979).
- I.Ephesos III H. Engelmann, D. Knibbe and R. Merkelbach, *Die Inschriften von Ephesos. Teil III.* (Bonn 1980).
- I.Ephesos IV H. Engelmann, D. Knibbe and R. Merkelbach, *Die Inschriften von Ephesos. Teil IV.* (Bonn 1980).
- I.Ephesos V C. Börker and R. Merkelbach, *Die Inschriften von Ephesos. Teil V.* (Bonn 1980).
- I.Ephesos VII. 1-2 R. Meriç, R. Merkelbach, J. Nollé, S. Şahin, *Die Inschriften von Ephesos. Teil VII.* (Bonn 1981).
- I.Erythrai H. Engelmann and R. Merkelbach, *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai. Band I-II* (Bonn 1972-1973).
- IG XII 2 W. R. Paton, *Inscriptiones Graecae XII. Fasc 2. Inscriptiones Lesbi, Nesi, Tenedi* (Berlin 1899).

- IG XII 3 F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *Inscriptiones Graecae XII. Fasc 3. Inscriptiones Symes, Teutlussae, Teli, Nisyri, Astypalaeae, Anaphes, Therae et Therasiae, Pholegandri, Meli, Cimoli* (Berlin 1898).
- IGR IV G. Lafaye, *Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes. Tome IV* (Paris 1927).
- IGUrbRom L. Moretti, *Inscriptiones Graecae Urbis Romae. Vol. I* (Rome 1968).
- I.Hadrianeia E. Schwertheim, *Die Inschriften von Hadrianoi und Hadrianeia* (Bonn 1987).
- I.Ilion P. Frisch, *Die Inschriften von Ilion* (Bonn 1975).
- IJO W. Ameling, *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis. Band II. Kleinasien* (Tübingen 2004).
- I.Lampsakos P. Frisch, *Die Inschriften von Lampsakos* (Bonn 1978).
- I.Laodikeia T. Corsten, *Die Inschriften von Laodikeia am Lykos* (Bonn 1997).
- I.Keramos E. Varinlioglu, *Die Inschriften von Keramos* (Bonn 1986).
- I.Kibyra T. Corsten, *Die Inschriften von Kibyra Teil. I.* (Bonn 2002).
- I.Kyzikos E. Schwertheim, *Die Inschriften von Kyzikos und Umgebung. Band I-II* (Bonn 1980-1983).
- IM *Istanbuler Mitteilungen.*
- I.Magnesia O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander* (Berlin 1900).
- I.Mylasa W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Mylasa* (Bonn 1988).
- I.Pergamon M. Fränkel, *Die Inschriften von Pergamon* (Berlin 1895).
- I.Perge S. Şahin, *Die Inschriften von Perge. Teil. 1. Vorrömische Zeit, frühe und hohe Kaiserzeit. Teil. 2. Historische Texte aus dem 3. Jhd. n. Chr. Grabtexte aus den 1-3. Jahrhunderten der römischen Kaiserzeit. Fragmente* (Bonn 1999).
- I.Priene F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *Inschriften von Priene* (Berlin 1906).
- I.Sardeis W. H. Buckler and D. N. Robinson, *Sardis VII. Greek and Latin Inscriptions* (Leiden 1932).
- I.Side J. Nollé, *Side im Altertum: Geschichte und Zeugnisse. Band. 1. Geographie, Geschichte, Testimonia, griechische und lateinische Inschriften* (Bonn 1993).
- I.Smyrna G. Petzl, *Inschriften von Smyrna. Band I-II* (Bonn 1982-1990).

- I.Stratonikeia* M. Çetin Şahin, *Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia, Teil.I. Panamara Teil. II. 1. Lagina, Stratonikeia und Umgebung Teil. II. 2. Neue Inschriften und Indices. In Zusammen-arbeit mit Arminda Lozano-Velilla von Arminda Lozano-Velilla. Teil.3. The Inscriptions of Stratonikeia* (Bonn 1981-2010).
- I.Tralleis* F. Poljakov, *Die Inschriften von Tralleis und Nysa* (Bonn 1989).
- JIAN* *Journal international d'archéologie numismatique.*
- JHS* *Journal of Hellenic Studies.*
- Jöai* *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien.*
- LIMC* *Lexikon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae V.* (Munich 1990).
- MacDonald* D. MacDonald, *The Coinage of Aphrodisias* (London 1992).
- MAMA V* C. W. Cox and A. Cameron, *Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua. V. Monuments from Dorylaeum and Nacolea* (Manchester 1937).
- MAMA VI* W. H. Buckler and W. M. Calder, *Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua. VI. Monuments and documents from Phrygia and Caria* (Manchester 1939).
- MAMA VII* W. M. Calder, *Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua. VII. Monuments from Eastern Phrygia* (Manchester 1956).
- MAMA VIII* W. M. Calder ad J. M. R. Cormack, *Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua. VIII Monuments from Lycaonia, the Pisido-Phrygian borderland, Aphrodisias* (Manchester 1962).
- MAMA IX* B. Levick, S. Mitchell, J. Potter and M. Waelkens, *Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua. IX. Monuments from the Aezanitis* (London 1988).
- MAMA X* B. Levick, S. Mitchell, J. Potter and M. Waelkens, *Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua. X. Monuments from Appia and the Upper Tembris Valley, Cotiaeum, Cadi, Synaus, Ancyra and Tiberiopolis* (London 1993).
- Milne* G. Milne, 'Kolophon and its Coinage: a Study', *Numismatic Notes and Monographs* xcvi (1941), 1-113.
- McClellan* S. W. Grosse, *Catalogue of the McClellan Collection of Greek Coins. Vol. III. Asia Minor* (Cambridge 1929).
- Milet* P. Herrmann, *Milet IV. Inschriften von Milet. Teil I-III* (Berlin 1997-2006).

Mionnet IV	T. E. Mionnet, <i>Description de médailles antiques, grecques et romaines. Tome IV</i> (Paris 1809).
Mionnet Supp. VII	T. E. Mionnet, <i>Description de médailles antiques, grecques et romaines. Supplément Tome VII</i> (Paris 1837).
NC	<i>Numismatic Chronicle</i> .
NZ	<i>Numismatische Zeitschrift</i> .
OGIS	W. Dittenberger, <i>Orientalis graeci inscriptiones selectae</i> (Leipzig 1903-1905).
OMS VI	L. Robert, <i>Opera minora selecta: épigraphie et antiquités grecques</i> (Amsterdam 1989).
PIR ²	<i>Prosopographia Imperii Romani. editio altera. Pars I-IV</i> (Leipzig 1933-1998).
P.Mich	<i>Michigan Papyri</i> .
RBN	<i>Revue Belge de Numismatique</i> .
REG	<i>Revue des études grecques</i> .
RIC	H. Mattingly, E.A. Sydenham, P. H. Webb, C. H. V. Sutherland, J. W. E. Pearce, R. A. G. Carson, <i>The Roman Imperial Coinage Volumes. I-IX</i> (London 1923-1951) and I. A. Carradice and T. V. Buttrey, <i>The Roman Imperial Coinage. Volume II, part 1, From AD 69-96, Vespasian to Domitian</i> (London 2007).
RIN	<i>Rivista Italiana di Numismatica</i> .
RN	<i>Revue numismatique</i> .
RPC I	A. Burnett, M. Amandry and P. P. Ripollès, <i>Roman Provincial Coinage Vol. I: From the Death of Caesar to the Death of Vitellius (44 BC- AD 69)</i> , (Paris and London 1992).
RPC II	A. Burnett, M. Amandry and I. Carradice, <i>Roman Provincial Coinage Vol II. From Vespasian to Domitian (AD 69-96)</i> , (Paris and London 1999).
RPC VII	M. Spoerri Butcher, <i>Roman Provincial Coinage vol. VII: de Gordien I^{er} à Gordien III (238- 244 après J-C) I. Province d'Asie</i> (Paris and London 2006).
RRC	M. H. Crawford, <i>Roman Republican Coinage</i> (London 1974).

- Schultz S. Schultz, *Die Münzprägung von Magnesia am Mäander in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Berlin 1975).
- SEG *Supplementum epigraphicum graecum.*
- SNG Aul H. R. Baldus, D. Klose and W. Leschhorn, *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum Deutschland, Sammlung Hans von Aulock* (Berlin 1957-1968).
- SNG Cop *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. The Royal Collection of Coin and Medals of the Danish National Museum* (Copenhagen 1943-1986).
- SNG France 5 E. Levante, *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum France 5. Mysie* (Paris 2001).
- SNG Glasgow J. Goddard, *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. The Hunterian Museum, the University of Glasgow. Part I. Roman Provincial Coins, Spain, Kingdoms of Asia Minor* (Oxford 2004).
- SNG Leake *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, Fitzwilliam Museum. Leake and General Collections* (Oxford 1965).
- SNG Leypold W. Szaivert and C. Daburon, *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, Österreich Sammlung Leypold, Kleinasiatischen Münzen der Kaiserzeit* (Vienna 2004).
- SNG Lewis I. A. Carradice, *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, The Lewis Collection in Corpus Christi College Cambridge* (Oxford 1971-1991).
- SNG München R. Franke und H. Küthmann, *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum Deutschland, Staatliche Münzsammlung München* (Munich 1989-1997).
- SNG Pfälzer J. Nollé, *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum Deutschland. Pfälzer Privatsammlung. Band IV* (Munich 1993).
- SNG Tübingen D. Mannsperger, *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum Deutschland, Münzsammlung der Universität Tübingen* (Berlin 1989-1998).
- SNR *Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau.*
- Stumpf G. R. Stumpf, *Numismatische Studien zur Chronologie der römischen Statthalter in Kleinasien (122 v. Chr.-163 n. Chr.)* (Saarbrücken 1991).
- TAM II. A. Hoelder, *Tituli Asiae Minoris. Volumen II. Tituli Lyciae: linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti. Fasc. 1-3* (Vienna 1920-1944).

- TAM V. 1 P. Herrmann, *Tituli Asiae Minoris. Volumen V. Tituli Lydiae: linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti. Fasc. 1. Regio septentrionalis ad orientem vergens* (Vienna 1981).
- TAM V. 2 P. Herrmann (ed.), *Tituli Asiae Minoris. Volumen V. Tituli Lydiae: linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti. Fasc. 2. Regio septentrionalis ad occidentem vergens* (Vienna 1989).
- TAM V. 3 G. Petzl, *Tituli Asiae Minoris. Volumen V. Tituli Lydiae: linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti. Fasc. 3. Philadelpheia et Ager Philadelphenus* (Vienna 2007).
- Wadd E. Babelon, *Inventaire sommaire de la collection Waddington, acquise par l'état en 1897 pour le Département des médailles et antiques de la Bibliothèque nationale* (Paris 1898).
- Weber L. Forrer, *Descriptive Catalogue of the Collection of Greek Coins formed by Sir Hermann Weber 1823-1918. Vol. III. Part I. Asia* (London 1926).
- Winterthur H. Bloesch, *Griechische Münzen in Winterthur in Winterthur (Münzkabinetts der Stadt Winterthur). Band I-II* (Winterthur 1987).
- ZfN *Zeitschrift für Numismatik.*
- ZPE *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik.*

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.

² Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 18-19.

³ Leschhorn (1981), 252-262, Heuchert (2005), 33, Howgego (1985), 98.

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.⁷ 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.⁸

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 Byzantium, which appears to have adorned its coinage with the names of local office holders: Schönert-Geiss (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 Kerreinios 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. 117-138.¹¹ 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.¹² 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.¹³ Groups of letters, which have been interpreted as abbreviated names and very occasionally full names are recorded on civic coinage from Kilikia and Syria.¹⁴ 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 (Elaioussa 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 the at least the sixth century BC.¹⁵ Therefore the Syrian and Kilikian abbreviations indicate the continuation of these practices long into the Roman imperial period.¹⁶

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

¹⁵ See pages 46-64.

¹⁶ 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-Claudian¹⁸ and Flavian¹⁹ 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.

¹⁸ Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992).

¹⁹ Burnett, Amandry and Carradice (1999).

²⁰ Spoerri Butcher (2006).

individual cities were available.²¹ For the periods currently not covered by the *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.²² However, the work of Münsterberg has now been superseded by the publication of the second volume of Leschhorn's '*Lexikon der Aufschriften auf Griechischen Münzen. Band II Ethnika und Beamtennamen*', which provides a catalogue of known coin eponyms along with references to published specimens.²³ However, some caution is required when using this resource, since Leschhorn is writing before the full publication of the relevant *RPC* volumes. In some cases he is forced to follow the unreliable readings of the early 19th 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 *RPC* project has provided considerable impetus for the analysis of the function and significance of coin eponyms.²⁴ The introductory sections of the published *RPC* I, *RPC* II and *RPC* VII

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 (Schönert-Geiss (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).

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 *strategos* L. Aurelios for Kyzikos and he overlooked completely the eponym Glykon from Perperene: Münsterberg (1914), 66.

²³ Leschhorn (2009).

²⁴ Much of Lenormant's late 19th 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 *Lydische Stadtmünzen* and *Kleinasiatische Münzen*, which established the correct readings of many coin legends: Imhoof-Blumer (1897), (1901). Head's introductions to the *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: *BMC* Lydia xxiii-cl and *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.²⁵ 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.²⁶ 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 *αἰτησάμενος* legend formula.²⁷ The function of the *αἰτησάμενος* legend formula was also the subject of an important article by Johannes Nollé, which independently arrived at similar conclusion.²⁸ 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.²⁹

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

and two books pertaining to the study of Roman provincial coinage. Of particular importance is his 1967 book on Greek coins and their types, legends, eponyms and geography: Robert (1967).

²⁵ Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 1-5 and Burnett, Amandry and Carradice (1999), 1-7.

²⁶ Weiss (2005), 57-68.

²⁷ Weiss (1984), 179-195, (1990), 221-237, (2004), 179-200 (culture and iconography), (1992), 197-180, (2002), 241- 254 (legend formulae).

²⁸ Nollé (1993), 487-504.

²⁹ 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.

³⁰ Johnston (2007).

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.

³⁴ Johnston (1974), 203-7, (1982-3), 59-78, (1995), 49-61.

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 *stratego*i 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 *PIR*² and Campanile's index of known *asiarches*, were also consulted.³⁵ 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 *gentilicium* 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 inscriptional 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 dependent 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 *boulai* 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.³⁷ 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*.³⁸ 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.³⁹ Epigraphic sources increasingly treat council membership as a mark of social

³⁷ The legal rights and privileges enjoyed by the bouletic 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* xlvi, 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.⁴⁰ 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.⁴¹ 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.⁴² Certainly, by the reign of Trajan entrance fees for the *boule* do not seem to have been universal in neighbouring Pontus-Bithynia.⁴³

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.Ephesos* III 622 (1st century AD); 679 (3rd century AD); *I.Tralleis* 114. For the phrase 'son of the councillor' at Ephesos see *I.Ephesos* IV 1044 (Ant. Pius), cf. *I.Ephesos* IV 1033.12; for the phrase 'son of the prytanis' (c. AD 130-40).

⁴² Quass (1993), 387; Dmitriev (2005), 154-6; *I.Ephesos* 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'.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.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 $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ + the genitive legend formula (in the time of) from the mid first century AD.⁴⁶ In cases which omit the $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ + the genitive formula the meaning of abbreviations such as *stra* or *arch* is more ambiguous. Such abbreviations may refer simply to the offices of the *strategos* and *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 *arxas* (ex-*archon*) is attested at Keramos from Nero to Caracalla.⁴⁷ However, such titles are rare and in the light of the near ubiquity of the $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ + 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

⁴⁴ For example see *I.Aph* 2007 11.508 and *I.Smyrna* 247.

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

⁴⁶ This situation is made more confusing by the occasional use of the $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ + the genitive formula without the addition of an office: for example at Aizanoi under Caligula all eponyms use the $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ + the genitive formula, but only Nannas gives any indication of office (*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 *RPC* I 2469).

⁴⁷ Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 676.

commonly attested office is that of the *strategos* (general).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.⁴⁹ The title *agonothetes* (a supervisor of a festival competition) occurs just once at Perperene (788).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 *hipparches* 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 Prynnessos (Herak. Nige: 2926-8).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*,

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

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.

⁵⁰ All Antonine period coin references refer to Heuchert thesis numbers.

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: *stratego*i 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 *stratego*i 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 *stratego*i 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 *stratego*i 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.⁵⁶ The same broad trends witnessed in the Hellenistic period continued into the era of Roman domination. The influence of the *strategoï* 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. *Strategoï*, in this case a college of five, are not attested at Ephesos until the provincial period.⁵⁷ However, the general trend is clear: the role of the *strategoï* continued to expand into non-military areas. In early second century the *strategoï* 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.⁵⁸ 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.⁵⁹

It is also apparent that the social prestige connected to the *strategoï* 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.⁶⁰ Such acts of munificence or the formal promise of acts of munificence to the city could precede the term of office. [Klaudios] Terentios Longeinus

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 *strategoï* make proclamation concerning the crowns, 2nd cent. BC); *I.Erythrai* 507. 68-70 (a *psephisma* for Magnesia records that the polemarch, *strategoï* and the *tamias* are to take concern for the treatment of foreign guests, 206 BC); *I.Ilion* 32, 29-30 (*strategoï* take part in sacrificial rites c. 280 BC); *I.Lampsakos* 9. 15-16 (*strategoï* 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).

⁵⁹ Dmitriev (2005), 120-1, 126-9.

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.⁶¹ 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.⁶² 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 *strategoī* 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*.⁶³ 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 ἀρχ α on coinage often designated the president of the board of *strategoī*.⁶⁴ This proposition is supported by ample numismatic and epigraphic evidence.⁶⁵ 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, Apollonshieron, Attia, Blaundos, Kadi, Keramos, Chios, Kolossai, Kotiaeion, Kyzikos, Daldis, Dokimeion, Germe, Hadrianeia, Hireokaiseria, Hyllanis, Hyrkanis, Hygalea, Ioulia Gordos, Maionia, Midaion, Miletropolis, Miletos, Mostene, Myrina, Otros, Philadelphia, Poemanion, Saittai, Sala, Sardeis, Silandos, 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 Aurelios Ainius at Magnesia on the Sipylus, Aur. Papias at Blaundos under Trebonianus Gallus and Kl. Hestaios at Kyzikos under Antoninus Pius (Imhoof-Blumer (1897) nos. 12-13; *BMC Lydia* 89-91, Ramsay (1895), 600, Heuchert 49-54). The formula '[στρα]τηγούτων τῶν [περὶ] Εὐξενον Ἀπολ[λωνίου? ἀρ]χόντων' 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.⁶⁶ Thus in the majority of cases, formulae such as ‘ἀρχ α τὸ β (*protos archon for the second time*)’, may be regarded as indicating the president of the board of *strategoi*.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*.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’.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

Severus Alexander). Yet in *TAM V* 2 990, 11-12, he is identified as the eponymous *protos archon*. However, the bottom of this text is missing and so the possibility that Pollios’ generalship was a separate office cannot be discounted. At Aizanoi, Aurelios Euphemos is recorded as holding the office of *τὴν πρώτην ἀρχὴν στρατηγήσαντα δις*: (*MAMA IX*, 29, 6-8, post AD 212). The title ‘*στρατηγοῦ πρώτου*’ is separately attested at Aizanoi and so the two titles must have been in simultaneous usage (*MAMA IX* 17, 13 c. AD 212). Moreover, *Dig xxvii*, 15. 9 treats the two titles as equivalent: *ὁ τῆς πόλεως ἀρχων, τοῦτ’ ἔστιν ὁ στρατηγός*.

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), Phl. Eisigonos (*stra*), Ti Kl. Phil(e)inos (*stra*) (AD 69-79), T. Phl. 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. Roupfos (*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. Phl. Phronton (*arch*) (AD 193-217), T. Ioul. Alkimachos (*arch a*) (AD 217-218), G. Sal. Klaudianos (*arch a*), Soulpikios Hermophilos (*arch a*) (AD 218-222), Soulp. Hermophilos (*arch a*), Roupfinos (*arch a*) Aur. Damianos (*stra*), G. Asin Neikomachos (*arch*), Sep. Menestratianos (*arch a*) (AD 235-238), Aur. Roupheinos (*arch a*), Iou. Soul. Hermophilos (*arch a*) (AD 238-244), Aur. Herakleidianos (*stra*), P. Kor. Akylas (*arch a*), Dom. Roupfos (*asiarches* and *arch a*) (AD 253-268): Leschhorn (2009), 1059 cf. *BMC Lydia* ci-cvi.

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.

⁶⁸ For example the term is used to refer to magistrates of Sardeis in a letter of Augustus: *I.Sardeis* 8, 23.

⁶⁹ *IGR IV* 792, AD 45/6 cf. *IGR IV* 704 (Synnada).

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 *strategoï* 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 *strategoï*.

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.⁷⁰ 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.⁷¹ 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 ‘οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ δῆμοι καὶ τὰ ἔθνη’ 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.⁷² 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.⁷³

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.⁷⁴ This view has been challenged by some who argue that we are in fact dealing with two entirely separate offices.⁷⁵ This is potentially significant because the term *asiarches* is more frequently attested on coinage than *archiereis Asias*.⁷⁶ 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 ναῶν 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*.⁷⁷ 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.⁷⁸ At first glance this legend would lend credence to the argument of Friesen that the title *asiarches* was in fact a civic distinction.⁷⁹ 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 ΠΑΤΡΙΔ’.⁸⁰ If this is the case, then Weiss has argued that ‘Κ’ was probably an abbreviation of ‘ΚΑΙ’. Thus we may be dealing a variation of the common formula ἀρχιερεὺς 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.⁸¹

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. Gaius 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.⁸² 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.⁸³ 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 Okokleia.⁸⁴ However, on each of these occasions a variant legend type is also attested, which while using the *ἐπί* formula bears no indication of office.⁸⁵ 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 177-180.⁸⁶ 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 ΚΙΔΗΣΣΕΩ (AD 178-182, Heuchert 2887-2888); Themistokles: ΕΠΙ ΑΙΑ ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΑΣΙΑΡΧ ΜΙΑΗΣΩΝ (AD 161-9, Heuchert 1928); Kalobrotos: ΕΠΙ ΚΑ ΚΑΛΩΒΡΟΤΟΥ ΑΣΙΑΡ ΟΚΟΚΛΙΗΝΩΝ (AD 178-182?, Heuchert 2844).

⁸⁵ For example the legend ΕΠΙ ΑΙΑ ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΜΙΑΗΣΙ 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 23-6.⁸⁷ 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 Sardinian, 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.⁸⁸ If this issue was indeed Sardinian, then why was it produced in the name of *koinon Asias* and not the city? In this case it is 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

⁸⁷ *RPC* I 2994 (Plate XLVIII. 2).

⁸⁸ Since this issue was produced in the name of the *koinon Asias* the Sardinian 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.⁸⁹ 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*.⁹⁰

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.⁹¹ 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 ΣΑΡΔΙΑΝΩΝ (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* 1 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. Aristas (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 *gentilicium* 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 *gentilicium*. Similarly, the names Epaphroditos (Hadraneia), Menekrates (Dioshieron), Eirenaios (Nysa), Philetos (Tralleis), Amarantos Moschion, Antiochos, Demes, Demokrates, Hermeros, Pammenes, Philoumenos, Photeinos (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 *gentilicium*, 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, Kotiaieion,

name Kourtos is also attested on the Pergamene coinage of this period, but this appears to be a Hellenised version of the Latin name Quartus: Heuchert 809-20.

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* 1 2912-16, 2928.

⁹⁶ Spoerri-Butcher (2006), 49-52.

Synnada, Ioulia Gordos, Magnesia on the Sipylus, Aphrodisias, Pergamon and Smyrna.⁹⁷ 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.⁹⁸ Indeed, elites of the province of Asia had been acquiring equestrian and even senatorial status since at least the Augustan period.⁹⁹ 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 109/10.¹⁰⁰ The career of Quadratus was clearly exceptional, but it provides a

⁹⁷ Thyateira: M. Aur. Diadochos (Macrinus, *BMC Lydia* 110; Mionnet Supp VII 624): Klo. Dionysios (Elagabalus, Imhoof-Blumer (1915), 96): G. Arountios Antoneinos (Severus Alexander, Imhoof-Blumer (1915), 96). Prymnessos: *arch Niger(ino) hippiko to b* (Gallienus: Imhoof-Blumer (1915), 97). Saittai: Ai. Attalianos (Gordian III: *RPC* VII 907-909). Apameia: P. Ail. Tryphon (AD 222-235, *BMC Phrygia* 118, 179-80; *SNG Aul* 305-7). Kotiaion: Ioul. Kodratos (AD 244-68, *BMC Phrygia* 74-77): P. Ail. Demetrianos (*SNG Aul* 3774; *SNG Cop* 335-340). Prymnessos: Nigeri(on?) (Gallienus, *BMC Phrygia* 35). Synnada: Aur. Tlepolemos (Trajan Decius, Wadd 6553, *BMC Phrygia* 28, 59-60). Ioulia Gordos: Aur. Ail. Phoibos (Valerian/Gallienus, *SNG München* 197; *BMC Lydia* 45-46 cf. 47-48 (The case of Aur. Phoibos of Ioulia Gordos is of particular interest because Phoibos grandly not only assumed the title of *hippikos*, but also proclaimed his close connections to the senatorial order (ΣΥΝΓ(ΕΝΟΥ) ΣΥΝΚΛΗ(ΤΙΚΩΝ), ‘kinsman of senators’) *BMC Lydia* 45). Magnesia: Aur. Ainos (AD 244-9, *BMC Lydia* 83, 89; Imhoof-Blumer (1897), 92, nos. 12-13). Saittai: Aur. Ail. Attalianos (AD 244-9, *BMC Lydia* 22, 58; Imhoof-Blumer (1897) 130 no. 13; *SNG Aul* 8243). Pergamon: Kl. Glykon (AD 238-244, *BMC Mysia* 341). Smyrna: Philetos (AD 253-60, Klose (1987), 196-7, 314-16). Aphrodisias: P. Ant. Kelsos (AD 255-68, MacDonald (1992), 42 type 221).

⁹⁸At 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 Thyateiran 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 Akmoneia produced the senator L. Servenius Cornutus (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.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(laud)ia Basilo).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 *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 *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 be the result of the elite’s desire to further differentiate themselves from the mass of the citizen population in the wake of the *constitutio Antoniniana* granting Roman citizen status to all free born individuals.

¹⁰¹ See also the case of Celsus Polemaenus, another Asian senator contemporary with Quadratus: Magie (1950), 578.

¹⁰² *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

¹⁰³ The title 'high priest' appears on the coinage of Hermippos son of Hermogenes at Philadelphia: *BMC Lydia* 13-16 (second century BC).

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 (ΦΟΥΠΙ[]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 *υἰὸς/θυγάτηρ τῆς πόλεως*, and *υἰὸς* with the genitive plural of the community and (once) *son of the demos* are attested on coinage.¹⁰⁸ The title of *philaletes* (*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

title *philopatris*); Prymnessos *RPC* I 3199 (Artas); Smyrna *RPC* I 2479 (Aulos Gessios); Temnos *RPC* II 980 [Hagnos Philopatris; Teos *RPC* II 1038.

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 Kotiaecion, the titles ‘*the son of the city*’ and ‘*the son of Kotiaeciens*’ appears just once, for the eponym Varus (*RPC* I 3220-1 c. AD 50-54). The eponym Antonios Zenon of Laodikeia produced *homonioia* an issue with Smyrna with the confusing legend: ANTΩ ZHNΩNOC ZHNΩN YIOΣ ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΩΝ ZYMPNIΩN OMHPOΣ. 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 ‘ZYMPNIΩN OMHPOΣ’ was an acclamation signifying the alliance of the two communities: Canali De Rossi (2007), 140 (for a discussion of the later *homonioia* 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.¹¹³ There is no indication of any connection between the priest Tiberios Klaudios Athenodotos and the medical school of Laodikeia. Consequently, it is possible that *philaletes* 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.¹¹⁴ The most notable of these were the titles *philokaisar* (*friend of the Caesar*) and *philosebastos* (*friend of the Augustus*).¹¹⁵ 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.¹¹⁶ Furthermore, the title of *sophist* is attested on three separate occasions at

¹¹³ Τιβέριον Κλαύδιον Τρύφωνος υἱὸν, Κυρίνα, Ἀθηνόδοτον [Φι]λι[α]λήθη, ἱερέα Προπυλαίων 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 *bouletes* 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: ΑΙΓΑΕΩΝ [ΕΠΙ ΔΕΙ]ΦΙΛΑΟΥ ΟΛΥΠΠΙΩΝΕΙ (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 ΕΠ ΠΕΙΟΥ ΟΛΥΜ 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 Smyranean 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 ΣΜΥΡ ΛΑΟ (*Attalos (the) sophist to his fatherlands Smyr[na and] Lao[dikeia]*): 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

However the types of Hermogenes are differentiated by the addition of a victory palm in the left field. Four of the types of Apollonios depict Apollo holding a taenia and laurel branch: Robert (1967), 51.

¹¹⁷ Attalos (c. AD 175-7 Heuchert 1365-72) and Kl. Proklos (c. AD 161-9 1349-64).

¹¹⁸ Klose (1987), 268-9.

¹¹⁹ *I.Smyrna* II, 1 602, cf. 771 (between AD 198-209) cf. Puech (2002), 438.

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.¹²¹ Consequently, Smyrna would have enjoyed a usual concentration of sophists, from whose ranks coin eponyms could be drawn.¹²² 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 Smyranean 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.¹²³ 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.¹²⁴ Likewise, regions in which eponyms are commonly attested display little evidence for the use of ‘civic eras’ or regnal years to date their coinages.¹²⁵ 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.¹²⁶ At the end of the second

¹²³ Howgego (2005), 8.

¹²⁴ Kushnir-Stein (2005), 161.

¹²⁵ Civic eras 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 Sardeis: 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.¹²⁷ 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 eras.¹²⁸

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.¹²⁹ However, eras were still used as a dating mechanism inside the borders of the province of Asia.¹³⁰ Such eras are frequently attested in inscriptions from Asia during the Imperial

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, lxxii, 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.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.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.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.¹³⁴ All epigraphic references to particular magistracies may be explained by recourse to “*relevant spheres of (often magisterial) responsibility.*”¹³⁵ Weiss has further argued that the formulae commonly used on coin inscriptions conformed to the ‘usual repertoire’ of titlature 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

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 *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.

¹³² Sherk (1990), 249-88.

¹³³ Sherk (1990), 256; cf. Robert *OMS* VI, 606, n. 8.

¹³⁴ Dmitriev (1997), 525-34.

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.'¹³⁸ 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.¹³⁹ 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'*¹⁴⁰

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.¹⁴¹ 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

¹³⁸ Dmitriev (1997), 534.

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. *Stephanephoroi* 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 ἡ 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 Ephesos 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.Ephesos* III 923 and 930 are dated by the formula: ἐπί (name) ἀγορανόμου καὶ πανηγυράρχου τῶν μεγάλων Πασιδέων 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.Didyma* 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 ἐμὶ σῆμα ('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 'N' 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.¹⁴⁵ It is probable that these legends refer to personal names.¹⁴⁶ 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.¹⁴⁷ However, the 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.¹⁴⁸ 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.¹⁴⁹ 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

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.

¹⁴⁶ Wallace (2007), 37-39; for alternative explanations see Wallace (1988), 203-7.

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.

¹⁴⁸ Weidauer (1975), 111: for the identification with Gyges see Browne (2000), 178-9.

¹⁴⁹ *FGrH* 90 F 65: Wallace (2007), 43-44.

moneymakers cannot be definitively ruled out, although there is little evidence to recommend it. It might seem strange for a royal coinage to mention a moneymaker 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.¹⁵⁰ This phase of coinage production was distinguished by the depiction of eight ancillary symbols in addition to the main griffin obverse type.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 an 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 ΝΑΥΚΡΑ[ΤΣ] and ΗΡΑ can be seen as ‘puns’

¹⁵⁰ May (1966), 45-8; cf. Price and Waggoner (1975), 37.

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.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.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.¹⁵⁴ In some cases patronymics are also recorded in coin legends.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.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

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.

¹⁵³ Barron (1966), 44-48.

¹⁵⁴ Robert (1966), 68-78.

¹⁵⁵ For example the case of Theokles, son of Pausanias at Chalcis: Knoepfler (1979), 165-188; cf. Meadows' discussion of the symbols at Stratonikeia in Karia in the Hellenistic period: Meadows (2002), 130-131.

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.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.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.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.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

¹⁵⁷ Barron (1966), 107.

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, Abydos, 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.

¹⁵⁹ Lenormant (1879), 38.

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 Ilias 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 *παρὰ* plus the genitive, *διὰ* plus the genitive, and the verb *ἀνέθηκε*: 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.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 *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.¹⁶⁵ In this respect the prominence of these officials on the coinage is unsurprising. The *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 *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 *agonothetes* from having a role in

¹⁶⁴Martin (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 (*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.

¹⁶⁵Robert (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.¹⁶⁶ 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.¹⁶⁷ Yet Jones was unable to find any instances where the paired eponyms held a dual magistracy contemporaneously.¹⁶⁸ 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.¹⁶⁹ Moreover many of these homonyms could not have been the same person.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*.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.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.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.¹⁷⁴ In addition to these there is often, but not always, a third eponym.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

¹⁶⁹ Regling (1927), 156-8.

¹⁷⁰ For example the name of a third century *stephanephoros* appears on a coin dated to the first century BC: Regling (1927), 166.

¹⁷¹ Regling (1927), 165-166.

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.

¹⁷³ For objections to Thompson’s absolute chronology see Lewis (1962), 275-333.

¹⁷⁴ Thompson (1961), 547-584.

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.¹⁷⁶ We know also that the duration of office for the third eponyms was subject to significant variation.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.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.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.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

¹⁷⁶ Thompson (1961), 590.

¹⁷⁷ Thompson (1961), 591-592.

¹⁷⁸ Kroll came to the same conclusion in his study of the tetrobols of Kos: Kroll (1964), 81-117.

¹⁷⁹ Thompson (1961), 594-5.

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.

been sourced from royal reserves.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.¹⁸²

Prosopographical analysis offers invaluable evidence for our understanding of the relationship between 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.¹⁸³ Lewis' prosopographical arguments for the revised chronology are compelling.¹⁸⁴ To give just one example Thompson dates the issues of king Mithradates

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).

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 *argurokopos* (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.

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.

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. MAKEΔONΩN 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.¹⁸⁵ 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.¹⁸⁶

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

Bruttius Sura, who was a legate in Macedonia during the years 93-7 BC and who provided the previous conventional date for the Roman coinages of Macedonia: Gaebler (1902), 171. The hypothesis of Lewis requires us to identify Sura with P. Cornelius Lentulus Sura (cos. 71 BC), who has no certain connection with the province of Macedonia. This identification is by no means impossible; Lentulus Sura was the brother-in-law of the L. Caesar also mentioned on the Aesillias coinage: Lewis (1962), 298. Lentulus Sura's presence in Macedonia is not supported by any independent evidence, but if one insists on associating Sura with Bruttius Sura, then one must divide the Aesillias coinage into two groups dated twenty years apart (For the coinage of L. Caesar should be dated to the 70's BC and Bruttius Sura was active in Macedonia during the 90's): Mattingly (1979), 157-160. Thus the low chronology of the Aesillias coinage is preferable. Another Athenian New Style coin type was over-struck by a late Lysimachos of Byzantion, but Mattingly has challenged the chronology of this series and so it cannot be used as decisive evidence for the high dating: Mattingly (1979), 151-154.

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'?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.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.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.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

¹⁸⁷ Gauthier (1975), 177-8.

¹⁸⁸ Gauthier (1975), 175.

¹⁸⁹ Thompson (1961), 595.

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 Seleucid 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 Callataj (2006), 58-60.

evolved into a full liturgy.¹⁹¹ However Gauthier's explanation requires that eponyms meant different things in different periods of coin production. It is surely 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.¹⁹² 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 counter measure to fraud.¹⁹³ 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.

¹⁹³ Bellinger (1958), 15-17.

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 ἀναπεισθῆναι 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.¹⁹⁴ 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.¹⁹⁵

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.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.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 *epimeleia* and are described as having discharged this and other benefactions with justice (*dikiosunes*) and love of honour (*philotimian*) (II 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 *τὴν καθήκουσαν... ἐπιμέλειαν* (II. 47). He argued that that term *epimeleia* carried technical significance and should be related to the occasional appearance of the participle *ἐπιμεληθεῖς* on the provincial coinage of Asia in the Roman period. Thus this term *epimeleia* should be understood as “*die sorge für das Münzwesen als Kommissorium ohne Titel*” (The concern for the coins as commissioner without title).¹⁹⁸

However, Jones has argued that in this context the term *epimeleia* had no particular technical resonance and should therefore be translated as “care” or

¹⁹⁶ Mørkholm (1991), 32-33.

¹⁹⁷ Mørkholm (1991), 32.

¹⁹⁸ von Fritz (1907), 1-3.

“diligence”.¹⁹⁹ 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.²⁰⁰ 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 *epimeleia* 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.²⁰¹ 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

¹⁹⁹Jones (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 *οὔτε 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 ὄπλα* (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 ἐπι + genitive formula in the Augustan period (*RPC I* 2398-2400).

BC.²⁰⁵ The second group, dating to c. 5 BC, displayed six eponyms.²⁰⁶ Group III was signed by five eponyms c. 5 AD.²⁰⁷ 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.²⁰⁸ 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.²⁰⁹ 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.²¹⁰ 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).²¹¹ Conversely, the parallels with the practices of eponym

²⁰⁵ Paired eponyms: Zosimus *philopatris* and Charax, Chares Charetos and Kokos. Single eponyms: Byron Byronos, Dorykanos Dioskouridou, Artemon Kodrou, Theokritos Theokritou, A Dryas, Tryphon.

²⁰⁶ Featuring the eponyms; Papias Apellidou, Kokos Pollidos, Diphilos, Heras Epaimetou, Attalos Meilichios 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.

²¹⁰ Harl (1987), 27; Thompson (1961) and Jones (1979), 63-109.

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.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 $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ + genitive formula

Over the course of the prevalence of Julio-Claudian era nominative legend formula went into decline and the $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ + genitive formula rose to prominence. The nature and speed of this change varied according to region and the process was not always uniform. The Sardinian coins in the name of Augustus and Tiberius were signed by an eponym in the nominative case.²¹⁵ From the reign of Nero Sardinian eponyms tend to use the $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ + genitive formula (*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.²¹⁶ By the Claudian period the coins of Philistos and Eikadios were signed using the $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ + genitive formula (*RPC* I 2475-77). Under Nero the coinage of Aulos Gessios Philopatris sees a return to the nominative (*RPC* I 2478-2485 c. AD 54-9), but the later pseudo-

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 Kotiaëion in which three eponyms sign coins under Galba and again under Vespasian, along with a new eponym Ti Klaudios Papylos (*RPC* I 3222-3227 and *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.

²¹⁵ Diodoros Hermophilou (*RPC* I 2986), Damas (*RPC* I 2987), Mousios (*RPC* I 2988), Ioulios Kleon (*RPC* I 2991).

²¹⁶ *RPC* I 2463-2473.

autonomous coins of Hermogenes and Scribonios Klaros use the *ἐπί* 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 *ἐπί* + 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 *ἐπί* + 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 *ἐπί* + 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 Kotiaion produced an issue of coinage bearing three eponyms in the *ἐπί*

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 *ἐπί* may in fact be an abbreviation of the verb *ἐπιμεληθέντος*.

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.

formula.²²² 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*.²²³ 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 Sipylus 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*'.²²⁴ 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

²²² T. Kl. Aretis, Ti Kl. Sekoundos and Ti. Kl. Ouaros: Burnett, Amandry and Carradice (1999), 214-5.

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 $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ + 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*.²²⁸ 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 *stephanephoros*), while the *strategos* was the magistrate actually responsible of the production of the coinage.²²⁹ 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 *stephanephoroi*. 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 *stephanephoros* is still the most likely candidate for the office held by these eponyms.²³⁰ 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.²³¹ The name adorning the obverse and reverse alternate so as to ensure that both eponyms are displayed equally prominently within the wreath.²³² 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.

²²⁹ Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 3, Klose (1987), 64-66.

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 *stephanephoros* Kl. Proklos and *strategos* Kl. Bion, c. AD 100-105, use the abbreviation ‘ΣΤΕ’ for *stephanephoros*.

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 Hieronymos (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.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 *grammateus* Kouron from early first century Mylasa is very similar. This *grammateus* is mentioned on one of the issues in the name of Thlastos: ΘΛΑΣΤΟΣ 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 grammateus.*’

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 ἐπί + 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

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 $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}$ + 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.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.²⁴⁰ The absorption of an irregular *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 *strategos* or *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 *grammateus*, suggests that arrangements for coin production could be influenced by the practice in neighbouring communities.

²³⁹ Harl (1987), 28.

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 *ἀνέθηκεν* 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.²⁴¹ 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.²⁴² 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.²⁴³ 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 Rhodiapolis 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) ΤΡΙΠΙΟΛΑ, ‘*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 (κατασταθεῖς δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς χαράξεως τοῦ λεπτοῦ χαλκοῦ: *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.

²⁴⁴ Howgego (1985), 86; following an unpublished section of Johnston’s 1983 paper ‘Die Sharing in Asia Minor the view from Sardeis’: *Israel Numismatic Convention* Jerusalem 1983.

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.

769).²⁴⁸ 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 ἐπί + genitive formula.²⁴⁹

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.²⁵⁰ 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.²⁵¹ Other eponyms are accorded honorific titles commemorating their munificence to

²⁴⁸ Harl (1987), 28.

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.²⁵² 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.²⁵³

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.²⁵⁴ 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.²⁵⁵ 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.²⁵⁶ The second case is that of Klaudios Melas, who produced two large denominations, both of which bear the unusual legend: ΨΗΦΙCΑΜΕΝΟC

²⁵² In the Julio-Claudian period the titles *son of the city* (Aphrodisias), *philopatris* (*lover of the fatherland*, Dionysopolis, Prymnessos) and *euergetes* (*benefactor*, Laodikeia) are attested on coinage: Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 3.

²⁵³ Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 4.

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 ΘΛΑΣΤΟC ANEΘHKEN 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*).²⁵⁷ The same dedicatory formula is employed without a wreath on *RPC I 2792* and *2794*.²⁵⁸ 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.²⁵⁹ 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.²⁶⁰ Why ἀνέθηκεν should enjoy such a marked increase in distribution

²⁵⁷ A variant of this legend is also known: ΘΛΑΣΤΟC ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕΝ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΥΟΝΤΟC ΚΟΥΡΩΝΟC (*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 ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΥΟΝΟC ΥΒΡΕΟΥ surrounded 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.

²⁶⁰ Laodikeia, Agrippinos: see page 181, note 637; Adramytion, Gesios: von Fritz (1913), 35 no. 105; Hydrela, Apellas Athenagorou: Wadd. 2432; Smyrna, Polemon: Klose (1987), 247-249; Kolossai, Okt. Apollonios Oua and Hieronymos: *BMC Phrygia* xlix-li, Wadd 5859, 5861-5862; Brouzos, Drymikos?: *BMC Phrygia* 7; Delphi, Aristotimos: Blum (1914), 34-35, the Achaian League and Korinth, Hostilios: Blum (1914), 35-7. In addition the related formula of the nominative eponym + dative ethnic is known Antinoos types from Arkadia, Chalkedon, Kyme and Galatian Ankyra: Blum (1914), 37-39, 47, 51.

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 (ΟΣΤΙΑΙΟΣ ΜΑΡΚΕΛΛΟΣ ΙΕΡΕΥΣ ΑΝΤΙΝΟΟΥ ΤΟΙΣ ΑΧΑΙΟΙΣ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕΝ).²⁶¹ 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.²⁶² 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.²⁶³ 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 Hostillios 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.²⁶⁴ Moreover the iconography of the *ἀνέθηκεν* issues from the cities of Laodikeia, Hydreia, 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.²⁶⁵

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.²⁶⁶ 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.²⁶⁷ 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 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.

²⁶⁴ Klose (1987), 248-250, Blum (1914), 45-6.

²⁶⁵ For a discussion of the origins of euergetism see Veyne (1992), 85-156.

²⁶⁶ Anineta, Neikanor Anthestios: Heuchert 1838-1839. Aphrodisias, Ti. Kl. Zelos: Heuchert 2103-2119. Attouda, M. Oul. Karminios Klaudianos: Heuchert 2150-1 (Plate XXXIV. 1-2). Kolossai, P. Ail. Ktestikles: Heuchert 2282-2283. Kyme, Hieronymos: Heuchert 1255-7. Hadrianoi, T. Lok. Diodoros: Heuchert 371-3. Laodikeia, P. Kl. Attalos: Heuchert 2300-2337. Metropolis, Poplios: Heuchert 1535. Phokaia, Attalos: Heuchert 1271-6. Smyrna, Theudianos: Heuchert 1339-1348. Tabala, Menophatos priest; Heuchert 2560. Temenothyrai, Skopelianos, son of Zeuxis: Heuchert 2606-13. Tmolos Aureliopolis, Heuchert 2461.

²⁶⁷ Brouzos: Kaik. Rouphinos: *BMC Phrygia* 2-3, 10. Otros: Alexandros *BMC Phrygia* 12-14, von Aulock (1980), nos. 778-790. Apollonia Salbake: Charides priest: Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 121 no. 10. Dionysopolis, Chares B priest of Dionysios: *BMC Phrygia* 21-23. Kolossai: the *Stephanephoroi* Menekles and Nigros:

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

BMC Phrygia 16, cf. Von Aulock (1987), nos. 589-591. Laodikeia: Ail. Pigres: *BMC* Phrygia 227. Tmolos Aureliopolis: Zenon 'b' Tatianos *BMC* Lydia 5-6.

²⁶⁸ Neapolis, Aur. Dionysios son of Zenon: *BMC* Karia lxvi; Kolossai, ΑΥ ΜΑΚΡΙΑΝΟΣ ΕΠΙ Α ΣΤΕΦΑΝΗΦΟΡΩΝ ΦΡΑ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕΝ: AD 252-3, von Aulock (1987), nos. 594-5.

²⁶⁹ For a case of the dative ethnic at Kyme, ΑΙΛ ΕΡΜΕΙΑΣ ΠΡΥΤ ΚΥΜΑΙΟΙΣ, see *BMC* Aeolis 154-160.

²⁷⁰ Jones (1940), 182-191.

²⁷¹ Howgego (1995), 138-40.

²⁷² Heuchert (Thesis), 26.

eponyms were rendered in the nominative case throughout the imperial period and many eponyms also signed their coinage with the *ἀνέθηκεν* formula.²⁷³ This raises the possibility that the nominative case implied *ἀνέθηκεν*, even when the actual verb is omitted.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 *ἐπί* and *ἀνέθηκεν* formulae could be negligible. The name of Menophantos, a priest of Lydian Tabala, usually appears in the genitive with *ἐπί*, but one type renders the name in nominative with *ἀνέθηκεν*.²⁷⁵ The same is true of the Severan coinage of Ailios Pigres from Laodikeia, who uses the both the *ἐπί* and *ἀνέθηκεν* formulae in the same issue.²⁷⁶ In one instance at Tmolos Aureliopolis both the *ἐπί* 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 ΑΝΕ[ΘΗΚΕΝ].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

²⁷³ *BMC Phrygia* xlix, Heuchert (Thesis), 28.

²⁷⁴ The first two types in the name of Ktestikles from Kolossai (Heuchert 2282-3) employ *ἀνέθηκεν* whereas it is absent from the third (2284): Heuchert (Thesis), 27.

²⁷⁵ Heuchert 2557-60, 2654.

²⁷⁶ Head, *BMC Phrygia* lxxx.

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 (ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΟ[Σ] ΜΕΝΕΚΡΑΤΟ[ΥΣ]), honoured in this legend may be synonymous with the Apollonides who appears under Commodus: ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΟΥ ΣΤΡΑ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ ΑΥΡΗΛΙΟΠΟΛΑΙΣ (*Apollonidos strategos dedicated to the Aurelipolitans*: Heuchert 2462-4).

eponyms of Smyrna are rendered in the *ἐπί* + genitive formula.²⁷⁸ 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.²⁷⁹ 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 *strategoī* on their coins, the *strategos* being the office of the vast majority of eponyms recorded from Smyrna.²⁸⁰ 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: *εἰσαγγείλαντος*, *ψηφισαμένου*, *προνοηθέντος*, *ἐπιμεληθέντος* and *αἰτησέμενος* are all attested on the Roman Provincial coinage of Asia. *ἐπιμεληθέντος*, 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 ΕΠΙΜΕΛΑ and at Mastaura the legend ΑΘΗΝΑΓΟΡΑΣ ΧΑΙΠΕΟΥ Ο ΕΠΙΜΕΛΗΤΗΣ ΤΩΝ ΠΑΝ ΤΩΝ is attested (*RPC* I 1349-51 and 2673).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.²⁸² Thus in some cases the abbreviations of ΕΙΜΕΛΑ 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 Kotiaecion, (*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 *ἐπιμεληθέντος* 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 *ἐπιμεληθέντος*

²⁸¹ The reading of this legend has been a matter of dispute. Imhoof-Blumer read [H?]ΠΑΣ ΧΑΙΠΕΟΥ ΟΕΠΙΜΕΛΗΤΗΣ ΤΩΝ ΠΑΝΑΘΗΝ (ΑΙΩΝ): Imhoof-Blumer (1897), 96 no. 3. However, the editors of *RPC* I followed the reading suggested by Head: *BMC* Lydia lxxii.

²⁸² For a discussion of *epimeletai* see Dmitriev (2005), 120.

formula. This formula also continued into the Antonine period at Kotiaieion.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.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 *ἐπιμεληθέντος* (RPC II 1332-1339).²⁸⁵ In the Antonine Period the eponym Markos Oulpios Karminios Klaudianos of Attouda signed issues with at least three different legend formulae: *ἀνέθηκεν*, *ἐπιμεληθέντος* and *διά* + the genitive (*διά* is found on Heuchert 2150, 2152, 2154-2159, *ἀνέθηκεν*, 2151 and *ἐπιμεληθέντος* 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

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

²⁸⁴ It has been suggested that exceptional formulae such as *ἐπιμεληθέντος* and *αἰτησαμέντος* 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 *ἐπιμεληθέντος* 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 *αἰτησαμέντος* formula: ΑΙΤΗΣΑΜΕΝΟΥ ΤΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΛΑΟΥ ΕΦ ΟΥΟΛΑΣΕΝΝ ΑΝΘΥΠΙΑΤΩ. 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). Howgego suggested that the signified 'Ephesos' the principal residents of the Roman governor of Asia: Howgego (1993), 202. More recently Weiss argued that the 'ΕΦ' cannot refer to the residence of the proconsul because the verb *αἰτεῖσθαι* 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.

²⁸⁵ The Vespasianic issues of Kotiaieion all use the *ἐπί* + 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, *ἐπιμεληθέντος* 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 *asiarches* 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 where 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 Akmonia).

an alternative for *ἐπιμεληθέντος*.²⁸⁹ 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.²⁹⁰

Αἰτησάμενος 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 *αἰτησάμενος* as signifying Roman imperial approval, either from the Emperor himself or from the local governor, for the production of local coinage.²⁹¹ 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.²⁹² 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*).²⁹³ The editors of *RPC* I and II attempted to resurrect Robert’s thesis at least in part.²⁹⁴ They argued that the verb *αἰτέω* 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 Phroton and his coinage see pages 122-125.

²⁹¹ Robert (1960), 53-62.

²⁹² This legend appears on the coinage of the cities of Eborā 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.

²⁹³ Weiss (1992), 167-180, Weiss (2000), 235-254 and Nollé (1993), 487-504.

²⁹⁴ Burnett, Amandry and Carradice (1999), 1-2.

RPC I 762-4). 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 ΟΥΟΛΑΣΕΝΝ ΑΝΘΥΠΙΑΤΩ).²⁹⁵ 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.²⁹⁶ 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.²⁹⁷ Issues which carry this formula may not have been managed significantly differently from the coins bearing the *ἐπί* + 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 stele in a field (RPC I 3113). It is possible that this stele was intended to commemorate the actual stele on which Basillaos' request to the city was inscribed, or was at least intended to symbolise of Basillaos' civic beneficence. An honorific stele 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.

²⁹⁶ Weiss (2000). 241.

²⁹⁷ Robert (1960), 56-8 cf. Weiss (1992), 170.

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.²⁹⁸ 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.²⁹⁹ However, the same formula appears on the coinage of P. Kl. Max(imos) Markellianos at Antonine Eukarpeia, 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 (Gaius Plotios Pollio) and at Stratonikeia on the Kaikos/ Hadrianopolis (Klaudios Kandidos) the eponyms are described as *strategoí*.³⁰⁰ 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*).³⁰¹ 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] ΕΠΙΕΧΑΡ[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 *εισανγείλαντος* is only attested on the issues of one Flavian eponym: M. Klaudios Oualerianos of Eumeneia, *archiereus Asiae* (*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 *εἰσανγείλαντος* refers to the act of announcing a proposal before the city.³⁰² Thus, in the numismatic context the proposal placed before the city must have been the initiation of the production of coinage. *Εἰσανγείλαντος* would appear to be very close in meaning to the participle *ψηφισαμένου* found on the coinage of Klaudios Melas from Mylasa and Phl. Diomedes of Stratonikeia (all in Karia) and indeed the *αἰτησάμενος* formula discussed above.³⁰³ The variation in terminology reflects the vocabulary employed in the epigraphic context. For example *εἰσανγείλαντος* is attested in the inscriptions of Phrygia.³⁰⁴ 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.³⁰⁵

Local fashion would also explain the distribution of the prepositions *διὰ* + 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: [. *γραμ*]ματέως τὸ δεύτερον ἐτεί[μῃσεν] ἢ πόλις εἰσαγγ[είλαντος] Ἀρίστων[ο]ς τοῦ [— — —]. For the idea that the terms *εἰσαγγελία* 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.³⁰⁶ 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.³⁰⁷ 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.³⁰⁸ Consequently it is unsurprising that *διά* 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.³⁰⁹ Conversely *διά* is relatively common on the coinage of Attouda and Trapezopolis, although neither of these mints were particularly prolific.³¹⁰ *Διά* 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.³¹¹ This may indicate that the eponyms were not magistrates at the time of minting, but this is an argument from

³⁰⁶ *Διά* 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 (*διά*) the first archon Klaudios Menandros: Weiss (2005), 64.

³⁰⁷ Heuchert (Thesis), 31.

³⁰⁸ Thonemann and Ertuğrul (2005), 75-86.

³⁰⁹ The legend ΔΙΑ [Κ]ΑΛΛΙΠΠΙΟΥ is known from Apollonia Salbake (*BMC Karia* 9) and the legend ΔΙΑ ΚΟΡ ΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΙΑΟ[Y] 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 *διά* 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 *διά*.

³¹¹ Lenormant (1879), 120-1.

silence.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.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.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 (*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.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* / *ἐπί* dominated contemporary legend forms,³¹⁶ but from the reign of Gordian III *παρά* returned to prominence, providing that one accepts ‘Π’

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.

³¹³ Heuchert 2150-5; cf. Weiss (2005), 64.

³¹⁴ Ramsey (1883), 53-71.

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

³¹⁶ *BMC Phrygia* and *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 ‘E’ (Otacilia Severa, *BMC Phrygia* 185). Since all the other issues of this eponym use the standard *ἐπί* formula, it seems probable that ‘E’ was intended as an abbreviation of *ἐπί* (*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 ‘Π 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 Gordian 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 [ΑΠ]ΟΛΙΝ[Α]ΡΙΟΥ ΠΑΝΗΓΥΡ [ΑΠ]ΑΜΕΩ[Ν] □) 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*.³²² 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.³²³ *Παρά* 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.³²⁴

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.³²⁵ In such a context the use of the preposition *παρά* (from) is entirely logical.³²⁶ 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, but 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 Λ 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 Sibia 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 APX ΠΠΩ (*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.³²⁹ Conversely it has been argued that that the participles *εἰσγγείλαντος*, *ψηφισαμένου*, *ἐπιμεληθέντος* and *αἰτησάμενος* did not explicitly imply expenditure on behalf of the eponym.³³⁰ 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 *ἐπιμέλειαν* in the Sestian inscription would indicate that the related term *ἐπιμεληθέντος* could have connotations of personal expenditure.³³¹ This conclusion is strengthened by Weiss' comparative study of numismatic legends in the context of epigraphic formulae.³³² Weiss provided compelling epigraphic evidence for the use of the verbs (in either finite or infinitive form) or nouns related to the participles *εἰσγγείλαντος*, *ψηφισαμένου*, *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:

τά ἔργα κατὰ τὴν εἰσαγγελίαν, ἣν ἐποίησάμην τῇ γλυκυτάτῃ πατρίδι Θήρα, κατασκευσάς ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἀνέθηκα, ... 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.

³³² Weiss (2000), 238-9, 247-8.

In this case the related nouns *εἰσαγγελίαν* (the promises made to the community by a prospective magistrate before assuming office) and *τὰ 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:

Εὐοδίῳ... αἰτησάμενου ἀνέστησεν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων τῶν ἐαυτοῦ ἐργέτην (Euodion... having proposed dedicated his benefaction from his own funds: I.Ephesos 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

³³³ Weiss (2000), 250.

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.³³⁴ Thus for Weiss coinage bearing the participles *εἰσαγγείλαντος*, *ψηφισαμένου*, *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).³³⁵ 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.³³⁶ 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.³³⁹ It is probable that the Hellenistic tradition of private financing of coin production continued and expanded into the Roman period.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.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.

³³⁹ Kroll (1964), 95-99; Sacks (1985), 17-18 and Thompson (1961), 594-5.

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 *ἐπί* + 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.

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.³⁴² 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.³⁴³ Festivals and agonistic contests are also common motifs on the New Style Athenian coinage.³⁴⁴ 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 NAYKPA[THΣ] 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.³⁴⁵ The obverse type is that of a quadriga driven by a man with the ethnic XAAKIDAEON 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.³⁴⁶ 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.³⁴⁷

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.³⁴⁸ Furthermore the same person appears to have been mentioned on another monumental inscription recording athletic victories at the Hermaia festival.³⁴⁹ Both these festivals appear to have been primarily local affairs with some limited participation by non-Chalcidian citizens.³⁵⁰ Knoepfler reasoned that the unusual nature of the iconography could be explained as a monument to the athletic prowess of Theokles.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.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*.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*.

³⁴⁸ *IG XII 9, 952*.

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.

³⁵⁰ Knoepfler (1979), 181.

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 wreathed 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.

³⁵² Knoepfler (1979), 187-8.

³⁵³ Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 269.

A more convincing case of personalised iconography in the Hellenistic period may be made for Athenopolis of Priene.³⁵⁴ The obverse type is that of a facing Athena wearing an Attic helmet with the civic ethnic ΠΠΙΗ. 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: ΑΘΗΝΟΠΟΛΙΣ. 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.³⁵⁵ The effect of the composition is that Nike is crowning the name of the eponym. The most obvious parallel for this device occurs on the coinage of the *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.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 *I.Priene* 107, which honours Athenopolis for his many services to the city. Athenopolis is commended for being a good man (ἀνὴρ καλός) having

³⁵⁴ Regling (1927), no. 27 (Plate I. 2).

³⁵⁵ Regling (1927), no. 174.

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 (*πολλὰ 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.³⁵⁷ However, the second and more likely candidate is Athenopolis the son of Pythotimos. According to the stemma of this family compiled by Hiller from the evidence of *I.Priene* 162, Athenopolis Pythotimou was the maternal uncle of Athenopolis Kydimou.³⁵⁸ We know the former from a monument commemorating his athletic prowess.³⁵⁹ 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.³⁶⁰ 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).³⁶¹ 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.³⁶² 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,³⁶³ 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.³⁶⁴ 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.³⁶⁵ 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.³⁶⁶ 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).³⁶⁷

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.

(*RPC* I 2902: Plate XXXVII. 11). 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.³⁶⁹ 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.³⁷⁰ 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 [Pompei]us? 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 Ripollès (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 Sipylus 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 a phlaston 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.³⁷¹ In particular, Damas as *archiprytanis* is recorded as drafting a decree for the *demos* that obliged the *stephanephoroi* to execute the entertainments (*εὐωχία*) 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*.³⁷² Robert first noted the link between Damas' novel types and his career.³⁷³ 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.

³⁷³ Robert (1967), 47-51.

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 eponym 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

³⁷⁴ Heuchert 1914, 1916, 1918, 1920, 1923, 1925, 1928, 1929, 1931, 1933, 1934, 1936, 1938 and 1940 (Plate XXVII. 9).

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, *I. Didyma* 346. Intriguingly, this Demetrios was also a *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 descendent 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 Ἀυρλίας Λέσης ὕδρφόρου*).

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.³⁸¹ 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.³⁸² 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 (*πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα ἀεὶ ἐνεργετοῦντα*) 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.³⁸³ However, Thonemann and Ertuğrul are almost certainly correct not to identify the eponym with a well-known benefactor of Aphrodisias, Markos Oulpios Karminios Klaudianos.³⁸⁴ The latter is the son of the Attoudian eponym: *Μαρ. Οὐλ. Κλαυδιανόν υἱὸν Καρ. Κλαυδινόν Ἀσίας ἀρχιερέως*.³⁸⁵

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.

³⁸³ *I.Aph* 2007 12.1111, 2-3.

³⁸⁴ Thonemann and Ertuğrul (2005), 78, for the alternative identification see Campanile (1994) no 53a.

³⁸⁵ *I.Aph* 2007 12.1111, 2-3.

(2167-2169: Plate XXXV. 3-5). 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).³⁸⁶ 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 Μ ΟΥΛ ΚΛΑΥΔΙΑΝΟΥ ΥΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΔΗΜΟΥ ΑΤΤΟΥΔΑ ΤΡΑΠΕΖΟΠΙ ΟΜΟΝΟ-ΙΑ. The same veiled deity with flanking lions is depicted on 2151, but the *tychai* are absent and the legend uses the *ἀνέθηκεν* formula: Μ ΟΥΛ ΚΑΡΜΙΝΙΟΣ ΥΙΟΣ ΠΟΛΕΩΣ ΑΤΤ-ΟΥΔΕΩΝ 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 *homonioia* type to the personal influence of the eponym himself. In effect, this *homonioia* 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' *homonioia* 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 AP ΠΑ 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 *διά* formula (2154-9): Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 742. However, since the *διά* formula is also used on the *homonioia* issue this chronological cannot be regarded as absolute.

subtle reference to the career of the eponym.³⁸⁷ They identify the veiled deity as Meter Adrastou, a local variant of Kybele.³⁸⁸ 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 Oulprios Karminios Klaudianos. Two of Karminios' descendents certainly held priesthoods of this deity.³⁸⁹ The image of the goddess, either standing or enthroned, between two lions is a motif that occurs several times in the output of Markos Oulprios Karminios Klaudianos at Attouda.³⁹⁰ Nevertheless, although the theory put forward by Thonemann and Ertuğrul is tantalising, it cannot be confirmed. We do not know which cults Markos Oulprios 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.³⁹¹ 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. Oulprios Karminios Klaudianos *neoterus* (*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.³⁹² 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 Statiliosi, 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 Aydın 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.³⁹³ 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 ἀρχίατρος Σεβαστῶν (High doctor of the Emperors) is attested in two short inscriptions published by Robert.³⁹⁴ 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.³⁹⁵ As a student of Soranos it is not unlikely that Attalos originally studied medicine at Ephesos, before achieving fame as an imperial physician.³⁹⁶

In addition to researching the prosopography of Statilios Attalos Robert carried out an analysis of his numismatic output.³⁹⁷ 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 (*St(atilios) Attalos to the youth of Herakleia*). The use of the dative case in this instance indicates a dedication to the youth of the city.³⁹⁸ 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 dedicatory 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 possess 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.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.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 *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 *homonoia* issue, which celebrated 'the alliance' between Laodikeia and Herakleia:

³⁹⁹ Robert (1957), 220.

⁴⁰⁰ Robert (1957), 226-7, 229-230.

Heuchert 2185. The obverse type followed the usual *homonoia* 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.⁴⁰¹ 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 Statilioi 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 (*ἀγωνοθετήσαντα τοῦ Σωτήρος Ἀσκληπιοῦ καλῶς ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων*). The stone of this text was found at modern Kilisse-köy (ancient Elaia). However Robert put forward the thesis that the S. Klaudios Aisimos from *I.Askl.* 40 was not a native of Elaia as

⁴⁰¹ Robert (1957), 226.

previously thought, but was in fact identifiable with the Pergamene eponym Klaudios Aisimos.⁴⁰² 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 same office of *agonothetes* as his father.⁴⁰³ Consequently Habicht was able to reconstruct the stemma of the family of the Klaudioi Silianoi.⁴⁰⁴ 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.⁴⁰⁵ Moreover his wife, Iulia Pia, is known to have made a dedication at the Propylon of the same sanctuary.⁴⁰⁶ 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. 9595.⁴⁰⁷ 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.

⁴⁰⁶ *I.Askl.* 310: Hepding (1910), 460, Habicht (1967), 86.

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.⁴⁰⁸ 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 *homonioia*.⁴⁰⁹ 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' '*homonioia*' issue, we must assume that the concord the type is celebrating the internal harmony of the city.

⁴⁰⁸ *I.Askl.* 40.

⁴⁰⁹ Heuchert 795 (Plate V. 2).

M. Kl. Phronton

The career of Kl. Phronton is not attested in the epigraphic record,⁴¹⁰ but the personal influence of the presiding eponym is clearly manifest in the images and legends of the coins themselves.⁴¹¹ 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.⁴¹² 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).⁴¹³ Heuchert has further reasoned that Phronton's Sardinian coinage was probably contemporary with the league coinage, because the sizes and weights and reverse designs are similar in both issues.⁴¹⁴ Indeed, it must surely be significant that most of the coin types struck in the name of the *Koinon Ionion* borrowed from the contemporary Sardinian 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 (*PIR*² 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 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*.⁴¹⁵ 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.⁴¹⁶ 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.⁴¹⁷

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.⁴¹⁸ 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.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 *Koinon Ionion*. The Trajanic era Sardian eponym L. Ioulios Libonianos held the office of ἀρχιερέα τῶν τρις καί δεκα πόλεων (high priest of the thirteen cities i.e. the *Koinon Ionion*).⁴²⁰ Thus the link between the Sardian elite and the *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 *asiarches*, since both Phronton and Ioulios Libonianos served in this capacity.⁴²¹ However, the nature of this association remains obscure.

Kl. Hestaios II

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

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: 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.

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

⁴²¹ Herrmann (2002), 236-8.

⁴²² Heuchert (Thesis), 45-6, Heuchert 55 (AD 138-61: Plate II. 3), 124-127 (c. AD 161-165: Plate II. 4-7): another Klaudios Hestaios 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 'beta'. It is likely that the *neokoros* is to be identified with Hestaios 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

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 Ἀδοῦ*, 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.

⁴²⁵ *SNG* Leypold 1673 and Burrell (2004), 121-122 contra *BMC Phrygia* lxxx.

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.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.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.⁴²⁸ The military prowess of the Emperor is celebrated by the depiction of the equestrian Emperor riding down a vanquished enemy or lion.⁴²⁹

Such overt imperial imagery displayed by the issues signed by Pigres is entirely consistent with the office of *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.⁴³⁰ Moreover, the expression of civic devotion to Caracalla on behalf of the Laodikeians is readily comprehensible. Laodikeia was first briefly made *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.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

⁴²⁶ *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).

⁴²⁷ *BMC Phrygia* 226 (Plate XLIII. 6).

⁴²⁸ For example see *I.Magnesia* 216 (Caracalla); *I.Ephesos* IV 1053 (Caracalla).

⁴²⁹ Enemy: unpublished coin from the *BNF* collection cited by Burrell (Burrell (2004), 121-122 (Paris 1604)), Lion: *SNG Leypold* 1673 (Plate XLIV. 3).

⁴³⁰ Harl (1987), 38-51.

⁴³¹ Burrell (2004), 119.

the time.⁴³² 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.⁴³³ 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.⁴³⁴ 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 has been associated with the commemoration of an imperial visit.⁴³⁵ 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

⁴³² 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.

⁴³³ Burrell (2004), 121-2, type 8 (Plate XLIV. 2).

⁴³⁴ *Pigres* signs *BMC Phrygia* 227 with the legend: Α. ΑΙΑ ΠΙΓΡΗΣ ΑΣΙΑΡΧΗΣ Γ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕΝ (*L. Ail. Pigres asiarches dedicated*).

⁴³⁵ *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.

coinage with imperial visitations in all cases.⁴³⁶ 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.⁴³⁷ 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).⁴³⁸ 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.⁴³⁹ 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

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 ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΩ 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 his 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.

thyrsos standing within an octastyle temple and Amalthea holding the infant Zeus.⁴⁴³ A further type of Alexandros shows the Emperor riding in a quadriga being crowned by Nike.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.⁴⁴⁵ Of potentially greater significance is the type of Alexandros depicting a prize crown with two palm branches.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.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.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

⁴⁴³ *RPC* VII 789-90 (Plate L. 2-3).

⁴⁴⁴ *RPC* VII 788 (Plate VII. 788).

⁴⁴⁵ Harl (1987), 40, 42-51: the theme of imperial victory was also a common motif on issues not signed by an eponym.

⁴⁴⁶ *RPC* VII 792 (Plate L. 4).

⁴⁴⁷ *MAMA* IV 67: this identification is confirmed by the fact that Alexandros is described as twice high priest in the body of the text.

⁴⁴⁸ *RPC* VII 796, with the reverse legend: ΔΩΠΙΕΩΝ ΙΩΝΩΝ ΣΥΝΝΑΔΕΩΝ. However, *BMC Phrygia* records another example of the agonistic prize type with the legend ΑΡΧ ΤΑΗΠΙΟΛΕΜΟΥ ΙΠΠΙΚΟΥ ΑΓΩ: *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.⁴⁴⁹ Nollé plausibly identified this mysterious rectangular object as a representation of a gladiatorial shield.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.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.⁴⁵² Nollé linked the appearance of this motif at Side with the bestowal of the right to put on *venationes* and gladiatorial contests from the imperial authorities, through the intervention of the ex-consul and citizen T. Likinnios Mukianos.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.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 gladiatorial shows and *venationes* put on by Alexandros during his tenure as high priest.⁴⁵⁵

⁴⁴⁹ *RPC* VII 791 (Plate L. 4).

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.

⁴⁵¹ *SNG* Aul 3998 from the reign of Gallienus.

⁴⁵² *SNG* Pfälzer IV 695; subsequent representations of the city goddess tend to include the depiction of a mysterious oblong object at her feet (*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 (1992/3), 61-3.

⁴⁵³ Nollé (1992/3), 63: for the text confirming the award of this privilege see *I.Side* TEp. 1 (early third century AD).

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 *asiarches* and gladiatorial spectacles see Carter (2002), 41-68.

⁴⁵⁵ Nollé further speculates that since Alexandros was also *agonothetes* he combined the Greek *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.⁴⁵⁹ The identity of these figures as representatives of the *Koinon Ionion* is confirmed by the legend TO KOINON IΩNΩN inscribed across the centre of the coin. Around the edge of the flan variants of the legend ΕΠΙ ΣΤΡ ΚΑ ΚΑΛΛΙΣΤΟΥ ΙΕΡΕΩΣ ΙΩΝΩΝ ΚΟΛΟΦΩΝΙΩΝ (*when Kallistos priest of the Ionians was general, (coin) of the Kolophonians*) may be read.⁴⁶⁰ 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.⁴⁶¹ 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.⁴⁶² 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 Klazomenai, 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.10.17g). The Artemis Ephesia and Athena types tend to be around 30mm in diameter (10.38g); 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 canon 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 *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 *neokoros* status to the city. However, collecting the material in the *BMC* corpus, *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 *BNF* collection. Moreover many of the types published in Mionnet were derived from the earlier

catalogues of Vaillant, Sestini and Eckhel.⁴⁶⁶ 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.⁴⁶⁷ The earliest epigraphic evidence for the colony is a dedication to Apollo Pityaënos dated to the 37th year of the Seleukid era (274 BC).⁴⁶⁸ 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.⁴⁶⁹

The Coinage and Eponyms of Thyateira

⁴⁶⁶ Vaillant (1698), Eckhel (1779) and Sestini (1796).

⁴⁶⁷ Cohen (1995), 238-9.

⁴⁶⁸ TAM V.2 881.

⁴⁶⁹ Robert (1969b), 278, TAM V.2 943.

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 poses 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.⁴⁷⁰ 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: Hermok(rates) and Menandros.⁴⁷¹ 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).⁴⁷² However the majority, particularly the smaller denominations, continued to be left unsigned by either local or Roman officials.⁴⁷³ 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.⁴⁷⁴ In the reign of Marcus Aurelius an increase in iconographic complexity and the number and size of the denominations occurred.⁴⁷⁵ 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. Peditanus Fuscus accords Trajan with the title of Dacius, his proconsulship must pre-date AD 103 (Stumpf 539, *PIR*² P 199). L. Dasumius Hadrianus was suffect consul in AD 93 (Stumpf 549, *PIR*² D 14). Q. Fabius Postuminus held the proconsulship in AD 111/2 (Stumpf 559, *I.Ephesos* VII. 2 3511, *PIR*² 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 139-144⁴⁷⁶

Krassipes? c. 138-161⁴⁷⁷

G. Aur(elios) Stratonikianos: AD 161 to 175 (probably 169-75)⁴⁷⁸

M. I(oulios) Menelaos, c. 166 - 180 (probably 169 to 177)⁴⁷⁹

K. Laibian(os) K (?) strategos AD 177-180⁴⁸⁰

Eudios II AD 178-80⁴⁸¹

L. Aur(elios). Demonstratos, AD 178 -180 ⁴⁸²

Uncertain Magistrate c. 180-2⁴⁸³

Moschianos Philippou c. 184-8⁴⁸⁴

Titos Aure(lios) Barbaros c. AD 184-8⁴⁸⁵

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

Artemidoros II Florou c. AD 191-2⁴⁸⁶

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 denomination 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 Severus⁴⁸⁷

Aur(elios) Glykon Loukiou, strategos, signs in the name of Septimius Severus, Caracalla and Geta Caesar⁴⁸⁸

Moschos II, strategos, the reign of Septimius Severus⁴⁸⁹

*Glykon Bakchios, strategos*⁴⁹⁰

*Korneli[os] Anton(inos?), strategos*⁴⁹¹

Hieronimos, in the name of Geta Caesar⁴⁹²

Philadelph[os], *strategos*, early third century⁴⁹³

M Aur(elios) Agathokles, strategos, AD 217-18

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

T. Kl(audios) Stratoneikianos, strategos, AD 218-24⁴⁹⁴

Aur(elios) Klo(dios) Dionysios, strategos, equestrian, strategos, AD 218-22.⁴⁹⁵

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 *Hieronimos* 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 *Hieronimos* 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*.

⁴⁹⁵ Mionnet IV 974 cf. Imhoof-Blumer (1915), 96, *Numismatica Ars Classica 40* 16th May 2007, and *SNG München 653*.

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

Artemagoras, strategos, Severus Alexander

*Aur(elios) Kentauros Dionysios, strategos, Severus Alexander*⁴⁹⁷

*L. Mar. Pollianos, strategos, Severus Alexander*⁴⁹⁸

*M. Aur(elios) Phaeinos b, strategos, c. AD 235-8*⁴⁹⁹

*T Pha(bios) Alph Apollinarios, strategos, c.238-44*⁵⁰⁰

*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.

⁵⁰⁰ Apollinarios signed a series of *homonioia* coinage in the reign of Gordian III: *RPC VII* 191-2, 196 and 198.

⁵⁰¹ Gorny & Mosch 108, 3 April 2001, 1498, 22.56; *M&M Deutschland* 15, 21-22 October 2004, 888, 6.05 (Righetti), *SNG Aul* 3238, Franke-Nollé 2356-63.

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 *gentilicium* 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 *M Αὐρήλιον Ἀντωνεῖνον βασιλέα*; for a fuller discussion of the unusual imperial titlature of 'basileus' see Eck, *Chiron* vi (1976), 291-3.

Kelsianos were both Ioulioi strengthens the possibility that he himself bore this *gentilicium*.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 Laibianos 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 of 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 Tyrinnos *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* (LI 1-3). In *I.Ephesos* VII. 1 3057, Athenaios was honoured for his advocacy of “our fatherland” (II 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.⁵⁰⁸ 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 *Chrysantheia* at Sardeis must be an unrelated homonym.⁵⁰⁹ However, Caldelli, who dates the foundation of the festival to c. AD 176, rejects the thesis that the Sardian Chrysantheia was a Severan foundation.⁵¹⁰ 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.⁵¹¹ Another honorific inscription commemorates

⁵⁰⁸ Puech (2002),153-4.

⁵⁰⁹ Puech (2002),153-4.

⁵¹⁰ Caldelli (1995), 62-69.

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.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.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.⁵¹⁴ Campanile tentatively identified this eponym with the *asiarches* M. Aur. Agathokles attested at Ephesos.⁵¹⁵ This text records that this man was four times *philosebastos*, *grammateus* of the *demos* and *asiarches* of the provincial imperial temples in Ephesos.⁵¹⁶ The association of the Thyateiran Agathokles with the *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.

⁵¹² TAM V. 2 945.

⁵¹³ For further discussion of the prosopography of this family see TAM V.2 p. 349.

⁵¹⁴ Mionnet IV 963, following Vaillant (1698), 147.

⁵¹⁵ Campanile (1994), 128, no. 128.

⁵¹⁶ *I.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.⁵¹⁷ M. Aurelios Diadochos Tryphosianos was the son of the otherwise unattested M. Aurelios Moschianos and Aurelia Tryphosia.⁵¹⁸ It has already been established that Diadochos was the husband of Aurelios Hermonassa, the daughter of the eponym M. Aur(elios) Athenaios and twice high priestess of Asia and Thyateira.⁵¹⁹ 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.⁵²⁰ 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 ὀξέσι*').⁵²¹ 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.⁵²² 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 Tyrinnos 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 Tyrinnos (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 ὀξέσι*' (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.⁵²³ 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.⁵²⁴

Aur(elios) Artemagoras

The name Artemagoras is attributed to Thyateira on a specimen published by Mionnet from the reign of Severus Alexander.⁵²⁵ 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.2 945.⁵²⁶ 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).

⁵²³ Carter (2004), 51.

⁵²⁴ The eponym Diadochos is also attested in fragmentary inscription *TAM* V. 2 951, but this text offers no further prosopographical information.

⁵²⁵ Mionnet IV 995

⁵²⁶ *TAM* V. 2 p. 348.

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 'IEPEIA OΛYM' (sacred Olympia, probably the [Hadrian]ia Olympia attested elsewhere⁵²⁷), 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.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.⁵²⁹ The 25-27 mm area appears to have been a border zone, in which both practices

⁵²⁷ TAM V. 2 p. 315, 1026. 3.

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

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.⁵³⁰ However, the eponyms who signed the preceding issues under Antoninus Pius, Krassipes and Hermogenes, are known from only one type each.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 *SNG* Cop 631 and *SNG* München 682 are of the same denomination and share the same obverse die, but only the former is signed by the *strategos* Aur(elios) Phaeinos. In the reign of Caracalla we find an unsigned reverse type was produced measuring 34mm in diameter.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.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

possessed a value of 2, possibly three *assaria*. The situation is more comprehensible for the third century. Okt. Artemidoros signed a type in the name of Salonina weighing just 8.53g, which again was probably valued at 2 *assaria*. The only known specimen of the eponym Philadelphos measures 25 mm in diameter (early 3rd century AD, Imhoof-Blumer (1897) no. 26). Unsigned specimens of similar dimensions include Heuchert 1090 (Commodus, 27mm, 7.26g: Plate XII. 3) and *McClean* 8723 (Diadumenianus, 27mm, 8.19g). These were also probably 2 *assaria* pieces.

⁵³⁰ Heuchert 1044 (40mm), 1045 (39mm), 1046 (38mm), 1047 (37mm), 1048 (35mm).

⁵³¹ Heuchert 1042-1043.

⁵³² *SNG* Aul 3226 (Plate XLIII. 6), *BMC* Lydia 96, *SNG* München 647.

⁵³³ For example see *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).⁵³⁴ The eponym T. Phabios Alph Apollinarios invariably signed the three largest denominations of this issue and two of the three 30mm denomination types.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 ΠΗ’ (year 88) could fit even the smallest denominations and types bearing this date range in eight from 43.91g to a mere 3.76g.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.

⁵³⁴ *RPC* VII 191-9.

⁵³⁵ *RPC* VII 197-8.

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.⁵³⁷ The most elaborate iconography appears on the very largest denominations, which from the sole reign of Marcus Aurelius were almost invariably signed by eponyms.⁵³⁸ 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 *orans* gesture.⁵³⁹ 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 *paludamentum* flanking a burning altar are paradigmatic of the kind of imperial motif produced in this period.⁵⁴⁰ The Emperor was

⁵³⁷ At Rome the act of distributing coins to the populace was recorded on coin iconography, either in the form of the personification of *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.

⁵³⁸ Metcalf (1993), 337-346.

⁵³⁹ Heuchert 1066 (Aurelios Demonstratos).

⁵⁴⁰ Asiatikos Hermogenes: *BMC Lydia* 91 (46mm), cf. Mionnet IV 933 for the same type signed by Aurelios Glykon Loukiou.

often depicted interacting with local gods.⁵⁴¹ Glykon also signed a type, which depicted Caracalla riding to the right making the *orans* gesture with his right hand to an image of Apollo Tyrimnaios held in the right hand of the city goddess.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 *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.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.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.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.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

⁵⁴¹ In the reign of Elagabalus, the Emperor was shown jointly supporting an agonistic urn with Apollo Tyrimnaios: *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.

⁵⁴² *BMC Lydia* 94 (Plate XVII. 2): 44mm cf. Mionnet Sup VII 619: Imhoof-Blumer (1897), no. 24: 45mm.

⁵⁴³ *SNG München* 645: 45.37g.

⁵⁴⁴ *SNG München* 646: 19.57: Wadd 5367: Mionnet IV 953: Imhoof-Blumer (1897), no. 25: 35mm.

⁵⁴⁵ *SNG Aul* 3210 (31.78g).

⁵⁴⁶ *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.⁵⁴⁷ 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 188-92.⁵⁴⁸ 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)⁵⁴⁹ 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.⁵⁵⁰ The same Hephaistos type also occurs once in the name of Asiatikos Hermogenes in the reign of Septimius Severus.⁵⁵¹ 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.⁵⁵² Heuchert suggested that this elaborate version of the type was modelled on an imperial medallion of Antoninus Pius.⁵⁵³ 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 Gnechi 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).⁵⁵⁴ Moreover, a simplified version of this motif without Athena is known from Nikomedia in Bithynia under Antoninus Pius.⁵⁵⁵ 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 Gnechi (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 Maximinus 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.⁵⁵⁶ 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.⁵⁵⁷ 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.⁵⁵⁸ 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-

⁵⁵⁶ Toynbee (1944a), 59 (Ephesos), 63 (Kilikia and Kappadokia).

⁵⁵⁷ For a full discussion of provincial medallions see Thompson (1977), 29-47 (Pautalia), Toynbee (1944b), 65-73 (Tarsos). In addition to Tarsos Toynbee identifies bronze medallions from Elis and Mantinea. The identification of the Tarsian issues with imperial medallions is greatly strengthened by stylistic similarities. A thick border composed of two or more concentric rings surrounds the central image of several of the Tarsian types. The same feature is often found on contemporary imperial medallions: Toynbee (1944b), 67.

⁵⁵⁸ Regling records 8 imperial bronze coins from Pergamon, while Bell lists three examples of sestertii from Sardeis: Regling (1913a), 355-365, Bell (1916), 47.

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 Stratoneikianos signed a remarkable type depicting the Emperor and civic deity Apollo Tyrinnaios. The Emperor is shown on the right wearing a cuirass and jointly supporting an agonistic urn with Apollo Tyrinnaios, 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 ΑΥΤΟΥΣΤΕΙΑ ΠΥΘΙΑ surrounded by a laurel wreath and a type depicting Apollo Tyrinnaios holding an agonistic

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.⁵⁶² Similar types also adorned the unsigned coinage during this period and thus it is very likely that they formed part of the same issue.⁵⁶³ The cultural context for these types is provided by an honorific decree dedicated to the athlete Gaios Perelios Aurelios Alexandros.⁵⁶⁴ 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.⁵⁶⁵ 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.⁵⁶⁶ 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* Leypold 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* Leypold 1305 (Plate XV. 4); *SNG* Aul 3232 (Plate XIII. 2) and *SNG* Leypold 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* Leypold 1260).

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.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: ΕΠΙ Σ ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΥΓΟΥΣΤΕΙΑ ΠΥΘΙΑ ΑΔΡΙΑΝΑ ΟΛΥΜΠΙ[A] ΘΥΑΤΕΙΡΗΝΩΝ.⁵⁶⁸ The Hadriana Olympia was also celebrated on the issue of Artemagoras under Severus Alexander.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.

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

convincingly should be attributed to this eponym in spite of the misreading by Mionnet of AY for KA (Mionnet IV 981) and *Stephanou Neik* (Mionnet 978): Head *BMC* Lydia cxxv.

⁵⁶⁷ Harl (1987), 63-70.

⁵⁶⁸ *SNG* München 688.

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 138-161.⁵⁷⁰ 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'.⁵⁷¹ 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-

⁵⁷⁰ Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 335-6.

⁵⁷¹ 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.

groups attributed to the workshop of 'Pergamon'.⁵⁷² Thyateira is also represented in Kraft's group D, which he attributed to the workshop of 'Sardeis'.⁵⁷³ External die-links between Thyateira and other cities in the sphere of the 'Pergamon' workshop are known from the reign of Severus Alexander.⁵⁷⁴ However, a further group of external die-links from the same reign places Thyateira in the sphere of the workshop of 'Sardeis'.⁵⁷⁵ In the reign of Philip I Kraft placed Thyateira in the area of the workshop of 'Smyrna',⁵⁷⁶ but in the time of Valerian and Gallienus Thyateira appears to have returned to the fold of the 'Pergamon' workshop.⁵⁷⁷ 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.⁵⁷⁸ 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.⁵⁷⁹ 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

⁵⁸⁰ Heuchert (2005), 43, Harl (1987), 15-16.

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-*homonoia* 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.⁵⁸³ 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.⁵⁸⁴

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.⁵⁸⁵ 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.⁵⁸⁶ 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.⁵⁸⁷ 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 overturned flowers and flying Eros lighting the way with a torch.⁵⁸⁸ 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).⁵⁸⁹ 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

abduction scene with the addition of a *kalathos* filled with poppies and corn ears, but no Eros and overturned flowers: Heuchert 1176.

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.⁵⁹⁰ 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.⁵⁹¹ 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.⁵⁹² 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.⁵⁹³ It remains possible that general regional popularity of the ‘Lydian Kore’ may have encouraged Thyateira to adapt 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 XXIV. 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).

⁵⁹³ Johnston (1981), 9.

the mid second century AD.⁵⁹⁴ 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.⁵⁹⁵ 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 161.⁵⁹⁶ 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.⁵⁹⁷ 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

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.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 (*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.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.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

⁵⁹⁸ *RPC* online no. 7790 (AD 161-175).

⁵⁹⁹ Kraft (1972), plate 37, 59b (Athena, Sardeis), 89, 25b (Athena, Pergamon), 7, 44b (Apollo, Smyrna), 31, 25a (Apollo, Sardeis), 47, 72a (Apollo, Pergamon).

⁶⁰⁰ Fuscus procos AD 98-102, *SNG München* 622 (*BMC Lydia* 72: AE 30mm: Imhoof-Blumer (1901) no. 2: 33mm); Gallienus AD 253-268, *SNG Cop* 632 (*BMC Lydia* 141).

Kathegemon.⁶⁰¹ 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.⁶⁰² 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.⁶⁰³ 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

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, Saittai, 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.⁶⁰⁷ 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*.⁶⁰⁸

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.⁶⁰⁹ 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.⁶¹⁰ 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.⁶¹¹ Kraft cited the evidence of die links from three third century specimens of these types from Akrasos, Attaleia and Hyrkaneis.⁶¹² 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.⁶¹³ 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.⁶¹⁴

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.⁶¹⁵ However, a few of the Roma/Athena obverses measure only c.14mm in diameter and can weigh as little as 1.54g.⁶¹⁶ 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.⁶¹⁷ 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.⁶¹⁸ 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 Leypold* 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 Telesphoros 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 Telesphoros 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 Leypold* 1258 20mm 4.10g and *SNG Aul* 3204 3.75g.

⁶¹⁶ I am aware of two specimens of this type: *SNG Leypold* 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.⁶¹⁹ 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.⁶²⁰ 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.⁶²¹

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.⁶²² 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 slightly 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.⁶²³ 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.⁶²⁴ 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.⁶²⁵ 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.⁶²⁶

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.⁶²⁷ 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 Denizli, in the area between the villages of Eskihisar and Goncali.⁶²⁸ 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.⁶²⁹

⁶²⁷ Our understating 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.

⁶²⁸ Cohen (1995), 309.

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.⁶³⁰ 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.⁶³¹ Thereafter eponyms were a regular feature of the imperial coinage of Laodikeia during the first century AD.⁶³² In the reign of Augustus the eponyms Zeuxis, Sosthenes and Antonios Polemon are attested.⁶³³ Eponyms continued to be frequently attested on the coinage of the Julio-Claudian and Flavian periods.⁶³⁴ 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 $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ + genitive formula occurs in relation to two types of Antonios Zenon and the $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ formula is utilised for the entire Domitianic series of Kornelios Dioskourides.⁶³⁵ 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-lxx, *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: ΕΠΙ ΙΕ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ ΠΙ(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.⁶³⁶ 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.⁶³⁷ 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 214/215.⁶³⁸ In addition, another eponym is known from a single issue in the name of Iulia Domna.⁶³⁹ 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': ΑΓΡΙΠΠΕΙΝΟΣ ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΩΝ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΩΝ: 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 München* 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 ΑΙΑ ΠΕΙΣΩΝΣΙΝΗΣΙΑΡ ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΩΝ ΝΕΩΡΚΟΡ. Leschhorn reads the name of the legend as ΠΕΙΣΩΝΕΙΝΑ, although the damaged condition of the legend precludes a definitive reading: Leschhorn (2009), 1031.

ΑΔΡ are visible.⁶⁴⁰ The final eponym from Laodikeia signs an issue with an obverse portrait of Otacilia Severa. The reverse legend reads: ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΩΣ ΤΟΥΣΚΙΑΝΟΥ ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΩΝ ΝΕΩΚΟ.⁶⁴¹ 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 ΑΙΑ ΠΙΓΡΗΣ ΑΣΙΑΡΧΗΣ Γ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΝ.⁶⁴² 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.⁶⁴³ 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 to 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.⁶⁴⁴

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 ΤΟΥΣΚΙΑΝΟΥ 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 ΑΙΑ 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 *homonioia* 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

⁶⁴⁵ von Aulock (1987), 26-7.

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.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.⁶⁴⁹ In this case the unusual legend (*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 ἐπί + 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.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 Π Η (to express the

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.

⁶⁴⁹ *RPC* II 1271.

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 ἐπί + 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 215/216.⁶⁵¹ The same dating system was employed for two mid-third century AD countermarks, dating to AD 235/236 and 248/249 respectively.⁶⁵² The only epigraphic reference to the Laodikeian era is the phrase $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tilde{\nu}\ \rho\kappa\zeta\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ (the year 127, AD 254/255) on a funerary inscription.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.⁶⁵⁴ Caracalla certainly granted the city neokorate status in respect to his own cult and probably revived the revoked *neokoria* of Commodus.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 *neokoros* the restoration of the *neokoria* of Commodus

⁶⁵¹ Imhoof-Blumer (1890), 217: who interprets the Laodikeian era as beginning in the year AD 123/4; Leschhorn (1993), 384.

⁶⁵² Howgego (1985) *cmks* 631 ‘PH’ (year 108) and 638 ‘TO PKA’ (year 121).

⁶⁵³ *I.Laodikeia* 72.

⁶⁵⁴ Leschhorn (1993), 385 cf. Howgego (2005), 10.

⁶⁵⁵ For a discussion of the revocation of the *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: $\text{KOMO}\Delta\text{O}\Sigma\ \text{KE}\ \text{ANT}\Omega\text{NEINO}\Sigma\ \text{}\Lambda\text{AO}\Delta\text{IKE}\Omega\text{N}\ \text{NE}\Omega\text{KOP}\Omega\text{N}$: 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: *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 ‘*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 *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.

probably preceded the imperial visit of Caracalla to Asia in AD 214/215.⁶⁵⁶ However, it remains probable that further benefactions were granted to Laodikeia in the context of the imperial visit to the province.⁶⁵⁷ Some indication of the privileges bestowed on Laodikeia by Caracalla is provided by iconography of the ‘TO Π Η’ issues themselves. In addition to the common Laodikeian types, for example Tyche Pantheia (*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.⁶⁵⁸ Burrell no. 4 depicts three prize crowns sitting on an agonistic table. The central crown is labelled ANTΩNIA, the right hand crown is labelled [KO]M[OΔIA] and the label on the left hand crown is illegible, beneath the table (labelled [...]EIA on its edge) stand three amphorae.⁶⁵⁹ Moreover, a prize crown sitting between two purses is displayed on Burrell 5. The crown is inscribed ANTΩNHNA and the table is labelled ΑΣΚΛΗΠΕΙΑ, beneath the table an amphora contains two palms and is labelled ΠΥΘΙΑ.⁶⁶⁰ Consequently it may be assumed with some confidence that Caracalla

⁶⁵⁶ *IGUrbRom* 37 (*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: *SNG München* 397 (Plate XLVI. 2).

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

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

⁶⁵⁹ Burrell records the label as reading ‘ANTΩNIA’, rather than ANTΩNINA 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.

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 ANTΩΝ between two purses standing on a table bearing the legend ΚΟΜΟΔΕΙΑ, beneath which is an amphora containing two palms. As Robert rightly noted (*contra* Ramsay), the term ΠΥΘΙΑ in these circumstances does not refer to a games dedicated to Apollo, but rather indicates that the games were *isopythian*: equal in rank to the Pythian games.

bestowed the right to hold agonistic contests in association with his own cult.⁶⁶¹ Robert assumed that ANTΩNHNA and KOMOΔΙΑ referred to a single game jointly celebrating the cults of Caracalla and Commodus under the name *Ἀντωνίνα Ἀσκλήπεια Πύθια*.⁶⁶² 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 ANTΩNHNA, ΑΣΚΛΗΠΕΙΑ and KOMOΔΙΑ. The origins of the Asklepieia 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.⁶⁶³ 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.⁶⁶⁴

Head also noted the connection between the date 'TO Π Η' and agonistic imagery and assumed that the 'P H' (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.

⁶⁶² Robert (1969), 291.

⁶⁶³ Robert interpreted the legend of Wadd 6311 (ANTΩNINA 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 *Ἀσκλήπεια Πύθια ἐν 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 Asklepieia of Laodikeia originated as benefaction of Caracalla remains sound. The parallel case of a great Asklepieia 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 Asklepieia 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.⁶⁶⁵ 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.⁶⁶⁶ 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.⁶⁶⁷ 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).⁶⁶⁸ 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 T 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).

ΟΙΚΟΥΜΕΝΙΚΟΙ; ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΩΝ ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ.⁶⁶⁹ 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.⁶⁷⁰ 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.⁶⁷¹ 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 ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ ΦΡΥΓΙΑ ΚΑΡΙΑ ΤΟ ΠΗ.⁶⁷² In this way the city articulated its position on the border between these two historic regions.⁶⁷³ This theme is reprised under Philip the Arab. The legend ΦΡΥΚΙΑ ΑΝΑΝΕΩΘΕΙΣ ΚΑΡΙΑ ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΩΝ ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ (*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 1. 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 cornucopiae and rudder (?).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.⁶⁷⁵ Laodikeia must still have been a part of Asia c. AD 244-7, since the *koina Asias* is mentioned on an agonistic coin type of Philip II as Caesar.⁶⁷⁶ However, the unprecedented use of ‘ANANEΩEIC’ (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 ‘ANANEΩEIC’ 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

⁶⁷⁴ Hecht (1968), 30 no. 9 (Plate XLVII. 3).

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 *ὑπατικός* (*consularis*) acting as *ἡγεμεύων* (*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. *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 *praeses* of Karia and Phrygia (*ἡγεμόνα Φρυγία[ς] καὶ 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.

⁶⁷⁶ *SNG* Aul 8422, *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.⁶⁷⁷ Moreover, two of the children of Polemon were to ascend to kingships in their own right.⁶⁷⁸ 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

⁶⁷⁷ Thonemann (Thesis), 141 cf. Appian BC v. 75 (319); Strabo 12. 6.1; for a full discussion of the prosopography of the Zenonid family see Thonemann (2004), 144-50.

⁶⁷⁸ Zeno Artixas of Armenia and Antonia Tryphaina, the wife of king Kotys of Thrace: Thonemann (Thesis), 142.

to the province and attaining the office of *asiarches*.⁶⁷⁹ This Zenon is accepted as responsible for an important issue of five types produced around AD 50-4.⁶⁸⁰ This identification is confirmed by the fact that on two issues the name Polemon is abbreviated to a monogram of Π and O, while Zenon is invariably written in full, thus implying that the name Zenon was of greater significance.⁶⁸¹ Moreover, the fact that the legend of *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.⁶⁸²

The importance of the issue represented by *RPC I* 2912-16 is unconnected with the reverse types, which are conventional.⁶⁸³ Rather, the focus of scholarly interest in this material revolves around a single obverse type depicting the *demoi* of Laodikeia and Smyrna facing one another with the legend: ΔΗΜΟΣ ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΖΜΥΠΝΑΙΩΝ.⁶⁸⁴ The direct reference to the *demoi* of another city prefigures the development of the phenomenon of the *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 *demoi* of the Laodikeia and Smyrna clasping hands and holding sceptres with the legend: ΑΝΤΩ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ ΖΗΝΩΝ ΥΙΟΣ ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΩΝ ΖΜΥΠΝΑΙΩΝ ΟΜΗΡΟΣ (*Anto(nios) Zenon son of Zenon son of the Laodikeians and*

⁶⁷⁹ Thonemann (Thesis), 144: *SEG* 37 855; cf. Robert (1954), no. 54: *I.Laodikeia* 53.

⁶⁸⁰ Thonemann (Thesis), 144: Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 476 (Zenon), 479 (Polemon).

⁶⁸¹ ΕΠΙ ΙΕΡΕΥΣ ΠΟ ΥΙΟΥ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ (*RPC I* 2912), ΕΠΙ ΙΕ ΖΗΝΩΝΟΣ Π(Ο) ΥΙ ΤΟ Δ: (*RPC I* 2914)

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.

⁶⁸³ *RPC I* 2912-14 depict a standing Zeus Laodikenos with eagle and staff, while *RPC I* 2915-16 portray a serpent and snake motif.

⁶⁸⁴ *RPC I* 2912.

Smyrneans homeros).⁶⁸⁵ 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 Smyranean by origin, since her mother Antonia is attested in an inscription from this city.⁶⁸⁶ 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.⁶⁸⁷

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.⁶⁸⁸ However, the Flavian eponyms Gaios Ioulios Kotys and Klaudia Zenonis are of greater interest.⁶⁸⁹ 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.⁶⁹⁰ 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 ‘OMHPOΣ’ 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.⁶⁹¹ 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.⁶⁹²

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.⁶⁹³ 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.⁶⁹⁴ 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.⁶⁹⁵ The same name also appears on a lavish issue of sixteen types produced during the reign of Domitian.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.⁶⁹⁷ If KOP monogram is an abbreviation of the *gentilicium* 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 Smyranean influence of the Zenonids. In cases where the dedicatory *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.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

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.

⁶⁹⁶ *RPC* II 1281-1296

⁶⁹⁷ *RPC* I 2926-7

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 Sardeis led her to conclude that the scale of production at the ‘Sardeis’ workshop changed during the period from the second issue of Gordian III until the reign of Philip. During this period the ‘Sardeis’ 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 Sardeis.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 ‘Sardeis’ 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

⁷⁰⁴ Johnston (1982/3), 67.

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.⁷⁰⁸ However, the same cannot be said of Themisonion, because same type is known from an issue of Maximinus Thrax (AD 235-8).⁷⁰⁹

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.⁷¹⁰ He identified an obverse die-link between Aphrodisias and Themisonion and associated these issues with similar obverse types from other Asian cities, including Laodikeia.⁷¹¹ 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.⁷¹²

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), Prynnessos (*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 *homonioia* 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 *homonioia* 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.⁷¹³ Nevertheless, this denominational distinction appears to have been short-lived. By the time of the next big issue of *homonioia* 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.⁷¹⁴ The final large issue of *homonioia* 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 *homonioia* issue with Pergamon depicting the two relevant Tychai weighs only 19.02 g and measures 33mm: Heuchert 2360.

⁷¹⁴ Weber 7155 celebrating *homonioia* 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 *homonioia* 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.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.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.⁷¹⁷ However, certain issues displaying this type produced in the reigns of Elagabalus and Severus Alexander were manufactured to a much heavier standard.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.⁷¹⁹ Yet by the early third century the same type was adorning much smaller denomination issues.⁷²⁰

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 *RPC* volumes it is impossible to

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.

⁷¹⁶ Weber 7135, *SNG Cop* 544 (Plate XLVII 4), 546 6 and *SNG Aul* 3833.

⁷¹⁷ *SNG Cop* 610 (Plate XIII. 9).

⁷¹⁸ *SNG Leake* 4985 (9.72g) and *SNG Cop* 600 (13.32g: Plate XLVII. 2).

⁷¹⁹ Heuchert 2301 (38mm 22.28g) and 2312 (35 mm and 26.19g).

⁷²⁰ *SNG Leypold* 1653 (22mm 6.5g: Plate XLVII. 7) and *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.⁷²¹ 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.⁷²² During the same period the names of two local eponyms could be attested, possibly representing a *strategos* and *stephanephoros*.⁷²³ In one instance three eponyms, two local and a proconsul are attested in the same legend.⁷²⁴ On other occasions only the proconsul was recorded.⁷²⁵ 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*.⁷²⁶ 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

⁷²¹ Aphrodisias: MacDonald (1992) cf. Johnston (1995), 43-100, Smyrna: Klose (1987) and Magnesia: Schultz (1975).

⁷²² For example Menophanes and Aviola (proconsul) AD 37-8 *RPC* I 2471.

⁷²³ Rheginos and Myrton is one example of the practice of paired eponyms: *RPC* II 1015-17.

⁷²⁴ Rheginos, Myrton and Frontinus: *RPC* II 1012-14.

⁷²⁵ Lucius Mestrius Florus c. AD 87/8 *RPC* II 1018.

⁷²⁶ Some variation in the formulae 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.⁷²⁷ 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).⁷²⁸ In addition to these regular denominations, larger pieces were also occasionally struck, which Klose categorised as ‘medallions’.⁷²⁹ 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.⁷³⁰ 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.⁷³¹ 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.⁷³² Similarly Klose records a ‘sechser’ type displaying the legend ΣΜΥΡΝΑΙΩΝ Γ ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ ΤΩΝ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩΝ

⁷²⁷ Schultz (1975), 22-3.

⁷²⁸ Klose (1987), 108.

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.

⁷³¹ Klose (1987), 288.

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 ΜΕΓΕΘΙ within a wreath.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.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.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.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.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.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

⁷³³ Klose (1987), 298 (c. AD 222-35).

⁷³⁴ Schultz (1975), 22-25.

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).

⁷³⁶ Heuchert 2103-2119.

⁷³⁷ Johnston (1995), 95-6.

⁷³⁸ Johnson (1995), 98-9.

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.⁷³⁹ 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.⁷⁴⁰ 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 *ἐπί* formula is rarely attested, although this does become the standard legend formula at Aphrodisias from Po. Ai(lios) Apollonianos under Philip the Arab.⁷⁴¹ The *ἐπί* 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.⁷⁴² One possible explanation is that responsibility for the organisation of coin production shifted away from single benefactors to the board of *archontes*.⁷⁴³ 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 ΑΡΧ ΤΩΝ ΠΕΡΙ ΜΕΝΕΣΘΕΑ ΙΣΟΒΟΥΝΟΝ (*In the year when Menestheus*

⁷³⁹ Heuchert 2103-2119 (Zelos: Plate XXVIII. 6-9) and MacDonald 89-107 (Menippos and Zenon).

⁷⁴⁰ Johnston (1995), 60.

⁷⁴¹ In this period the *ἐπί* formula is used by Phl. Periti(...) on a *homonomia* issue with Ephesos: MacDonald 109 (c. AD 201-9).

⁷⁴² Johnston (1995), 60-61.

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 *ἐπί* 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).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.⁷⁴⁵

‘einer’

‘zweier’

‘dreier’

‘vierer’

‘sechser’

⁷⁴⁴ MacDonald 82-5.

⁷⁴⁵ The table is derived directly from Klose (1987), 108.

Griffin (AD 147- 180)	Herakles	2 Nemeseis (AD 141-268)	standing Amazon (AD 209-68)	three temples (AD 212-268)
Lion (AD 147)		Tyche (AD 161-268)	enthroned	wreath surrounding legend (AD 198- 268)
		Tyche temple (AD 198-268)	Kybele (AD 147-268)	enthroned Kybele and Amazon (AD 193-211)
		Asklepios (AD 161-177)	enthroned Zeus (AD 147-268)	
		Hygeia (AD 162-177)	enthroned Roma (AD 212-268)	2 Nemeseis (AD 193-268)
			Asklepios and Hygeia (AD 193-95)	The dream of Alexander (AD 147- 249)

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.⁷⁴⁶ A further ‘vierer’ type of interest signed by Klaudios Rouphinos depicted Caracalla being crowned by Nike.⁷⁴⁷

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

20mm	22mm	25mm	30mm	35mm
Eros	Dionysos	Aphrodite	three Charities	Emperor
Hermes	recumbent river deity	standing Men	Tyche Pantheistic goddess	riding temple
		Leafless tree		

The only type at Aphrodisias used consistently for several denominations was the cult statue of Aphrodite type.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.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.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

⁷⁴⁶ Heuchert 1382.

⁷⁴⁷ Klose (1987), 284 (AD 211/2-217).

⁷⁴⁸ Johnston (1995), 67.

⁷⁴⁹ This type is attested on 22, 30 and 35 mm denominations: Johnston (1995), 67.

⁷⁵⁰ Johnston (1995), 94.

⁷⁵¹ Johnston (1995), 67.

common.⁷⁵² 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.⁷⁵³ 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 Antiocheia 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.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.⁷⁵⁵ The standing Athena holding a spear (sometimes also next to an altar) type displays a similar denominational flexibility.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 *ἀνέθηκεν* formula, it seems reasonable to assume that the eponym was responsible for the choice of type.⁷⁵⁷ Eponyms not using the *ἀνέθηκεν* formula signed other large denomination types of interest.⁷⁵⁸ The eponym Klaudios Stratonikianos is attested on a ‘sechser’ type depicting Caracalla,

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 (Otacilia Severa).

⁷⁵⁵ Schultz 247 (Severus Alexander, ‘vierer’), 290-291 (Julia Mamaea, ‘fünfer’), 342 (Maximus, ‘fünfer’), 402 (Gordian III, ‘fünfer’) and 489 (Philippus II, ‘vierer’).

⁷⁵⁶ Schultz 296 (Julia Mamaea, ‘fünfer’), 306 (Maximinus, ‘sechser’), 342 (Maximus, ‘fünfer’: Plate XXVI. 9), 413 (Gordian III, ‘fünfer’) and 468 (Gordian III, ‘zweier’).

⁷⁵⁷ The legend reads: ΘΕΥΔΙΑΝΟΣ ΣΤΡΑΤ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ ΣΥΜΠΑΙΟΙΣ ΠΕΛΟΥΨ: Heuchert 1339.

⁷⁵⁸ This formula falls out of use at Smyrna after Theudianos. Thereafter the *ἐπί* + 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 *ἐπί* + 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.

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).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).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.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.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

⁷⁵⁹ Klose (1987), 271: a similar motif depicting Maximinus and Maximus is found on a ‘sechser’ type signed by M. Aurelios Publios Proklianos (Klose (1987), 304).

⁷⁶⁰ Klose (1987), 270.

⁷⁶¹ Schultz 110, (Marcus Aurelius), 143 (Septimius Severus), 159 (Caracalla).

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 Gordioea 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 (MENIΠΠΙΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΖΗΝΩΝ ΤΗ ΠΑΤΡΙΔΑ) was adorned with the standard type of a member of the imperial family riding down enemies.⁷⁶³

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

⁷⁶³ MacDonald 90.

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 eponym 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 where 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 canon 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).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

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.⁷⁶⁵ 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.⁷⁶⁶ 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

⁷⁶⁵ Meadows and Williams (2001), 33-37.

⁷⁶⁶ 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.

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.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.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 *adventus*.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 *asiarches* Alios Pigres produced a type depicting Caracalla standing before a temple enclosed by a columns on three sides distributing wreaths.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

⁷⁶⁹ MacDonald (1992), 28, Fredrich (1897), 361-380.

⁷⁷⁰ *BMC* Lydia 112; *SNG* Cop 616; *SNG* Aul 3231; *SNG* Cop 621 (Plate XIII. 12).

⁷⁷¹ Harl (1987), 55-8.

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.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 *ἀνεθήκεν* 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

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: *RRC* no. 334, *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 (*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 (*nobilitas*). For example the tomb of Ioulios Aurelios Charidemos Ioulianos at Aphrodisias enumerates the career and achievements of the builder's father and grandfather: *I.Aph* 2007 12.909, (*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.⁷⁷⁴ Cult statues representing prominent civic deities had been a feature of coin iconography since its origin.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.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.⁷⁷⁷ Moreover, it is also apparent that profound changes in civic coin iconography occurred in the Roman imperial period. The editors of *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.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.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.⁷⁸⁰ Scenes from the civic myth-history were lavishly depicted on numerous coin types.⁷⁸¹ The image of the Emperor and Imperial house began to

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.

⁷⁷⁵ For the example Zeus Ithomatas at Messene: *BMC Peloponnesus* xliii.

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 Thespieae c. 1st century BC, Stesichoros at Himera c. 100 BC, Anaxagoras at Klazomenai, Hippokrates at Kos c. 1st century BC, and Eukleides(?) at Megara c. 100 BC: Schefold (1943), 172, Büschner (1882), 109-137.

⁷⁷⁷ Heuchert (2005), 52.

⁷⁷⁸ Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 43 and Burnett, Amandry and Carradice (1999), 33.

⁷⁷⁹ Heuchert (2005), 49.

⁷⁸⁰ Burnett (1999), 158.

⁷⁸¹ Heuchert (2005), 51-2.

permeate even reverse types.⁷⁸² Later in the second century and particularly in the third, motifs relating to agonistic contests became extremely popular.⁷⁸³

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.⁷⁸⁴ 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.⁷⁸⁵ 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.⁷⁸⁶

⁷⁸² Harl (1987), 39-70.

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.

⁷⁸⁵ Burnett (1999), 158-9.

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.⁷⁸⁷ 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 worshipping one of the primary civic deities or making a formal entry into the city on horseback (the *adventus*).⁷⁸⁸ 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.⁷⁸⁹ 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).⁷⁹⁰ 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.

⁷⁸⁹ Burnett (1999), 157-8.

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.

new neokorate.⁷⁹¹ 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.⁷⁹² For example, the three neokorate temples type of Smyrna was in use for a sustained period between AD 212- 268.⁷⁹³ 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.⁷⁹⁴ 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 ΝΩΕ.⁷⁹⁵ 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.⁷⁹⁶ In the second century the Phrygian city of Synnada claimed descent from both Athens and Sparta via the heroes Akamas, the son of Theseos, and Thynnaros, who were proudly depicted on the city's coinage.⁷⁹⁷ 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.⁷⁹⁸ 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.

⁷⁹⁷ Howgego (2005), 6; see Spawforth and Walker (1986), 89-90 and Jones (1996), 39-41 for an account of the foundation myth at Athens.

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.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.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

⁷⁹⁹ Heuchert (2005), 55.

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 *RPC* I, to six in *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.⁸⁰¹ 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.⁸⁰² Polemon's son Attalos continued to be resident at Smyrna, but dedicated a coinage to his two fatherlands, Smyrna and Laodikeia on the Lykos: Ἀτταλος σοφιστῆς ταῖς πατρίσι Σμυρ Λαο ('Attalos (the) sophist to his fatherlands Smyr(na and) Lao(dikeia)).⁸⁰³ Moreover he married a native of Phokaia.⁸⁰⁴ Other eponyms also operated within Pan-Hellenic elite cultural networks. The eponym M. Oulpius Appouleios Eurykles served as Aizanoi's representative at the Panhellenion in Athens, ultimately achieving the position of *archon*.⁸⁰⁵ Later he was appointed as the curator (*logistes*) of the *gerousia* of Ephesos c. AD 162/3 by the proconsul.⁸⁰⁶ In addition to this Eurykles twice served as high priest of the *koinon* of Asia, the first of which is mentioned on his coinage.⁸⁰⁷ 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 (Philostratos *VS* 532): Thonemann (Thesis), 146-8. For a recent discussion of the career of Polemon see Quet (2003), 401-443.

⁸⁰² Philostratos *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 Wörrle (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 Chrysispos 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.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.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.⁸¹³ Moreover, the opening three lines of the text ([Θ]έω Δ[ί] ἐλευθερίω φιλοπάτριδι| Θεοφάνη) emphasise both the posthumous divine honours accorded to Theophanes and his role in securing freedom for Mytilene.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

⁸¹¹ Salzmänn (1985), 252, Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 396: for the purging of Theophanes' descendents see Tac *Ann.* VI. 18.

⁸¹² Plutarch, *Pompey* 42.

⁸¹³ *IG* XII 163 b.

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*.⁸¹⁷ The Dada reverse type portrays a standing female figure wearing a *chiton* holding a short staff in her right hand.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.⁸¹⁹ The same inscription records that Phlabia Nikomachis was the daughter of Dinnomachos and Prokla.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.⁸²¹ The similar nomenclature suggests that Deinomachos should be identified with the Dinnomachos, who is attested epigraphically as the father of Nikomachis.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.⁸²³ The depiction of local notables on the coinage of Mytilene is so common in this period that the reference to Nausikaa (ΝΑΥΣΙΚΑΑ ΗΡΩΙΔΑ) is more likely to refer to a distinguished lady of

⁸¹⁷ *BMC* Lesbos 161-2 (Plate III. 4-5).

⁸¹⁸ *BMC* Lesbos 163 (Plate III. 7).

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

⁸²⁰ Heuchert 766-9 (Plate IV. 1-3).

⁸²¹ Wroth (1894), 226-7, Heuchert 752 (Plate III. 6).

⁸²² Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 1036.

⁸²³ Wroth (1894), 226-7 cf. Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 228.

Mytilene than the legendary daughter of Alkinous.⁸²⁴ 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.⁸²⁵ 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.⁸²⁶ 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 Saltatione* (69) is plausible.⁸²⁷

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.⁸²⁸ 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?]ΠΙ.ΛΕ); however, the youthful male bust obverse type indicates that we probably dealing with another honorific portrait bust. The reverse type bears the legend ΛΕΥΚΙΠΠΙΟΣ ΜΥΤΙ and depicts a male figure standing in a himation.⁸²⁹

⁸²⁴ Heuchert (Thesis Appendix), 228.

⁸²⁵ Heuchert 771, 774-775 (Plate IV. 5, 8-9).

⁸²⁶ Parker (1991), 126.

⁸²⁷ Parker (1991), 126.

⁸²⁸ Salzmann (1985), 260.

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 *JG* XII. 2 163 b. 5.

the portrait types of Mytilene.⁸³¹ Seven inscriptions record the names, patronymics and ethnics of mythical founders, all honoured with the title *ktistes*.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.⁸³³ The names of [M]. Plankios Ouaros and G. Plankios Ouaros are accorded the title of *ktistes* on the extant statue bases.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.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

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.

⁸³² *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.

⁸³³ For a discussion and hypothetical reconstruction of the monument see *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.

⁸³⁴ *I.Perge* 108-9.

⁸³⁵ The fact the portrait of Nikomachos is juxtaposed with that of Sextos adds considerable strength to this supposition: Wroth (1894), 226-7

posthumously.⁸³⁶ 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.⁸³⁷ The coin legend of Nausikaa accords heroic status to her (ΝΑΥΣΙΚΑΑ ΗΡΩΙΔΑ). 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.⁸³⁸ Therefore in this context, where heroic references were so common, the snake probably refers to heroic status, rather than to Asklepios.⁸³⁹ 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.⁸⁴⁰ 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 become 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.⁸⁴¹ 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*.⁸⁴² Several public hero cults are attested in the epigraphic record of Mytilene.⁸⁴³ Thus the heroic titlature 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.⁸⁴⁴

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 Lesbos the philosopher and Nausikaa.⁸⁴⁵ 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 Kapitón (*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. Klaudia 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.⁸⁴⁶ 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 15/16.⁸⁴⁷

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 *prophetes* 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.⁸⁵⁰ 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*.⁸⁵¹ 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.⁸⁵² 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.⁸⁵³ A Tiberios Klaudios Aristeas Menandros is

⁸⁵⁰ *I.Aph* 2007 1. 179 records that Markos Aurelios Zenas was honoured for dedicating the sum of 250 denarii to finance an annual lottery. In addition *I.Aph* 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 (*τήν τε πόλιν ἰστίασαν πᾶσαν καὶ ἔδωκαν διανομῆς ἐκάστῳ τῶν πολιτῶν ἀνὰ δηνάρια δύο ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ, ἕκαστον δῆμον ἐκ τῶν δέλτων καλέσαντες*).⁸⁵⁴ It is generally accepted that the eponym and the priest are the same man.⁸⁵⁵ Therefore, Harl is convinced that the extant bronze coins were produced for distribution at this event.⁸⁵⁶ 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*.⁸⁵⁷ 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*.

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*.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.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

⁸⁶³ Rogers (1991), Appendix 1 152-185 (*I.Ephesos* I 36): cf. van Bremen (1993), 245-6.

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).⁸⁶⁵ 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 ethnic. 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 ΝΕΟΙΣ (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.⁸⁶⁶ The reverse legend records the name and title of the eponym as well as the city ethnic: Α ΦΟΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΕΡΕΥΣ ΓΥΜΝΑΣΙΑΡΧΩΝ ΠΕΡΓΑΜΗΝΩΝ.⁸⁶⁷ 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 *boulaios*, probably by A. Phourios, the eponym mentioned in the nominative case on the reverse.⁸⁶⁸ 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.⁸⁶⁹ 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 Phourios 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 ΦΟΥΡΙΟΣ 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 Ripollès (1992), 400.

⁸⁶⁹ Meyer (1991), 198-203.

sculpture to gems, cameos and reliefs.⁸⁷⁰ 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.⁸⁷¹ 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.⁸⁷²

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 ANTINOOΣ HPΩΣ 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.⁸⁷³ 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

⁸⁷⁰ Meyer (1991), 13-161.

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 Adramyttion 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'.⁸⁷⁴ The legend formulae, denomination and unique iconography of Polemon's Antinoos issues mark them out from the conventional coinage of Smyrna.⁸⁷⁵ 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.⁸⁷⁶ 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).⁸⁷⁷ 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.⁸⁷⁸ 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.⁸⁷⁹ 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.⁸⁸⁰ 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.⁸⁸¹ 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.⁸⁸² 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.⁸⁸³ Under the Ptolemies, the worship of the Apis bull became assimilated with the Osiris-Dionysos cult.⁸⁸⁴ 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.⁸⁸⁵ 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.⁸⁸⁶ 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.

⁸⁸⁴ Thompson (1988), 201-3.

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 epehebic 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.⁸⁸⁹ 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 ΑΙΑ ΕΡΜΕΙΑΣ ΠΡΥΤ ΚΥΜΑΟΙΣ. However, the iconography of Hermeias' issue, in contrast to that of Polemon, largely drew upon the established civic repertoire.⁸⁹⁰ 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.⁸⁹¹ 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, Iason 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.⁸⁹² The early third century was a period of unprecedented output of this mint.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.⁸⁹⁴ The epigraphic material also provides ample evidence for the importance of munificence on the part of the priests serving at these sanctuaries.⁸⁹⁵ Therefore Harl has argued that other Severan eponyms of Stratonikeia were responsible for the type of distribution conducted by Klaudios Aristeas.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

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 (Kl. Dionysos); *SNG* Cop 508 (Plate XXXII. 6: Nikephoros Dionysos); *SNG* 507 (Plate XXXII. 4: Iason 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).

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

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).

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.

⁸⁹⁶ Harl (1996), 266.

figures.⁸⁹⁷ 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.⁸⁹⁸ In such cases distributions were probably in the form of silver denarii or existing bronze coinage.⁸⁹⁹ The re-use of old bronze in this context may help to explain the preponderance of countermarked specimens.⁹⁰⁰ For Harl the countermarks are evidence that civic bronze coins were reissued at subsequent festivals.⁹⁰¹ 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: Iason 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 Artemisos (*I.Stratonikeia* 197).

⁸⁹⁹ Evidence for the distribution of silver is provided by the formula *ἐπὶ διανομῇ 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 ‘*θεός*’ 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.⁹⁰² 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.⁹⁰³ 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 Phlabios Aristolaos were drawn from influential families with strong ties to the sanctuaries at Lagina and Panamara.⁹⁰⁴ 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

⁹⁰² Eumenes: Augustus? *RPC* I 2775 (drachm, riding Zeus Panamaros), 2776 (hemidrachm, Nike in incuse); Aristeas: Augustus/Tiberios? 2777 (drachm, riding Zeus Panamaros), 2778 (hemidrachm, Hekate head/Nike in incuse); Klaudios Theophanes: Claudius/Nero 2779 (drachm, Zeus Panamaros riding), 2780 (hemidrachm Hekate head/Nike in incuse); [?]abeiniano[?]as: Nero? (didrachm, Zeus Panamaros riding); Phlabios Aristolaos: Antoninus Pius Heuchert 1994 (drachm?, Zeus Panamaros riding); Klaudios Aristeas: Antininos Pius Heuchert 1995 (drachm?, Zeus Panamaros riding).

⁹⁰³ Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès (1992), 457-8.

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.⁹⁰⁸ However, it was probably more common for new, particularly small denomination, coinage to be sold to the moneychangers.⁹⁰⁹ 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.⁹¹⁰ 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.⁹¹¹ In this scenario access to a supply of new coinage would have been a priority for to the moneychangers.⁹¹²

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.⁹¹³ However, this flexibility could also be advantageous. Other monuments were confined to particular location, thus limiting the opportunities for interaction, whereas local

⁹¹⁰ *OGIS* 484 ll.8-23.

⁹¹¹ *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).

⁹¹² 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.

⁹¹³ 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.⁹¹⁴ 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.⁹¹⁵ 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.⁹¹⁶ 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, Byzantium and some mints in Achaia began to change. There was a general shift towards the *ἐπί* + 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 (*εἰσαγγείλαντος, ψηφισαμένου, προνοηθέντος, ἐπιμεληθέντος* and *αἰτησάμενος*) or indicating that the coinage was a personal dedication

⁹¹⁶ Butcher (2005), 148-150.

(ἀνέθηκεν). Since the ἐπί + 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.⁹²¹ He was also responsible for an issue dedicated to the *demos* of Smyrna commemorating Hadrian's deceased favourite Antinoos.⁹²² 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.⁹²³ 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

⁹²¹ *PIR*² A 862, Philostratos *VS*, *I.Smyrna* 697,6; 697, 35; 778, 2-3.

⁹²² Klose (1987), 250-4.

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.⁹²⁴ 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.⁹²⁵ 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

⁹²⁴ 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.

⁹²⁵ At Smyrna Theudianos uses the dedication formula in conjunction with the common civic type of Kybele enthroned: Klose (1987), 258.

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.⁹²⁶ 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.⁹²⁷ 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.⁹²⁸ Even reverse types began to be adorned with images of the Emperor and Imperial house.⁹²⁹ By the second century and particularly in the third, motifs relating to agonistic contests became extremely popular.⁹³⁰ 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.

⁹²⁹ Harl (1987), 39-70.

⁹³⁰ Klöse (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

⁹³¹ Leschhorn (1981), 252-266: for an outline of other possible distorting factors in the figures compiled by Leschhorn see Johnston (1984), 240-247.

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.⁹³⁴ 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.⁹³⁵ 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.⁹³⁶

and site find evidence, although her findings must be treated with caution because of the limitations inherent in the evidence: Katsari (2005), 267-270. Only 10 mid third century base metal hoards are published for the whole of Anatolia and the number of excavated sites is equally limited (including Pergamon, Tarsos, Troy, Ephesos, Sardeis, Aphrodisias, Side, Sagalassos, Galatian Ankyra, Kültepe and Perge). Not only is the sample used by Katsari small, but also it is liable to significant bias. Johnston has pointed out that many later issues re-used earlier worn flans, thus obscuring the true level of first, second and early third century civic minting. During the third century the pattern of issues changed so that ratio of reverse to obverse dies increased in the wake of the drive toward greater iconographic diversity, therefore museum collections over-represent more diverse later issues. In addition the distribution of published hoards is suspicious. The lack of hoards dating to before the reign of Maximian lends weight to Johnston's thesis that large bronze hoards were the result of the monetary difficulties of the 250's and 60's (the debasement of the denarius and the end of civic coinage). Therefore, disproportionate numbers of mid third century issues may have entered museum collections: Johnston (1984), 252-253.

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.

⁹³⁶ Leschhorn (1981), 254.

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.⁹³⁷ 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.⁹³⁸

The only significant change in eponym citation strategy in the third century is the disappearance of the *ἀνέθηκεν* and dative ethnic dedication formulae.⁹³⁹ 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.

⁹³⁷ The eponyms G. Daphnos and Aurelios are attested for the reign of Gallienus at Magnesia and the eponym Aur. Sextos appears on the coinage of Smyrna c. AD 260-8: Schultz (1975), 25, 123-4, Klose (1987), 316-326.

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-xlix (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 *ἐπί* + 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 *ἐπί* + 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 *ἐπί* + 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 uncertainty, 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.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.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.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.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

⁹⁴⁰ Ratté (2001), 124.

⁹⁴¹ Smith (1999), 173.

⁹⁴² Roueché (1989), xxiv-xxv.

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.⁹⁴⁴ 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 relative 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.⁹⁴⁵ 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.⁹⁴⁶ 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.⁹⁴⁷ 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

⁹⁴⁵ Howgego (1985), 60-62, Johnston (2007), 43-6.

⁹⁴⁶ Johnston presents evidence for this system at Eumenia, Termessos, Koana, Pednelissos, Timbria: 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.⁹⁴⁸ 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.⁹⁴⁹ 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.⁹⁵⁰

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.

⁹⁴⁹ Burnett (1987), 122-126.

⁹⁵⁰ Burnett (1987), 124.

particular a re-tariffing of the Alexandrian tetradrachm to the aureus.⁹⁵¹ 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.⁹⁵² 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 tarified 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.⁹⁵³ 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.

⁹⁵² Howgego (1995), 125-127.

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 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.

⁹⁵⁵ Burnett (1987), 126-131.

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.

Bibliography

Abbott and Johnson 1926: F. F. Abbott and A. C. Johnson, *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire* (Princeton).

Akarca 1959: A. Akarca, *Les monnaies grecques de Mylasa* (Paris).

Alcock 2002: S. Alcock, *Archaeologies of the Greek Past, Landscapes, Monuments and Memories* (Cambridge).

Ashton 2001: R. H. J. Ashton, 'The Coinage of Rhodes 408-c.190 BC', in A. Meadows and K. Shipton (eds.), *Money and its uses in the Ancient Greek World* (Oxford), 79-117.

von Aulock 1979: H. von. Aulock, 'Zur Münzprägung von Aizanoi', in R. Naumann (ed.), *Der Zeustempel zu Aizanoi: nach den Ausgrabungen von Daniel Krencker und Martin Schede* (Berlin), 82-94.

von Aulock 1980: H. von. Aulock, *Münzen und Städte Phrygiens. I* (Tübingen).

von Aulock 1987: H. von Aulock, *Münzen und Städte Phrygiens. II* (Tübingen).

Babington 1866: C. Babington, 'On an unpublished Coin of Laodicea in Phrygia, bearing the name of an Asiarch, *Numismatic Chronicle* vi, 93-133.

Barr 1996: A. E. Barr, 'Horse and Rider Plaques at Ilion: a Preliminary Study of the Hellenistic Hero cult in Asia Minor', *Studia Troica* vi, 135-157.

Barron 1966: J. P. Barron, *The Silver Coins of Samos* (London).

Bell 1916: H. W. Bell, *Sardis volume XI. Coins* (Leiden 1916).

Bellinger 1958: A. Bellinger, 'The First Civic Tetradrachms of Ilium,' *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* viii, 1-24.

- Bellinger 1961: A. Bellinger, *Troy: the Coins* (Princeton).
- Birley 1997: A. Birley, *Hadrian: the Restless Emperor* (London).
- Blum 1914: G. Blum, 'Numismatique d'Antinoos', *Journal international d'archéologie numismatique* xvi, 33-70.
- Bloesch 1997: H. Bloesch, *Griechische Münzen in Winterthur. Teil II* (1997).
- Bosch 1935: C. E. Bosch, *Die kleinasiatischen Münzen der römischen Kaiserzeit. Teil. I. -2.* (Stuttgart).
- Bowersock 1969: G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford).
- Bowie 1974: E. Bowie, 'Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic', in M. Finley (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Society* (London), 166-209.
- Bowie 1982: E. Bowie, 'The Importance of Sophists', *Yale Classical Studies* xxvii, 29-59.
- van Bremen 1993: R. van Bremen, 'Review of G. M. Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos*, London 1991, *Journal of Roman Studies* lxxxiii, 245-6.
- van Bremen 1996: R. van Bremen, *The Limits of Participation: Women and Civic Life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Amsterdam).
- Broughton 1938: T. R. S. Broughton, 'Roman Asia' in T. Frank (ed.), *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome Vol. IV* (Baltimore), 499-916.
- Browne 2000: G. M. Browne, 'A New Lydian Text', *Kadmos* xxxix, 178-9.
- Bürchner 1882: L. Bürchner, 'Griechische Münzen mit Bildnissen historischer Privatpersonen', *Zeitschrift für Numismatik* ix, 109-137.

Burnett 1987: A. Burnett, *Coinage in the Roman World* (London).

Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès 1992: A. Burnett, M. Amandry and P. Ripollès, *Roman Provincial Coinage Vol. I: From the Death of Caesar to the Death of Vitellius (44 BC- AD 69)*, (Paris and London).

Burnett, Amandry and Carradice 1999: A. Burnett, M. Amandry and I. Carradice, *Roman Provincial Coinage Vol. II. From Vespasian to Domitian (AD 69-96)*, (Paris and London).

Burnett 1999: A. Burnett, 'Buildings and Monuments on Roman Coins', in G. M. Paul (ed.), *Roman Coins and Public Life under the Empire. E. Togo Salmon Papers II* (Ann Arbor), 137-164.

Burnett 2005: A. Burnett, 'The Roman West and the Roman East', in C. Howgego, V. Heuchert and A. Burnett (eds.) *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces* (Oxford), 171-180.

Burnett 2009: A. Burnett, 'The `Rise and Fall of the Roman `Sestertius' at Alexandria', *Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau* lxxxviii, 225-243.

Burrell 2004: B. Burrell, *Neokoroi: Greek Cities and Roman Emperors* (Leiden).

Burton 1979: G. P. Burton, 'The Curator Rei Publicae: Towards a Reappraisal', *Chiron* ix, 465-488.

Butcher 1988: K. Butcher, *Roman Provincial Coins: an Introduction to Greek Imperials* (London).

Butcher 2005: K. Butcher, 'Information, Legitimation, or Self-Legimation? Popular and Elite Designs on the Coin Types of Syria', in C. Howgego, V. Heuchert and A. Burnett (eds.) *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces* (Oxford), 143-156.

Caldelli 1995: M. L. Caldelli, 'Considerazioni sulla cronologia dei *Chrysanthia* di Sardinia', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* cix, 62-72.

Caltabiano 1971-2: M. Caccamo Caltabiano, 'Contromarche di revaluazione su serie monetali di Stratonicea di età severiana', *Atti della Accademia peloritana* ccxli-ccxlii, 293-295.

Callu 1969: J-P. Callu, *La politique monétaire des empereurs romains de 238 à 311* (Paris).

Campanile 1994: M. D. Campanile, 'I sacerdoti del koinon d'Asia (I sec. a.C. –III sec d.C.). Contributo allo studio della romanizzazione delle élites provinciali nell'Oriente greco', (Pisa).

Canali De Rossi 2007: F. Canali De Rossi, *Filius Publicus. ΥΙΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΛΕΩΣ e titoli affini in iscrizione greche di età imperiale* (Rome).

Carter 2004: M. Carter, 'Archiereis and Asiarchs: a Gladiatorial Perspective', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* xliv, 41-68.

Christol and Drew-Bear 1986: M. Christol and T. Drew-Bear, 'Documents latins de Phrygie', *Tyche* i, 41-87.

Cohen 1995: G. Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands and Asia Minor* (Berkeley).

Crawford 1975: M. H. Crawford, 'Finance, Coinage and Money from the Severans to Constantine', in H. Temporini and W. Haase, *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung. II Band II* (Berlin/New York), 560-593.

Crawford 1985: M. Crawford, *Coinage and money under the Roman Republic: Italy and the Mediterranean economy* (London).

de Callatay 1992: F. de Callatay, 'Athenian New Style Tetradrachms in Macedonian Hoards', *American Journal of Numismatics* iii-iv, 11-20.

de Callatay (forthcoming): F. de Callatay, 'The Coinage of the Attalids and their Neighbours'.

Demougin 1999: S. Demougin, 'L'ordre équestre en Asie Mineure. Histoire d'une Romanization', in S. Demougin, H. Devijver and M-T. Raepsaet-Charlier (eds.), *L'ordre équestre. Histoire d'une aristocratie (IIe siècle av. J.-C. – IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.)*, (Rome), 579-612.

Devijver 1989: H. Devijver, *The Equestrian Officers of the Roman Imperial Army* (Amsterdam).

Dmitriev 1997: S. Dmitriev, 'ΟΙ ΕΠΙΩΝΥΜΟΙ and ΕΠΙΩΝΥΜΟΙ ΑΡΧΑΙ in the Cities of Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor', *Revue des études anciennes* xcix, 525-534.

Dmitriev 2001: S. Dmitriev, 'The End of *provincia Asia*', *Historia* 1, 468-89.

Dmitriev 2005: S. Dmitriev, *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor* (Oxford).

Dräger 1993: M. Dräger, *Die Städte der Provinz Asia in der Flavierzeit: Studien zur kleinasiatischen Stadt- und Regionalgeschichte* (Frankfurt).

Drew-Bear 1978: T. Drew-Bear, *Nouvelles inscriptions de Phrygie* (Zutphen).

Drew-Bear 1979: T. Drew-Bear, 'The City of Temenouthyrai in Phrygia', *Chiron* ix, 275-302.

Ebert 1972: J. Ebert, *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen* (Berlin).

Eckhel 1779: J. Eckhel, *Catalogus Musei Cæsarei Vindobonensis numorum veterum distributus in partes II: Quarum prior monetam urbium, populorum, regum, altera Romanorum complectitur* (Vienna).

Engelmann 1972: H. Engelmann, 'Eine Prägung des Ionischen Bundes', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* ix, 188-192.

Fernoux 2004: H. L. Fernoux, *Notables et élites des cités de Bithynie aux époques hellénistique et romaine: IIIe siècle av. J.-C.-IIIe siècle ap. J.-C: essai d'histoire sociale* (Lyon).

Figueira 1998: T. Figueira, *The power of Money: Coinage and Politics in the Athenian Empire* (Philadelphia).

Franke 1975: P. R. Franke, 'Zur Münzprägung von Methymna' in H. G. Buchholz (ed.), *Methymna: archäologische Beiträge zur Topographie und Geschichte von Nordlesbos* (Mainz), 163-76.

Franke and Nollé 1997: P. R. Franke and M. K. Nollé, *Die Homonoia-Münzen Kleinasiens und der thrakischen Randgebiete, i: Katalog* (Saarbrücken 1975).

Fraser 1978: P. M. Fraser, 'The Kings of Commagene and the Greek World' in S. Şahin, E. Schwertheim and J. Wagner (eds.), *Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasiens; Festschrift für Friedrich Karl Dörner zum 65. Geburtstag am 28 Februar 1976* (Leiden), 359-374.

Fredrich 1897: C. Fredrich, 'Die Aphrodite von Aphrodisias in Karien', *Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* xxii, 361-380.

Frei-Korsunsky 1986: S. Frei-Korsunsky, 'Meilensteine aus der Gegend von Eskisehir', *Epigraphica Anatolica* viii, 91-99.

French 1989: D. French, 'Two Gladiatorial Texts from Claudiopolis in Bithynia', *Epigraphica Anatolica* xiii, 91-97.

French 1991: D. French, 'Sites and Inscriptions from Phrygia, Pisidia and Pamphylia', *Epigraphica Anatolica* xvii, 51-68.

Friesen 1993: S. J. Friesen, *Twice Neokoros: Ephesus, Asia and the Cult of the Flavian Imperial Family* (Leiden).

Friesen 1999: S. J. Friesen, 'Asiarchs', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* cxxvi, 275-90.

von Fritz 1913: H. von Fritz, *Die antiken Münzen Mysiens* (Berlin).

Fröhlich 2002: P. Fröhlich, 'Les magistrats des cités grecque: image et réalité du pouvoir', in H. Inglebert (ed.), *Idéologie et valeurs civiques dans le monde romain; hommage à Claude Lepelley* (Paris), 75-92.

Fürtwängler 1982: A. Fürtwängler 'Griechische Vieltypenprägungen und Münzbeamte', *Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau* lxi, 5-30.

Garnsey 1970: P. Garnsey, *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire* (Oxford).

Garnsey 1971: P. Garnsey, 'Honorarium Decurionatus' *Historia* xx, 309-325.

Garnsey 1988: P. Garnsey, *Famine and Food Supply*, (Cambridge).

Gauthier 1975: P. Gauthier, 'Légendes monétaires grecques', in J-M. Dentzer, P. Gauthier and T. Hackens (eds.), *Numismatique antique: problèmes et méthodes: actes du colloque organisé à Nancy du 27 septembre au 2 octobre 1971* (Nancy/Louvain), 165-79.

Gauthier 2005: P. Gauthier, 'Trois exemples méconnus d'intervenants dans décrets de la basse époque hellénistique', in P. Fröhlich and C. Müller (eds.), *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique: actes de la table ronde des 22 et 23 mai 2004, Paris BNF*, (Geneva), 79-93.

Geagan 1972: D. J. Geagan, 'Hadrian and the Athenian Dionysiac technitai', *Transactions and proceedings of the American philological society* ciii, 134-160.

Gillespie 1956: J. U. Gillespie, 'KOINON IΓ ΠΟΛΕΩΝ: a Study of the Coinage of the Ionian League', *Revue Belge de Numismatique* cii, 31-53.

Gillespie 1959: J. U. Gillespie, 'KOINON IΓ ΠΟΛΕΩΝ: Addendum,' *Revue Belge de Numismatique* cv, pp. 211-13.

Gnecchi 1912: F. Gnecchi, *I Medaglioni Romani* (Milan).

Grimm, Kessler and Meyer 1994: A. Grimm, D. Kessler and H. Meyer, *Der Obelisk des Antinoos: eine kommentierte Edition* (Munich).

Grant 1946: M. Grant, *From Imperium to Auctoritas: a historical study of aes coinage in the Roman Empire 49 B.C.-A.D. 14* (Cambridge).

Habicht 1969: C. Habicht, *Altertümer von Pergamon VIII. 3: Die Inschriften des Asklepieions* (Berlin).

Halfmann 1979: H. Halfmann, *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr* (Göttingen).

Halfmann 1986: H. Halfmann, *Itinera principum. Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen im römischen Reich. (Heidelberger althistorische Beiträge und epigraphische Studien 2.)* (Stuttgart).

Hallet 2005: C. Hallet, *The Roman Nude: Heroic Portrait Statuary 200 BC –AD 300* (Oxford).

Hamon 2005: P. Hamon, 'Le Conseil et la participation et le non-participation des citoyens; les mutations de la basse époque hellénistique', in P. Fröhlich and C. Müller (eds.), *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique: actes de la table ronde des 22 et 23 mai 2004, Paris BNF*, (Geneva), 121-144.

Harl 1981: K. W. Harl, 'Caracalla or Elagabalus', *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* xxvi, 163-184.

Harl 1987: K. W. Harl, *Civic Coins and Civic Politics in the Roman East AD 180-275* (Berkeley).

Harl 1996: K. W. Harl, *Coinage in the Roman Economy 300 BC to AD 700* (Baltimore).

Harl 1997: K. W. Harl, 'Greek Imperial Coins in the Economic Life of the Roman East' in J. Nollé, B. Overbeck and P. Weiss (eds.), *Nomismata 1. Internationales Kolloquium zur kaiserzeitlichen Münzprägung Kleinasiens: 27.-30. April 1994 in der Staatlichen Münzsammlung* (Munich), 223-9.

Head 1911: B. Head, *Historia Numorum: a Manual of Greek Numismatics* (London).

Hecht 1968: R. E. Hecht, 'Some Greek Imperial Coins in my Collection', *Numismatic Chronicle* cxxviii, 27-35.

Hepding 1910: H. Hepding, 'Der Arbeiten zu Pergamon', *Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* xxxv, 401-523.

Herda 2006: A. Herda, *Der Apollon-Delphinios-Kult in Milet und die Neujahrsprozession nach Didyma: ein neuer Kommentar der sog. Molpoi- Satzung* (Mainz).

Herrmann 1975: P. Herrmann, 'Eine Kaiserurkunde aus der Zeit Marc Aurels aus Milet', *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* xxv, 144-66.

Herrmann 2002: P. Herrmann, 'Das KOINON ΤΩΝ ΙΩΝΩΝ unter Römischer Herrschaft' in J. Deininger, N. Erhardt and L-M. Günther (eds.), *Widerstand, Anpassung, Integration: die griechische Staatenwelt und Rom: Festschrift für Jürgen Deininger zum 65. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart), 222-240.

Heuchert (Thesis): V. Heuchert, *Roman Coins from the Province of Asia in the Antonine Period (AD 138-192)*, Thesis for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Oxford, Michaelmas Term 1997.

Heuchert 2005: V. Heuchert, 'The Chronological Development of Roman Provincial Coinage' in C. Howgego, V. Heuchert and A. Burnett (eds.) *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces* (Oxford), 29-56.

Hiller 1906: von Hiller, *Die Inschriften von Priene* (Berlin).

Hodot 1976: R. Hodot, 'Notes critiques sur le corpus épigraphique de Lesbos', *etudes d'archéologie classique* v, 17-81.

Holtheide 1983: B. Holtheide, *Römische Bürgerrechtspolitik und römische Neubürger in der Provinz Asia* (Freiburg).

Hoover and MacDonald 1999-2000: O. Hoover and D. MacDonald, 'Syrian Imitations of the New Style Athenian Tetradrachms struck over Myrina', *Berytus* xliv, 109-117.

Houghton 1983: A. Houghton, *Coins of the Seleucid Empire from the Collection of A. Houghton* (New York).

Houghton and Lorber 2002: A. Houghton and C. Lorber, *Seleucid Coins: a Comprehensive Catalogue. Part I Seleucus I through Antiochus III. Volumes I and II* (New York).

Howgego 1981: C. Howgego, 'Ionian Magistrates: Caracalla or Elagabalus?', *Numismatic Chronicle* cxli, 147-149.

Howgego 1985: C. Howgego, *Greek Imperial Countermarks: Studies in the Provincial Coinage of the Roman Empire* (London).

Howgego 1990: C. Howgego, 'Why did Ancient States strike Coins', *Numismatic Chronicle* cl, 1-25.

Howgego 1993: C. Howgego, 'Review of A. Burnett, M. Amandry and P. Ripollès, *Roman Provincial Coinage Vol. I: From the Death of Caesar to the Death of Vitellius (44 BC- AD 69)*, Paris and London 1992', *Journal of Roman Studies* lxxxiii, 199-203.

Howgego 1995: C. Howgego, *Ancient History from coins* (London).

Howgego 2005: C. Howgego, 'Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces,' in C. Howgego, V. Heuchert and A. Burnett (eds.) *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces* (Oxford), 1-18.

Hughes 1999: D. Hughes, 'Hero-Cult, Heroic Honors, Heroic Dead: Some Developments of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods', in R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek hero cult: proceedings of the Fifth International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, organized by the Department of Classical Archaeology and Ancient History, Göteborg University, 21-23 April 1995* (Gothenburg), 167-175.

Imhoof-Blumer 1890: F. Imhoof-Blumer, *Griechische Münzen: neue Beiträge und Untersuchungen* (Munich).

Imhoof-Blumer 1897: F. Imhoof-Blumer, *Lydische Stadtmünzen* (Leipzig).

Imhoof-Blumer 1898: F. Imhoof-Blumer, 'Zur griechischen Münzkunde', *Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau* viii, 1-48.

Imhoof-Blumer 1898b: F. Imhoof-Blumer, 'Coin Types of Some Kilikian Cities', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* xviii, 161-181.

Imhoof-Blumer 1901: F. Imhoof-Blumer, *Kleinasiatische Münzen, Band I & II* (Vienna).

Imhoof-Blumer 1908: F. Imhoof-Blumer, 'Nymphen und Chariten auf Griechischen Münzen', *Journal international d'archéologie numismatique* xi, 1-213.

Imhoof-Blumer 1915: F. Imhoof-Blumer, 'ΙΙΙΠΙΚΟΙ' Römische Ritter als Beamte in griechischen Städten', *Numismatische Zeitschrift* xlviii, 94-107.

Jameson 1965: S. Jameson, 'Cornutus Tertullus and the Plancii of Perge', *Journal of Roman Studies* lv, 54-8.

Johnston 1974: A. Johnston, 'New Problems for Old: Konrad Kraft on Die-sharing in Asia Minor,' *Numismatic Chronicle* xiv, 203-7.

Johnston 1982-3: A. Johnston, 'Die Sharing in Asia Minor: the view from Sardis', *Israel Numismatic Journal* vi-vii: 59-78.

Johnston 1983: A. Johnston, 'The Denominational systems of the Greek Imperials of Bizye in Thrace', *Numismatic Chronicle* cxliii, 231-9.

Johnston 1983: A. Johnston, 'Caracalla's Path: the Numismatic Evidence', *Historia* xxxii, 58-76.

Johnston 1984a: A. Johnston, 'Greek Imperial Statistics: a Commentary', *Revue numismatique* 6^e xxvi, 240-257.

Johnston 1984b: A. Johnston, 'Hierapolis revisited', *Numismatic Chronicle* cxliv (1984), 52-80.

Johnston 1995: A. Johnston, 'Aphrodisias Reconsidered', *Numismatic Chronicle* clv, 43-100.

Johnston 2007: A. Johnston, *Greek Imperial Denominations, ca. 200-275: a Study of the Roman Provincial Bronze Coinages of Asia Minor* (London).

Jones 1940: A. M. H. Jones, *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian* (Oxford).

Jones 1953: A. M. H. Jones, 'Census Records of the Later Roman Empire'. *Journal of Roman Studies* xliii, 47-64.

Jones 1980: C. P. Jones, 'Prosopographical Notes on the Second Sophistic', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* xxi, 373-9.

Jones 1990: C. P. Jones, 'Heracles 'the warden of arms'', *American Journal of Numismatics* ii, 70-6.

Jones 1996: C. P. Jones, 'The Panhellenion', *Chiron* xxvi, 29-56.

Jones 1979: N. F. Jones, 'The Wreathed Tetradrachms of Magnesia on the Maeander', *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* xxiv, 63-109.

Kampmann 1997: U. Kampmann, 'Eine gemeinsame Emission der Städte Pergamon und Ephesos für das Koinon der 13 Ionischen Städte. Beiträge des Münzhandels zur Imperialforschung', J. Nollé, B. Overbeck and P. Weiss (eds.), *Nomismata I. Internationales Kolloquium zur kaiserzeitlichen Münzprägung Kleinasiens: 27.-30. April 1994 in der Staatlichen Münzsammlung* (Munich), 83-91.

Karwiese 1995: S. Karwiese, *Die Münzprägung von Ephesos* (Vienna).

Kastner 1986: W. Kastner, '„Phanes“ oder „Phano“, ' *Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau* lxxv, 5-11.

Kater-Sibbes and Vermaseren 1975a: G. J. F. Kater-Sibbes and M. J. Vermaseren, *Apis I. The Monuments of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods from Egypt* (Leiden).

Kater-Sibbes and Vermaseren 1975b: G. J. F. Kater-Sibbes and M. J. Vermaseren, *Apis II. The Monuments from outside Egypt* (Leiden).

Kater-Sibbes and Vermaseren 1977: G. J. F. Kater-Sibbes and M. J. Vermaseren, *Apis III. Inscriptions, Coins and Addenda* (Leiden).

Katsari 2005: C. Katsari, 'The Monetization of Roman Asia Minor in the Third Century AD', in S. Mitchell and C. Katsari (eds.), *Patterns in the Economy of Roman Asia Minor* (Swansea), 261-288.

Kawerau and Rehm 1914: G. Kawerau and A. Rehm, *Milet. Heft III: Das Delphinion in Milet* (Berlin).

Kearsley 1986: R. A. Kearsley, 'Asiarchs, Archiereis, and Archiereiai of Asia', *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* xxvii, 183-192.

Kearsley 1987: R. A. Kearsley, 'M. Ulpus Appuleius Eurykles of Aezani: Panhellene, Asiarch and Archiereus of Asia', *Antichthon* xxi, 49-56.

Kearsley 1988: R. A. Kearsley, 'Asiarchs: Titulature and Function. A Reappraisal', *Studia Classica* xxvi, 57-65.

Kearsley 1990: R. A. Kearsley, 'Asiarchs, Archiereis and Archieriai of Asia: New Evidence from Amorium in Phrygia', *Epigraphica Anatolica* xvi, 69-80.

Keil and von Premerstein 1911: J. Keil and A von Premerstein, '*Bericht über eine zweite Reise in Lydien. Ausgeführt 1908 im Auftrage des K. K. Österreichischen archäologischen Instituts*', (Vienna)

Keil and Gschnitzer 1956: J. Keil and F. Gschnitzer, 'Neue Inschriften aus Lydien', *Anzeiger der philosophisch-historischen Klasse. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften* xviii, 219-231.

Kern 1900: O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander* (Berlin).

Kinns 1987: P. Kinns, 'Asia Minor', in Burnett and Crawford (eds.), *The Coinage of the Roman World in the Late Republic: proceedings of a colloquium held at the British Museum in September 1985* (Oxford), 105-120.

Kinns 1989: P. Kinns, 'Two Studies in the Silver Coinage of Magnesia on the Maeander' in G. Le Rider, K. Jenkins and U. Westermark (eds.), *Kraay-Mørkholm essays: numismatic studies in memory of C.M. Kraay and O. Mørkholm* (Louvain), 137-148.

Klose 1987: D. Klose, *Die Münzprägung von Smyrna in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Berlin).

Klose and Stumpf 1996: D. Klose and G Stumpf, *Sport, Spiele, Sieg: Münzen und Gemmen der Antike* (Munich).

Klose 2005: D. Klose, 'Festivals and Games in the Cities of the East during the Roman Empire' in C. Howgego, V. Heuchert and A. Burnett (eds.) *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces* (Oxford), 125-135.

Knoepfler 1979: D. Knoepfler, 'Contributions à l'épigraphie de Chalcis' *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* ciii, 165-188.

Kraay 1976: C. Kraay, *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins* (London).

Kraft 1972: K. Kraft, *Das System der kaiserzeitlichen Münzprägung in Kleinasien. Materialien und Entwürfe* (Berlin)

Kroll 1964: J. H. Kroll, 'The late Hellenistic Tetrobols of Kos', *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* xi, 81-117.

Kroll 1981: J. H. Kroll, 'From Wappenmünzen to Gorgoneia to Owls', *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* xxvi, 1-30.

Kushnir-Stein 2005: A. Kushnir Stein, 'City Eras on Palestinian Coinage', in C. Howgego, V. Heuchert and A. Burnett (eds.) *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces* (Oxford), 157-162.

Lacroix 1964: L. Lacroix, 'Quelques aspects de la numismatique Sicyonienne', *Revue Belge de Numismatique* cx, 5-52.

Laumonier 1937: A. Laumonier, 'Researches sur la chronologie des prêtres de Panamara', *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* lxi, 236-298.

Laumonier 1958: A. Laumonier, *Les Cultes indigènes en Carie* (Paris).

Le Rider 1999: G. Le Rider, *Études d'histoire monétaire et financière du Monde Grec. Écrits 1958-1998. Tomes I-III* (Athens).

Le Rider 2001: G. Le Rider. 'Sur un aspect du comportement monétaire des villes libres d'Asie Mineure occidentales au II^e siècle: leurs émissions de tétradrachms de poids attique frappées entre 188 et c. 140', in A. Bresson and R. Descat (eds.), *Les cités d'Asie Mineure occidentale au II^e siècle avant J.C.*, (Bordeaux), 35-59.

Le Rider and de Callatay 2006: G. Le Rider and F. de Callatay, *Les Séleucides et les Ptolémées: l'héritage monétaire et financier d'Alexandre le Grand* (Brussels).

Lenormant 1879: F. Lenormant, *la monnaie dans l'antiquité: leçons professées dans la chaire d'archéologie près la Bibliothèque Nationale en 1875-1877. Tome III.* (Paris).

Leschhorn 1981: W. Leschhorn, 'Le monnayage impérial d'Asie Mineure et la statistique', in C. Carcassone and T. Hackens (eds.) *PACT 5. Statistics and Numismatics. Table ronde organisée par le centre de Mathématique Sociale de l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales de Paris et le Séminaire de Numismatique Marcel Hoc de l'Université Catholique de Louvain. Paris, 17-19 sept. 1979* (Strasbourg), 252-266.

Leschhorn 1993: W. Leschhorn, *Antike Ären: Zeitrechnung, Politik und Geschichte im Schwarzmeerraum und im Kleinasien nördlich des Tauros* (Stuttgart).

Leschhorn 2002: W. Leschhorn, *Lexikon der Aufschriften auf griechischen Münzen. Band 1. Geographische Begriffe, Götter und Heroen, mythische Gestalten, Persönlichkeiten, Titel und Beinamen, Agonistik, staatsrechtliche und prägerechtliche Formeln, bemerkenswerte Wörter* (Vienna).

Leschhorn 2009: W. Leschhorn, W. Leschhorn, *Lexikon der Aufschriften auf griechischen Münzen. Band II. Ethnika und Beamtennamen* (Vienna).

Levy 1987: B. E. Levy, 'Indulgentiae Augusti Moneta Impetrata: a Flavian episode' in H. Huvelin, M. Christol and G. Gautier (eds.), *Mélanges de Numismatique offerts à Pierre Bastien à l'occasion de son 75e anniversaire* (Wetteren), 39-49.

Lewis 1962: D. Lewis, 'The Chronology of the Athenian New Style Coinage', *Numismatic Chronicle* cxxii, 275-300.

Lindner 1984: R. Lindner, *Der Raub der Persephone in der antiken Kunst* (Würzburg).

Lindner 1994: R. Lindner, *Mythos und Identität: Studien zur Selbstdarstellung kleinasiatischer Städte in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Stuttgart).

Loebbecke 1895: A. Loebbecke. 'Griechische Münzen aus meiner Sammlung II', *Zeitschrift für Numismatik* xii, 307-357.

Lorber and Kovacs 1997: C. Lorber and F. Kovacs, 'A Ptolemaic mint at Soli: a Tale of Two Magistrates', *Schweizer Münzblätter* 47/187, 92-99.

MacDonald 1976: D. MacDonald, *Greek and Roman Coinage from Aphrodisias* (Oxford).

MacDonald 1992: D. MacDonald, *The Coinage of Aphrodisias* (London).

MacDonald 1996: D. Macdonald, 'Claudius Attalos as *logistes* at Synnada', *Ancient History Bulletin* x, 66-72.

Macro 1976: A. D. Macro, 'Imperial Provision for Pergamon: OGIS 484', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* xvii, 169-179.

Madden 1866: F. W. Madden, 'On Some Coins of Septimius Severus, Macrinus and Philip I struck at Apameia, in Phrygia with the legend ΝΩΕ', *Numismatic Chronicle* xxvi, 173-219.

Magie 1950: D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ Vols. I-II* (Princeton).

Martin 1985: T. Martin, *Sovereignty and Coinage in Classical Greece* (Princeton).

Mattingly 1948: H. Mattingly, 'The Consecration of Faustina the Elder and her Daughter', *The Harvard Theological Review* xli no. 2, 147-151.

Mattingly 1971a: H. Mattingly, 'Some Third Magistrates in the Athenian New Style Silver Coinage', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* xci, 85-92.

Mattingly 1971b: H. Mattingly, 'Some Problems in Second-Century Attic Prosopography', *Historia* xx, 26-46.

Mattingly 1979: H. Mattingly, 'L. Julius Caesar, Governor of Macedonia', *Chiron* ix, 147-65.

Mattingly 1990: H. Mattingly, 'The Beginning of the Athenian New Style Silver Coinage', *Numismatic Chronicle* cl, 67-78.

May 1966: J. M. F. May, *The coinage of Abdera (540-345 B.C.)* (London).

Meadows and Williams 2001: A. Meadows and J. Williams, 'Moneta and the Monuments: Coinage and Politics in Republican Rome' *Journal of Roman Studies* xci, 27-49.

Meadows 2001: A. Meadows, 'Money, Freedom and Empire in the Hellenistic World', in A. Meadows and K. Shipton (eds.) *Money and its uses in the Ancient Greek World* (Oxford), 53-63.

Meadows 2002: A. Meadows, 'Stratonikeia in Caria: the Hellenistic City and its Coinage', *Numismatic Chronicle* clxii, 79-134.

Meiggs and Lewis 1969: R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford).

Melville-Jones 1993: J. R. Melville-Jones, *Testimonia numaria: Greek and Latin texts concerning ancient Greek coinage. Vol. I. Texts and translations* (London).

Melville-Jones 2007: J. R. Melville-Jones, *Testimonia numaria: Greek and Latin texts concerning ancient Greek coinage. Vol. II. Addenda and Commentary* (London).

Metcalf 1993: W. E. Metcalf, 'Whose Liberalitas? Propaganda and Audience in the Early Roman Empire', *Rivista Italiana di Numismatica e Scienze affini* xcv, 337-346.

Meyer 1991: H. Meyer, *Antinoos. Die archäologischen Denkmäler unter Einbeziehung des numismatischen und epigraphischen Materials sowie der literarischen Nachrichten. Ein Beitrag zur Kunst- und Kulturgeschichte der hadrianisch-frühantoninischen Zeit* (Munich).

Milne 1941: J. G. Milne, 'Kolophon and its Coinage: a Study', *Numismatic Notes and Monographs* xcvi, 1-113.

Mitchell 1974: S. Mitchell, 'The Plancii in Asia Minor', *Journal of Roman Studies* lxiv, 27-39.

Mitchell 1993: S. Mitchell, *Anatolia: Land, Men and Gods in Asia Minor. Vol I* (Oxford).

Mørkholm 1980: O. Mørkholm, 'The Chronology and Meaning of the Wreath Coinage of the early 2nd century B.C.', *Numismatica e antichà classiche* ix, 145-158.

Mørkholm 1984: O. Mørkholm, 'The Chronology of the New Style Coinage of Athens', *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* xxix, 29-42.

Mørkholm 1991: O. Mørkholm, *Early Hellenistic Coinage: from the accession of Alexander to the Peace of Apamea (336-188 B.C.)* (Cambridge).

Müller 1980: H. Müller, 'Claudia Basilo und ihre Verwandtschaft', *Chiron* x, 457-484.

Münsterberg 1911: R. Münsterberg, 'Die Beamtennamen auf des griechischen Münzen', *Numismatische Zeitschrift* xlv, 69-132.

Münsterberg 1912a: R. Münsterberg, 'Die Beamtennamen auf griechischen des Münzen', *Numismatische Zeitschrift* xlv, 1-111.

Münsterberg 1912b: R. Münsterberg, 'ΦΙΛΑΛΛΑΗΘΗΣ', *Numismatische Zeitschrift* xlv, 112.

Münsterberg 1915: R. Münsterberg, 'Die Münzen der Sophisten', *Numismatische Zeitschrift* xlviii, 119-24.

Münsterberg 1927: R. Münsterberg. 'Die Beamtennamen auf griechischen den Münzen', *Numismatische Zeitschrift* lx, 42-105.

Nicolet 1984: C. Nicolet, 'Augustus, Government and the Propertied Classes', in F. Millar and E. Segal (eds.), *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects* (Oxford), 89-128.

Nollé 1992/3: J. Nollé, 'Kaiserliche Privilegien für Gladiatorenmunera und Tierhetzen: Unbekannte und ungedeutete Zeugnisse auf städtischen Münzen des griechischen Ostens', *Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte* xlii/iii, 49-82

Nollé 1993: J. Nollé, 'Städtisches Prägerecht und römische Kaiser. Suchten die Städte Kleinasiens beim römischen Kaiser um das Recht nach, Bronzemünzen zu prägen? Überlegungen zu dem Formular *αἰτησαμένου τοῦ δεινός*', *Rivista Italiana di Numismatica e scienze affini* xcv, 487-504.

Özgen and Öztürk 1996: I. Özgen and J. Öztürk, *The Lydian Treasure: Heritage Recovered* (Istanbul).

Parker 1991: R. W. Parker, 'Potamon of Mytilene and his family', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* lxxxv, 115-129.

Pera 1996: R. Pera, 'Le monete di dedica di M. Ulpio Carminio Claudiano ad Attuda (Caria)', in C. Stella and A. Valvo (eds.), *Studi in onore di Albino Garzetti* (Brescia), 313-324.

Petzl 1974: G. Petzl, 'Kleine Beiträge zu griechischen Inschriften aus Smyrna', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* xiii, 118-26.

Picard 1979: O. Picard, *Chalcis et la Confédération eubéenne: étude de numismatique et d'histoire* (Athens/Paris).

Price and Waggoner 1975: M. Price and N. Waggoner, *Archaic Greek Coinage: the Asyut Hoard* (London).

Price 1984a: S. R. F. Price, *Rituals and Power: the Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge 1984).

Price 1984a: S. R. F. Price, 'Gods and Emperors: the Greek Language of the Roman Imperial Cult', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* civ, 79-95.

Puech 2002: B. Puech, *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d'époque impériale* (Paris).

Quass 1993: F. Quass, *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens: Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Entwicklung in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit* (Stuttgart).

Quet 2003: M-H. Quet, 'Le Sophiste M. Antonius Polémon de Laodicée, éminente personnalité politique de l'Asie romaine du IIe siècle', in M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni and L. Lamoine (eds.), *Les élites et leurs facettes: les élites locales dans le monde hellénistique et romain* (Rome and Clermont-Ferrand), 401-443.

Ramsey 1883: W. M. Ramsey, 'Metropolitanus Campus', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* iv, 53-72.

Ramsey 1895: W. M. Ramsey, *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia. Being an Essay of the Local History of Phrygia from Earliest Times to the Turkish Conquest. Vol I. Part I. The Lycos Valley to South-Western Phrygia* (Oxford).

Ramsey 1897: W. M. Ramsey, *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia. Being an Essay of the Local History of Phrygia from Earliest Times to the Turkish Conquest. Vol I. Part II. West and West-Central Phrygia* (Oxford).

Rathbone 1996: D. Rathbone, 'Monetization, not price-inflation in third-century AD Egypt?', in C. King and D. Wigg (eds.), *Coin Finds and Coin Use in the Roman World. The thirteenth Oxford Symposium on Coinage and Monetary History 25.- 27. 3. 1993* (Berlin), 321-339

Ratté 2001: C. Ratté, 'New Research on the Urban Development of Aphrodisias in late Antiquity', in D. Parish (ed.), *Urbanism in Western Asia Minor. New Studies on Aphrodisias, Ephesos, Hierapolis, Pergamon, Perge and Xanthos* (Portsmouth, Rhode Island), 117-148.

Rawson 1976: E. Rawson, 'The First Latin Annalists', *Latomus* xxxv, 689-717.

Regling 1913a: K. Reglin, 'Verzeichnis der bei den Ausgrabungen von Pergamon gefundenen Münzen' in A. Conze, *Altertümer von Pergamon. Band I: Stadt und Landschaft*. (Berlin), 355-365.

Regling 1913b: K. Regling, 'Überblick über die Münzen von Nysa' in W. Diest (ed.), *Nysa ad Maeandrum nach Forschungen und Aufnahmen in den Jahren 1907 und 1909* (Berlin), 70-103.

Regling 1927: K. Regling, *Die Münzen von Priene* (Berlin).

Reynolds 1982: J. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome: documents from the excavation of the theatre at Aphrodisias conducted by Professor Kenan T. Erim, together with some related texts* (London)

Reynolds 1991, J. Reynolds, 'Epigraphic Evidence for the Construction of the Theatre: 1st c. BC to the mid 3rd c. AD' in R.R.R. Smith and K. T. Erim (eds.), *Aphrodisias Papers 2. The Theatre, a Sculptors' workshop, Philosophers and Coin Types: including the papers given at the Third International Aphrodisias Colloquium held at New York University on 7 and 8 April 1989* (Michigan), 15-28.

Robert 1937: L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes: recherches sur les inscriptions grecques de l'Asie mineure* (Paris).

Robert 1938: L. Robert, *Études épigraphiques et philologiques* (Paris).

Robert 1940: *Les Gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec* (Limoges).

Robert 1946: L. Robert, 'Divinités éponymes', *Hellenica VII: recueil d'épigraphie de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques* (Paris), 51-64.

Robert 1949: L. Robert, 'Les boules dans le types monétaires agonistique', *Hellenica VII: recueil d'épigraphie de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques* (Paris), 93-104.

Robert 1954: L. Robert, *La Carie: histoire et géographie historique avec le recueil des inscriptions antiques. Tome. II. Le plateau de Tabai et ses environs* (Paris).

Robert 1955: L. Robert, 'Villes et monnaies de Lycie,' *Hellenica X: recueil d'épigraphie de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques* (Paris), 188-222.

Robert 1959: L. Robert, 'Review of T. Wiegand, *Didyma. Zweiter Teil: Die inschriften von Albert Rehm*, Belin 1958', *Gnomon* xxxi, 670-675.

Robert 1960: L. Robert, 'ΑΙΘΗΣΑΜΕΝΟΣ sur les monnaies,' *Hellenica XI-XII: recueil d'épigraphie de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques* (Paris), 53-62.

Robert 1962: L. Robert, *Villes d'Asie Mineure: études de géographie ancienne, 2e éd* (Paris).

Robert 1966: L. Robert, *Monnaies antiques en Troade* (Paris).

Robert 1967: L. Robert, *Monnaies grecques: types, légendes magistrats monétaires et géographie* (Paris).

Robert 1969: L. Robert, 'Les Inscriptions', in J. Des Gagniers (ed.), *Laodiceé du Lycos: le Nymphée; Campagnes 1961-3* (Quebec), 247-389.

Robert 1969b: L. Robert, *Opera Minora Selecta: épigraphie et antiquités grecques. Tome. II* (Paris).

Robert 1973: L. Robert, 'Les monétaires et un décret hellénistique de Sestos', *Revue numismatique* 6^e xv, 43-53.

Robert 1975: L. Robert, 'Nonnos et les monnaies d'Akmonia en Phrygie,' *Journal des Savants* iii, 153-192.

Robert 1976: L. Robert, 'Monnaies grecques de l'époque impériale I. Types monétaires à Hypaipa de Lydie. II: Une Fête à Sardes', *Revue numismatique* xviii, 49-56.

Robert 1987: L. Robert, *Documents d'Asie Mineure* (Paris).

Robinson 1954: E. S. G. Robinson, 'Cistophori in the name of king Eumenes', *Numismatic Chronicle* cxiv, 1-8.

Rogers 1991: G. M. Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos: Foundation Myths of a Roman city* (London).

Rossner 1974; M. Rossner, 'Asiarchen und Archiereis Asias', *Studii Clasice* xvi, 101-142.

Sacks (1985): K. Sacks, 'The Wreathed Coins of Aeolian Myrina', *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* xxx, 1-43.

Şahin 1996: S. Şahin, 'Studien zu den Inschriften von Perge III. Marcus Plancius Rutilius Varus and C. Plancius Varus Cornutus, Vater und Sohn der Plancia Magna', *Epigraphica Anatolica* xxvii, 115-126.

Salapata 1993: G. Salapata, 'The Lakonian Hero Reliefs in the light of the Terracotta plaques in O. Palagia and W. Coulson (eds.), *Sculpture from Arcadia and Laconia. Proceedings of an international Conference held at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. April 10-14 1992* (Oxford), 189-196.

Salzmann 1985: D. Salzmann, 'Cn. Pompeius Theophanes: ein Benennungsvorschlag zu einem Portät in Mytilene', *Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, römische Abteilung* xcii, 245-260.

Schefold 1943: K. Schefold, *Die Bildnisse der antiken Dichter, Redner und Denker* (Basel).

Schmidt 1991: S. Schmidt, *Hellenistische Grabreliefs: typologische und chronologische Beobachtungen* (Colonge).

Schultz 1975: S. Schultz, *Die Münzprägung von Magnesia am Mäander in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Berlin).

Schönert-Geiss 1972: E. Schönert-Geiss, *Griechisches Münzwerk: Die Münzprägung von Byzantion. Teil II: Kaiserzeit* (Berlin).

Sestini 1796: D. Sestini, *Descriptio numorum veterum ex museis Ainslie, Bellini, Bondacca, Borgia, Casali, Cousinery, Gradenigo, San Clemente, de Schellersheim, verità etc.: cum multis iconibus nec non animadversiones in opus Eckhelianum cui titulus doctrina numorum veterum* (Leipzig).

Seltman 1924: C. Seltman, *Athens: its History and Coinage before the Persian Invasion* (Cambridge).

Sherk 1990: R. K. Sherk, 'The eponymous officials of Greek Cities' *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* lxxxiii, 249-88.

Sherwin-White 1978: S. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos: a Historical Study from the Dorian Settlement to the Imperial period* (Göttingen).

Smith 1999: R. R. R. Smith, 'Late Antique Portraits in a Public Context; Honorific Statuary at Aphrodisias in Caria, AD 300- 600', *Journal of Roman Studies* lxxxix, 155-189.

Spawforth 1978: A. J. Spawforth, 'Balbilla, the Euryclids and Memorials for a Greek Magnate', *Annual of the British School at Athens* lxxiii, 249-60.

Spawforth and Walker 1985: A. J. Spawforth and S. Walker, 'The World of the Panhellenion I. Athens and Eleusis,' *Journal of Roman Studies* lxxv, 78-104.

Spawforth and Walker 1986: A.J. Spawforth and S. Walker, 'The World of the Panhellenion II. Three Dorian Cities', *Journal of Roman Studies* lxxvi, 88-105

Sperti 2000: L. Sperti, 'Ricognizione archeologica a Laodicea di Frigia: 1993-8', in G. Traversari (ed.), *Laodicea di Frigia I* (Rome), 29-103.

Spoerri Butcher 2006: M. Spoerri Butcher, *Roman Provincial Coinage vol. VII. De Gordien I^{er} à Gordien III (238-244 apr. J-C). I Province d'Asie* (Paris and London).

Steinhart and Wirbelauer 2000: M. Steinhart and E. Wirbelauer, 'Par Peisistratou: Epigraphische Zeugnisse zur Geschichte des Schenkens', *Chiron* xxx, 255-289.

Stumpf 1991: G. R. Stumpf, *Numismatische Studien zur Chronologie der römischen Statthalter in Kleinasien (122 v. Chr.-163 n. Chr.)* (Saarbrücken).

Thomasson 1984: B. E. Thomasson, *Laterculi Praesidum. Vol. I adiuvantibus collegis amicis fautoribus multis composuit* (Gothenburg).

Thompson 1961: M. Thompson, *The New Style Coinage of Athens: Numismatic Studies 10* (New York).

Thompson 1962: M. Thompson, 'Athens Again', *Numismatic Chronicle* cxxii, 301-333.

Thompson 1977: M. Thompson, 'A Greek Imperial Medallion from Pautalia', *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* xx, 29-36.

Thonemann 2004: P. J. Thonemann, 'Polemo, son of Polemo (Dio 59. 12. 2)', *Epigraphica Anatolica* xxxvii, 144-150.

Thonemann Thesis: P. J. Thonemann, *ΜΑΙΑΝΔΡΟΣ: Studies in the Historical Geography of the Maeander Valley*, Thesis for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Oxford, 2006.

Thonemann and Ertruğrul 2005: P.J. Thonemann and F. Ertruğrul, 'The Carminii of Attouda', *Epigraphica Anatolica* xxxviii, 75-86.

Toynbee 1944a: J. M. C. Toynbee, *Roman Medallions: Numismatic Studies* 5 (New York).

Toynbee 1944b: J. M. C. Toynbee, 'Greek Imperial Medallions', *Journal of Roman Studies* xxxiv, 65-73.

Trevett 2001: J. Trevett, 'Coinage and Democracy in Athens' in A. Meadows and K. Shipton (eds.), *Money and its uses in the Ancient Greek World* (Oxford), 23-34.

Vaillant 1698: J. Vaillant, *Numismata imperatorum, Augustarum et Caesarum, a populis, Romanæ ditionis, Græcè loquentibus, ex omni modulo percussa: quibus urbium nomina, dignitates, prærogativæ, societates, epochæ, numina, illustres magistratus, festa, ludi, certamina, & alia plurima ad eas spectantia consignantur* (Amsterdam).

Veyne 1992: P. Veyne, *Bread and Circuses. Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism* (abridged with an introduction by Oswyn Murray; translated by Brian Pearce) (London).

Walker 1976: D. R. Walker, *The Metrology of the Roman Silver Coinage. Part I from Augustus to Domitian* (Oxford).

Wallace 1988: R. Wallace, 'WALWE and KALI', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* cviii, 203-207.

Wallace 2007: R. Wallace, 'KUKALIM, WALWET, and the Artemision Deposit: Problems in Early Anatolian Electrum Coinage', in van Alfen (ed.), *Agoranomia: Studies in Money and Exchange Presented to John H. Kroll*, (New York), 37-48.

Weidauer 1975: L. Weidauer, *Probleme der frühen Elektronprägung* (Fribourg).

Weiss 1984: P. Weiss, 'Lebendiger Mythos: Gründerheroen und städtische Gründungstraditionen im griechisch-römischen Osten', *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft neue Folge* x, 179-195.

Weiss 1990: P. Weiss, 'Mythen, Dichter und Münzen von Lykaonien', *Chiron* xx, 221-237.

Weiss 1992: P. Weiss, 'Zu Münzprägungen mit den Formeln ΑΙΤΗΣΑΜΕΝΟΥ und ΕΙΣΑΝΓΕΙΛΑΝΤΟΣ', *Studien zum antiken Kleinasien*, II, 167-180.

Weiss 2000: P. Weiss, 'Euergesie oder römische Prägegenehmigung? Αἰτημένον-Formular auf Städtemünzen der Provinz Asia, Roman Provincial Coinage (RPC) II und persönliche Aufwendungen in Münzwesen', *Chiron* xxx, 235-54.

Weiss 2002: P. Weiss: P. Weiss. 'Asiarchen sind Archiereis Asias. Eine Antwort auf S. J. Friesen', in Ehrhardt und Günther (eds.), in J. Deininger, N. Erhardt and L-M. Günther (eds.), *Widerstand, Anpassung, Integration: die griechische Staatenwelt und Rom: Festschrift für Jürgen Deininger zum 65. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart), 241-254.

Weiss 2004: P. Weis, 'Städtische Münzprägung und zweite Sophistik', in B. E. Borg (ed.). *Paideia: The World of the second Sophistic* (Berlin), 179- 200.

Weiss 2005: P. Weiss, 'The Cities and their Money', in C. Howgego, V. Heuchert and A. Burnett (eds.) *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces* (Oxford), 57-68.

Weisser 1992: B. Weisser, 'Quintus Corellius Rufus und Marcus Maecius Rufus in Asia. Flavische Münzen aus Hierapolis und Ephesos', *Epigraphica Anatolica* xx, 117-124.

Weisser 2005: B. Weisser, 'Pergamum as Paradigm' in C. Howgego, V. Heuchert and A. Burnett (eds.) *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces* (Oxford), 135-142

Wiegand 1958: T. Wiegand, *Didyma. Zweiter Teil: Die inschriften von Albert Rehm* (Berlin).

Williamson 2005: G. Williamson, 'Aspects of Identity', in C. Howgego, V. Heuchert and A. Burnett (eds.) *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces* (Oxford), 19-28

Woodward 1953: A. M. Woodward, 'Sparta and Asia Minor under the Roman Empire', in (eds.) G.E. Mylonas and D. Raymond (eds.), *Studies presented to David Moore Robinson II on his seventieth birthday* (Saint Louis), 868-883.

Wörrle 1988: M. Wörrle, *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien: Studien zu einer agonistischen Stiftung aus Oinoanda* (Munich).

Wörrle 1992: M. Wörrle, 'Neue Inschriftenfunde aus Aizanoi', *Chiron* xxii, 337-376.

Wroth 1894: W. Wroth, 'Portraits of Famous Citizens of Mytilene. *Αἰνέσωμεν δὴ ἄνδρας ἐνδόξους*,' *The Classical Review* viii, 226-7.

Wroth 1902: W. Wroth, 'Greek Coins acquired by the British Museum', *Numismatic Chronicle* lxi, 212-344.

Zuiderhoek 2009: A. Zuiderhoek, *The politics of munificence in the Roman Empire: citizens, elites and benefactors in Asia Minor* (Cambridge).

Catalogue of Attested Eponyms

Ailianos? Poplas (Miletos), Commodus; Heuchert 1946; Baldus, *Chiron* xv (1985), 187-196; Robert (1959), 672; *I.Didyma* 179.13; 169. 6; 241. 3; 277. 4; 363a. 5; p. 192; Lane-Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (1992), 192.

Alios Ailianos (Miletos), Septimius Severus; *SNG* Tübingen 3107; *I.Didyma* 310; 242?; (=Alios Ailianos Dionysios?) *Milet* 483/ (Alios Ailianos Pamphilos?) *Milet* 1106. 234; 235.

M. Ail. Apollinarios (Apameia) Antoninus Pius; Heuchert 2827-2830; *IGR* IV 786.

P. Alios Apollonios (Aphrodisias) Philip the Arab; MacDonald 197-199; *I.Aph* 2007 12.17; 12.535.

T. Alios Eteoneus (Kyzikos), Commodus; Heuchert 268-269; *BCH* (1890), 537 no. 2.

Ail. Neon. Ioul. (Maioneia), Antoninus Pius; Heuchert 2488-2493; *TAM* V. 1 542.

Alios Onesiphoros (Kyzikos), Septimius Severus/Caracalla (AD 198-217); *SNG* Aul 7378; *SNG* Glasgow 1217; *SEG* XL 1128.2.

P. Alios Proteleon (Miletos) Marcus Aurelius; Heuchert 1943-1945; *I.Keramos* 31; Robert (1967), 42.

P. Alios Themistokles (Miletos/ Keramos), Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus; Heuchert 1928-1932; 1988-1990; *I.Keramos* 31; Robert (1967), 42

Ail. Theoxenos (Stratonikeia) Antoninus Pius; Heuchert 1996-1999; *I.Stratonikeia* 240.10.

P. Alios Tryphon (Apameia), Severus Alexander; *BMC* Phrygia 118, 179-80; *SNG* Aul 3506-3507; 8417; *SNG* Leypold 1463; Campanile 117; *MAMA* VI 222?

Akiamos (Sardeis), Tiberius; *RPC* I 2989; Malay, *Grek and Latin Inscriptions in the Mansia Museum* (1994), no. 451?

Alexandros (Synnada), Gordian III; *RPC* VII 788-792; *MAMA* VI 67; Nollé (1992/3), 74-75.

Alph(enos) Modestos (Kyzikos), Septimius Severus; *BMC Mysia* 247; Campanile 37; F. Dorutiu-Bola, *Inscripțiile din Scythia Minor V grecești și latine* (1987), no. 300; J. Baillet, *Inscriptions grecques et latines des tombeaux des rois ou syringes* (1926), no. 1544; *TAM* v. 2 913a-913b; 935; *P.Mich* VI 426. 2-25; Robert (1937), 124 (brother of T. Phab. Alphenos of Thyateira).

Antiochos IV of Kommagene (Chios), Nero; *RPC* I 2419-2420; Fraser (1978), 359-374; *IGR* IV 954; *SEG* xvi 1490.

Antipatros (Hierapolis), Caracalla; Mionnet IV 630?; Philostratos *VS* 606-607.

L. Antonios Zenon (Laodikeia), Claudius; *RPC* I 2912-2916; *PIR*² A 882; Campanile 11; *MAMA* VI 104; Malay, *EA* IX (1987) 73; *SEG* XXXVII 855; Robert (1954), no. 54; *I.Laodikeia* 53.

Pollios (Philadelphia); 2nd Century AD; *BMC Lydia* 29; (=L. Antonios Polianos?) *TAM* V. 3 1463 (cf. Peuch (2002), 6).

(Antonius) Polemon (Smyrna), Trajan; Klose (1987), 248, 250-254; *PIR*² A 862, Philostratos *VS* 530-545; *I.Smyrna* 697,6; 697, 35; 778, 2-3; Puech (2002), 396-414; Quet (2003), 401-443.

Ant(onios) Polemon (Miletos), Gallienus; Wadd 1880; *SNG Aul* 2113; *I.Didyma* 176?

Apella(s?) Tryphonos (Hermokapeleia), Septimius Severus/ Caracalla; Kraft (1972), Taf, 68. 42; *TAM* V. 2 1233.

Apollodotos (Hyrgaleis), Antoninus Pius; Heuchert 1479-1481; *IGR* IV 769.

G. Aroun. Antoneinos (Thyateira) Severus Alexander; *BMC* Lydia 122; *TAM* V. 2 915.

Gaios Aron(tios) Maternos (Temenothyrai), Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus (1), Commodus (2); Heuchert 2614 (1); 2616-2617: Campanile 41; *I.Sardeis* 77; Drew-Bear (1979), 297; Christol and Drew-Bear (1986), 57-58.

Asiatikos Hermogenes (Thyateira), Septimius Severus; *BMC* 89; *SNG* Aul 3221; *TAM* V 2 953?

Gaios Asin(ios) Neikomachos Phroug(ianos) (Sardeis), Severus Alexander; *BMC* Lydia 178-179; *SNG* Aul 8260; Herrmann *Chiron* xxiii (1993), 248-263; Burrell (2004), 112.

Attalos (Smyrna and Phokaia), Antoninus Pius?; (=Antonios Attalos); Heuchert 1366-1372; 1271-1276; *RPC* Online 2943; Philostratos *VS* 609; Jones (1980), 374-377; Thonemann (Thesis), 149.

M. Aur. Agathokles (Thyateira), Macrinus; Mionnet IV 963; Campanile 128; *I.Ephesos* 897.

Aur. Ail. Phoibos (Ioulia Gordos), Valerian and Gallienus; *BMC* 45-47; *SNG* München 197; *TAM* V. 1 758.

M. Aur. Alexandros (Pergamon), Caracalla; *SNG* France 5, 2226; *I.Pergamon* 525.

(Aur.) Alex(andros) Tieiou (Phrygian Metropolis), Trajan Decius; *BMC* Phrygia 5-6; *SNG* Aul 3885; *MAMA* IV 132; Ramsay (1897), 695.

Aur. Ammianos (Nysa), Severus Alexander; Regling (1913b), 137; Malay, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions in the Mansia Museum* (1994), 376?

Aur. Glykon (Thyateira and Attaleia) Septimius Severus/ Caracalla; *BMC* Lydia xxxvii; Mionnet IV 933-934; *SNG* Aul 3222-3223; Wadd 5365; *TAM* V. 2 945? 949?.

Aurelius Athenaios (Thyateira), Commodus; *TAM V. 2* 954; 957; *I.Ephesos* 971?; 3057.

M. Aur. Damianos (Sardeis), Severus Alexander; *BMC Lydia* 176-177; *SNG Tübingen* 3823; J-Y Strasser, *BCH* cxxvi (2003), 25-299 (*SEG* LIII 1355).

Marcus Aur. Diadochos (Thyateira), Macrinus ; *TAM V. 2* 950; 951; 952; 954.

(Aurelius) Eugenotor (Philadelphia) Marcus Aurelius; Heuchert 2437-2438; *TAM V. 3* 1480.

Aur. Glykon (Thyateira), Septimius Severus; *BMC Lydia* 29; 91; *SNG Aul* 3223; *SNG Glasgow* 1367; *SNG München* 656; *SNG Tübingen* 3856; *TAM V. 2* 945; p. 349.

Aurelius Hermolaos (Saitta), Philip the Arab; *BMC Lydia* 65; Campanile 137; *I.Ephesos* 3246?

Aur. Metrodoros (Daldis) Septimius Severus; *BMC Lydia* 11-12; *TAM V. 1* 671?

M. Aur. Peios (Daldis), Gallienus; *BMC Lydia* 19; Winterthur 3727; *SNG Aul* 2932; *TAM V. 3* 1511; Robert (1967), 51 note 5.

Aurelios Seoueros (Aizanoi), Severus Alexander; Wadd 5585; 8755; *SNG Cop* 105; Campanile 141; *IGR IV* 577.

Aur. Sep(timios) Iollas (Saitta); Philip the Arab; *SNG Aul* 3091; Herrmann-Malay 49. 5; *TAM V. 1* p. 30.

Aur. Teimotheos (Blaundos), Septimius Severus; *BMC Lydia* 83; *Blaundos: Berichte zur Erforschung einer Kleinstadt im lydisch-phrygischen Grenzgebiet* (2006), no. 23 (*SEG XLI* 1017).

Bassa Kleonos (Eumeneia), Nero; *RPC I* 3151 (Wife of Ioulios Kleon)

Ti. (Klaudios) Damas (Miletos) Nero; Robert (1967), 47-52; *Milet* 134; *I.Didyma* 237; 268.

Dom(itios) Roupfos (Sardeis), Valerian/ Gallienus; Mionnet IV 800, 802-803; 807-808; Mionnet Sup. VII 533; Imhoof-Blumer (1897), no. 21; *BMC Lydia* 206-211; Wadd 7059; *SNG Aul* 3164-3165; 8262; *PIR*² D 191; Campanile 152; *TAM V.* 3 1422; *TAM V.* 1 78.

Eikadios (Smyrna), Claudius; *RPC I* 2475; *I.Smyrna* 682, 688.

Epigonos (Eumeneia), Tiberius; *RPC I* 3142; Ramsay (1897), 199?

Epikrates (Philadelphia), Caligula; *RPC I* 3022; *TAM V.* 3 1748 (date unknown).

Glyptos (Tralleis), Septimius Severus; *SNG Aul* 3289; *SNG München* 766; (=T. Kl. Glyptos?) *CIG* 2926.

Hekataios Sosandrou (Stratonikeia), Claudius/Nero (AD 41-68); Meadows, *NC* clxii (2002), 97; *I.Stratonikeia* 686; 485.

Hermias (Phokaia), Trajan; Mionnet III 854; (=Hermias Herakleidou?) Macridy, *Jöai* xv (1912), 48.

Hermipos (Miletos), Septimius Severus/ Caracalla; *SNG Aul* 2111; (=Lykinnios Hermippos?) *I.Didyma* 164?

Hermogenes (Philadelphia), Caligula; *RPC I* 3023; p. 491; *TAM V.* 3 1438?

Hybreas (Mylasa), Augustus; *RPC* I 2791; Strabo XIV. 659; Robert *Hellenica* VIII (1950), 95-6.

Ioulia Severa (Akmoneia), 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.

G. Ioul(ios) Ailianos (Silandos), Severus Alexander; *SNG* Aul 3181; Winterthur 3949; Herrmann-Malay 69.6.

G. Ioul(ios) Apronianos (Miletopolis), Philip the Arab; *SNG* Aul 7929; Winterthur 3068; Imhoof-Blumer KM 13; *I.Ephesos* 3467.

Iou. Ioulianos (Hierokaisareia), Antoninus Pius; Heuchert 1119; *TAM* V 2 1298?

T. Iou. Iouli. Lykinos (Synnada), Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus; Heuchert 2906; Campanile 95; *MAMA* VI 373.

Ioulios Kleon (Eumeneia), Nero; *RPC* I 3149-3950; Campanile 21; *I.Ephesos* 688; Holtheide (1983), 265-266; Englemann *ZPE* xx (1976), 86 (husband of Bassa Kleonou).

Lo. Io(ulios) Libonianos (Sardeis), Trajan; *BMC* Lydia 75; Imhoof-Blumer (1897), 139; Campanile 99; *I.Sardeis* 47.

(G. Antios) Au(los) Iou(lios) Kouadratos (Pergamon), Trajan; *PIR*² I 507; Halfmann 17; Weisser (2005), 135-142; *I.Pergamon* 269; 290; 436; 54; *I.Ask.* 20; *I.Ephesos* 1538; 3033; 3034.

G. Iou. Menekles (Smyrna), Gordian III; Klose (1987), 191-192, 306; *SNG Aul* 2228;
I.Smyrna 637.

M. I. Menelaos (Thyateira), Marcus Aurelius; Heuchert 1054-1057; *TAM V.* 2 969.

Ioulios Phaustos (Kolophon), Commodus; Heuchert 1532-1533; (=T. Ioulios Phlaustos)
SEG XXX 1333.4; XXXVII 971. 6; XXXVI 974. 3; Robert (1954), 381 no. 194. 7; 382 no.
195. 7; Macridy, *Jöai xv* (1912), 47 no. 4.

Hipponeikos (Hadrianeia), Alexander Severus; *SNG France* 5, 1050; (=Aur. Hipponeikos,
Gordian III), *I.Hadrianeia* 45.

(Loukios Kerreinius) Paitos (Loukiou) (Ephesus) Antoninus Pius; Heuchert 1606-1611;
IEphesos 21; 635; 925.

Kl(audia) Basilo (Synnada) 164-9; Heuchert 2909; *I.Ephesos* 891; Müller (1980), 457-484.

Klaudios Aisimos (Pergamum) Antoninus Pius; Heuchert 794-796; *I.Ask.* 40, *I.Pergamon*
605, *IGR IV* 457.

Ti. Klud. Alexandros (Blaundos), Septimius Severus; *BMC Lydia* 81; *SNG Aul* 2929;
Blaundos: Berichte zur Erforschung einer Kleinstadt im lydisch-phrygischen Grenzgebiet
(2006), no. 24.

Tib. Kl. Alexandros (Pergamon), Elagabalus; *SNG France* 5, 2259?; 2261; *I.Pergamon*
525. 8?; *IGR IV* 451; 468?

Klaudios Aristeas (Stratonikeia), Antoninus Pius, Heuchert 1995; (=asiarches?)
I.Stratonikeia 674/ (=father of Tib. Kl. Aristeas Menandros?) *I.Stratonikeia* 701.

Tib Kludios Aristeas Menandros (Stratonikeia), Septimius Severus; *SNG Aul* 2664-2667;
SNG Cop 502; Wadd 2577-2578; *I.Stratonikeia* 701; 179.

Kl. Aristophanes (Smyrna), Septimius Severus; Klose (1987), 267-268, 273-274; *I.Smyrna* 596.

Kla. Attalos (Synnada), Antoninus Pius (1) and Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus (2); Heuchert 2889-2892 (1); 2904-2905 (2); *MAMA* VI 374; *IG* III 55 (*SEG* XXX 89).

Klau(dios) Bias (Kibyra), Domitian; *RPC* II 1262-1267; Campanile 19; Balland, *Fouilles de Xanthos VII. Inscriptions d'époque imperial du Letoon* (1981), 231 no. 70.

G. Kl. Bion (Smyrna), Trajan; Klose (1987), 147 *ISmyrna* 713; 642.

Kl. Dionysios Neikephoriou (Stratonikeia), Septimius Severus; *SNG* Aul 22693-696; *SNG* Cop 508; *I.Stratonikeia* 1226?

Kl. Euneos (Kyzikos), Hadrian; *SNG* France 5, 645; Mordtmann, *AM* vii (1882), 254; Hasluck *JHS* xxvi (1906), 30-31.

Kl. Kandidos (Stratonikeia-Hadrianopolis), Hadrian; Imhoof-Blumer (1897), 13-16; *SNG* Aul 3187; Robert (1948) 80-84; *IGR* IV 1156; Weiss (1992), 180-198.

Ti. Kl. Kretarios (Smyrna), Caracalla; Klose (1987), 278, 286-287; *ISmyrna* 727?

Kl. Lepidos (Aizanoi) Commodus; Heuchert 2658; Campanile 69; *MAMA* IX 22; p55; *IGR* IV 541?; 586; Günter, *AM* xxxix (1976), 111-115 (*SEG* XXVI 1352).

Klaudios Melas (Mylasa) AD 79-81; *RPC* II 1198; *I.Mylasa* 411.

Ti. Kl. Menekrates (Maioneia), Nero: *RPC* I 3014; *TAM* V. 1 602; *I.GUrbRom* 686?

Menogenes tou Nanna (=Ti. Kl. Menogenes)(Aizanoi), Claudius; *RPC* I 3096; *MAMA* IX lx; *IGR* IV 559 (son of Nannas)

Ti. Kl. Meilatos (Pergamon), Trajan; *SNG* Aul 7501; *I. Pergamon* 523?

Kl. Nikomedes (Pergamon), Marcus Aurelius; Heuchert 859-871; *PIR*² C 944; *I.Ask.* 29-31; 41; p. 71-72; *AM* xxvii (1902), 499; *AM* xxxv (1910), 453 no. 36; *SEG* LII 1196; Philostratos *VS* 591: Puech (2002), 363-367.

M. Kl. Oualerianos (Eumeneia), Domitian; *RPC* II 1307; Campanile 20; *I.Ephesos* 950; Drew-Bear (1978), 67-70; Robert *Hellenica* VII 90-91

Kl. Pardalas (Pergamon) Antonine: Heuchert 821-823; *PIR*² C 951. *MAMA* IX 18; 19; 20; 21; *I.Ask* 140; Ailios Aristiades *Or. L.* 27; Puech (2002), 372-375.

Ti. Kl. Peison Tertylleinos (Synnada), Antoninus Pius; Heuchert 2893-2896; *MAMA* VI 374; *IG* III 55 (*SEG* XXX 89).

Kl. Philokles (Kibyra), Marcus Aurelius; Heuchert 2235-2239; (=M. Kl. Philokles Kassianos?) *I.Kibyra* 37; 40.

Klaudios Roupheinos (Smyrna), Septimius Severus; Klose (1987), 255; *PIR*² C 998; Philostratos *VS* 608; *I.Smyrna* 602; 771; Puech (2002), 438-443.

Kl. Tatianos (Aizanoi), Commodus; *MAMA* IX 492?

Ti. Kl. Zelos (Aphrodisias) date; *I.Aph* 2007 8.84; 8.85.

L. Kor(nelios) Ouettenianos (Sardeis), Septimius Severus; *BMC* Lydia 153; *SNG* Aul 3158-3159; Imhoof-Blumer (1897), 141 no. 17; *I.Sardeis* 75.

Koskonina Myrton (Smyrna), Domitian: *RPC* II 1012-1013; *I.Smyrna* 731 and 644; *SEG* XXVI 1288. 5 (Kolophon); van Bremen (1996), 327-328; Dmitriev (2005), 191; *IGR* IV 1393.

Kousinos (Ephesos), Claudius; *RPC* I 2623-2625; *I.Ephesos* 659b; 716; 4119; *GRIA* 21; *SEG* XLIII 79.

Ktesias (Miletos), Septimius Severus; Wadd 1897; (=Aur. Ktesias?) Robert (1959) 673; *IDidyma* 181/ (=Ktesias Ktesiou?) *Milet* 1111.

Laibianos K(allisratou) (Thyateira), Commodus; Heuchert 1058-1059; *TAM V* 2 982; 983; 1012.

L. Mar(kios) Pollios (Thyateira), Severus Alexander; *SNG* 3235; *BMC Lydia* 47; 121; Mionnet IV 993-994; *TAM V*. 2 990.

Menandros Ask(epiadou) (Synaos) Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus; Heuchert 2681-2686; *MAMA IX* 22.

Menekrates (Daldis) Flavian; *RPC II* 1326-1327; *TAM V*. 2 621, 650

Menelaos (Kyzikos), Severus Alexander; Hasluck, *NC* (1906), 29 no. 10; (=Aur. Menelaos?) Campanile 138; *IGR IV* 154.

Mousias (Sardeis), Augustus; *RPC I* 2988; *I.Sardeis* 8.6.

Nannas (Aizanoi) Augustus; *RPC I* 3073; *MAMA IX* 306?; p. xxiii, xxv; *IGR IV* 582; 559.

Neikomachos (Sardeis), Antoninus Pius; Heuchert 2477; (=G. AsiniusNeikomachos?) Herrmann, *Chriron* xxiii (1993), 256-257.

Opinas (Sardeis), Tiberius; *RPC I* 2889-2992; *I.Sardeis* 8. 132?

Oul(pianos) Hegesandros (Miletos), Septimius Severus; *SNG Aul* 2112; Robert (1959), 672-673; *I.Didyma* 179; 277; p. 192; 363?

Jamos Pankles (Apollonis), Commodus; Heuchert 1111; *TAM V*. 2 1186

Perikles (Philadelphia) Septimius Severus; *BMC Lydia* 30; (=G. Ioulios Perikles) *TAM V*. 3 1483.

Proklios Tryphon (Apameia), Gallienus; Wadd 5734; *SNG Leypold* 1470; *SNG Aul* 3514; Campanile 164; *IGR IV* 783; 802; Ramsay (1897), 467-468

T. Phab. Alph(enos) Apollinarios (Thyateira), Gordian III; *RPC* VII 192; 198; 196; *TAM* V. 2. 913, 935 and Robert (1937), 126.

Philippos (Miletopolis), Elagabalus; *SNG France* 5, 1325; *I.Kyzikos* 120?

Phl. Andreas (Miletos) Marcus Aurelius; Heuchert 1939-1942; Robert (1959), 673; *Milet* 1075, *I.Didyma* 219,; 238; 352; 286.

T. Phl. Aristoloas (Stratonikeia) Antoninus Pius; Heuchert 1994; *I.Stratonikeia* 212. 6-8; 214. 126; 1025.27-29; p. 99.

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. Leu(kios) 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 (Akmoneia), 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.

M. Oul(pios) (Appouleios) Eurykles (Aizanoi), Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus; Heuchert 2653-2654; Campanile 110a; *OGIS* 504-7 (Oliver (1989), nos. 155, 170); *I.Ephesos* 25, *IGR IV* 564; *I.Aph* 2007 11. 223; 12. 538; Oliver, *Marcus Aurelius. Aspects of Civic and Cultural Policy in the East* (Princeton 1970), 113-116 nos. 28; 30; Naumann, *IM xxxv* (1985), 217-226; Spawforth and Walker (1985), 89-90; Wörrle (1992), 36-337; 338; 351 nos. 2-3; 352-353 no. 4.

Markos Oulpios 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 (Akmoneia), 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 (Saittai), 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. Kyzkos, *RPC* online no. 2658.
51. Kyzikos, *RPC* online no. 678.
52. Kyzikos, *RPC* online no. 2322.
53. Kyzikos, *RPC* online no. 2321.
54. Kyzikos, *RPC* online no. 679.
55. Kyzikos, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), no. 13; *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.
454. Abydos, Price *NC* (1971), 129, no. 15; *RPC* online no. 26.
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 .
766. Mytilene, *RPC* online no. 1972.

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.
827. Pergamon, von Fritz, *Die Antiken Münzen von Pergamon* (1910), 48, 53; *RPC* online no. 3207.
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.
906. Pergamon, von Fritz, *Die Antiken Münzen von Pergamon* 69; *RPC* online no. 3263.
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 LXXIX 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.
1914. Miletos, H. Temporini, 'Die Milesischen Münzen der Jüngerer Faustina. Zur Vorlage eines Ineditum der Tübinger Sammlung' in *Praestant Interna Festschrift für Ulrich Hausmann* (1982), 349-363; *RPC* online no. 2694.
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.
1923. Miletos, *SNG Tübingen* 3100; Temporini 352 no. I. 3.
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.
1988. Keramos, *BMC Karia* 7; Robert (1967), 40-44; *RPC* online no. 868.
1989. Keramos, Freidländer, *ZfN* ii (1875), 110-111; *RPC* online no. 3337.
1990. Keramos, Robert (1967), 41; *RPC* online no. 869.
1992. Keramos, Freidländer, *ZfN* ii (1875), 110-111; *RPC* online no. 871.
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.
2157. Attouda, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 125, no. 9; *RPC* online no. 861.
2158. Attouda, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 125, no. 10; *RPC* online no. 862.
2159. Attouda, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 125, no. 11; *RPC* online no. 863.
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.
2262. Keratapa Diokaisareia, von Aulock (1980), 499-500; *RPC* online no. 1841.
2263. Keratapa Diokaisareia, von Aulock (1980), 502; Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 250 no. 2; *RPC* online no. 1843.
2282. Kolossai, von Aulock (1987), 565; *RPC* online no. 1879.
2283. Kolossai, von Aulock (1987), 484; *RPC* online no. 1896.
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.
2314. Laodikeia, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 271 no. 40; *RPC* online no. 2135.
2315. Laodikeia, *BMC Phrygia* 106; Imhoof-Blumer (1901) 271 no. 39; *RPC* online no. 3321.
2316. Laodikeia, *BMC Phrygia* 106; Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 271 no. 40; *RPC* online no. 2132.
2317. Laodikeia, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 270 no. 38; *RPC* online no. 2134.
2318. Laodikeia, *BMC Phrygia* 107; *RPC Online* no. 2133.
2319. Laodikeia, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 270 no. 37; *RPC* online no. 3322.
2320. Laodikeia, *RPC* online no. 2138.
2321. Laodikeia, *SNG Aul* 3825; *RPC* online no. 2127.

2322. Laodikeia, *RPC* online no. 3038.
2323. Laodikeia, *BMC Phrygia* 104; *RPC* online no. 2124.
2324. Laodikeia, *BMC Phrygia* 105; *RPC* online no. 2125.
2325. Laodikeia, Imhoof-Blumer (1901) 269 no. 34a; *RPC* online no. 2126.
2326. Laodikeia, *BMC Phrygia* 102; *RPC* online no. 2121.
2327. Laodikeia, *BMC Phrygia* 101; *RPC* online no. 2120.
2328. Laodikeia, *SNG Aul* 3824; 106; *RPC* online no. 2122.
2329. Laodikeia, Imhoof-Blumer (1901) 269 no. 34; *RPC* online no. 2129.
2330. Laodikeia, *BMC Phrygia* 103; *RPC* online no. 2123.
2331. Laodikeia, *RPC* online no. 2948.
2332. Laodikeia, *RPC* online no. 2976.
2333. Laodikeia, *RPC* online no. 2977.
2334. Laodikeia, *SNG Aul* 3826; *RPC* online no. 2130.
2335. Laodikeia, *RPC* online no. 2500.
2336. Laodikeia, *RPC* online no. 2975.
2337. Laodikeia, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 270 no. 35; *RPC* online no. 2131.
2352. Laodikeia, *RPC* online no. 2101.
2354. Laodikeia, Imhoof-Blumer (1890), 743 no. 714; Stumpf 601; *RPC* online no. 2141.
2355. Laodikeia, *BMC Phrygia* 208; Stumpf 599; *RPC* online no. 2094.
2357. Laodikeia, *BMC Phrygia* 275; *RPC* online no. 2107.
2372. Laodikeia, *BMC Phrygia* 278; Imhoof-Blumer, *NOMISMA* vi (1911), 11 no. 4; *RPC Online* no. 2110.
2374. Laodikeia, *BMC Phrygia* 280; *RPC* online no. 1715.
2382. Hierapolis (in the *conventus* of Kibyra), Milne *NC* (1942), 221 no. 9; *RPC* online no. 2006.
2407. Hierapolis (in the *conventus* of Kibyra), Webber, *NC* (1913), 144; *BMC Phrygia* 38; *SNG Cop* 428; *RPC* online no. 2045.
2461. Tmolos Aureliopolis, *BMC Lydia* 1; *RPC* online no. 1576.
2462. Tmolos Aureliopolis, *SNG Aul* 3241; *RPC* online no. 1578.
2463. Tmolos Aureliopolis, *BMC Lydia* 2-4; *RPC* online no. 1577.
2464. Tmolos Aureliopolis, *BMC Lydia* 5; *RPC* online no. 159.
2470. Sardeis, *RPC* online no. 1937.
2471. Sardeis, *RPC* online no. 1490.
2472. Sardeis, *BMC Lydia* 139; *RPC* online no. 1426.
3499. Maioneia, *SNG Aul* 3018; *RPC* online no. 1302.

2557. Tabala, *RPC* online no. 2859.
2558. Tabala, *RPC* online no. 2920.
2559. Tabala, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 185 no. 1; *RPC* online no. 1426.
2560. Tabala, *BMC Lydia* 4; *RPC* online no. 1525.
2564. Tabala, *BMC Lydia* 4; *SNG Aul* 3193; *RPC* online no. 1530.
2569. Tabala, *BMC Lydia* 9; *RPC* online no. 1531.
2571. Tabala, *BMC Lydia* 4; *SNG Aul* 8272; *RPC* online no. 1532.
2599. Bageis, *BMC Lydia* 22; *RPC* Online no. 1179.
2600. Bageis, *BMC Lydia* 23-24; *SNG Cop* 47; *RPC* online no. 1180.
2601. Bageis, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 169 no. 4; *RPC* online no. 2504.
2602. Bageis, Imhoof-Blumer (1890), 716 no. 590; *RPC* online no. 2503.
2603. Bageis *BMC Lydia* 5; *RPC* online no. 1182.
2606. Bageis, Imhoof-Blumer in K. Masner (ed.), *Festschrift für Otto Benndorf* (1898), 207 no. 2.
2607. Temenothyrai, *BMC Phrygia* 1; *RPC* online no. 2178.
2608. Temenothyrai, Milne, *NC* (1940), 223 no. 1; 1; *RPC* online no. 2182.
2609. Temenothyrai, *RPC* online no. 2991.
2610. Temenothyrai, *RPC* online no. 2990.
2611. Temenothyrai, *BMC Phrygia* 2-3; *RPC* online no. 2179.
2612. Temenothyrai, *BMC Phrygia* 20; *RPC* online no. 2173.
2613. Temenothyrai, *BMC Phrygia* 4; *RPC* online no. 2181.
2614. Temenothyrai, *SNG Aul* 4004; *RPC* online no. 2175.
2615. Temenothyrai, *BMC Phrygia* 21; *SNG Cop* 741; *RPC* online no. 2174.
2617. Temenothyrai, *BMC Phrygia* 22; *RPC* online no. 2177.
2653. Aizanoi, von Aulock (1979a), 58; *BMC Phrygia* 112; *RPC* online no.1668.
2654. Aizanoi, von Aulock (1979a), 61; Löbbecke, *ZfN* (1885), 340; *RPC* online no.1669.
2658. Aizanoi, von Aulock (1979a), 64; *RPC* online no.1761,
2733. Ioulia Gordos, *BMC Lydia* 23; *RPC* online no. 1249.
2737. Ioulia Gordos, *RPC* online no. 3105.
2739. Ioulia Gordos, *BMC Lydia* 28; Imhoof-Blumer (1897), 84 no. 4; *RPC* online no. 1253.
2769. Dionysopolis, von Aulock (1987), 134; *RPC* online no. 1862.
2806. Stektorion, *RPC* online no. 3039.
2807. Stektorion, *BMC Phrygia* 6; *RPC* online no. 2161.
2808. Stektorion, *RPC* online no. 3009.
2809. Stektorion, *RPC* online no. 2265.

2810. Stektorion, *BMC Phrygia* 1; Borrell, *NC* (1845), 34; Imhoof-Blumer (1890), 290 no. 1; *RPC* online no. 2166.
2811. Stektorion, *RPC* online no. 2194.
2812. Stektorion, *RPC* online no. 2266.
2827. Apameia, *BMC Phrygia* 159; *RPC* online no. 1734.
2828. Apameia, Imhoof-Blumer (1890), 729 no. 635; *RPC* online no. 3350.
2829. Apameia, *RPC* online no. 2959.
2840. Apameia, *BMC Phrygia* 162; *RPC* online no. 1740.
2841. Apameia, Imhoof-Blumer (1890), 730 no. 654; *RPC* online no. 3351.
2842. Apameia, *BMC Phrygia* 163; *RPC* online no. 1741.
2844. Okokleia, von Aulock (1980), 709; *RPC* online no. 1852.
2845. Okokleia, *BMC Phrygia* 1; von Aulock (1980), 704-705; *RPC* online no. 1853.
2855. Hierapolis (in the *conventus* of Apameia), *BMC Phrygia* 14; Imhoof-Blumer, (1901), 244 no. 4; *RPC* online no. 2073.
2856. Hierapolis (in the *conventus* of Apameia), *SNG Aul* 8386 *RPC* online no. 2074.
2857. Hierapolis (in the *conventus* of Apameia), *BMC Phrygia* 15; Imhoof-Blumer, (1901), 244 no. 3; *RPC* online no. 2075.
2858. Hierapolis (in the *conventus* of Apameia), *BMC Phrygia* 4; Imhoof-Blumer, (1901), 244 no. 2; *RPC* online no. 2078.
2859. Hierapolis (in the *conventus* of Apameia), *BMC Phrygia* 1; *RPC* online no. 2076.
2864. Eukarpeia, *RPC* online no. 2010.
2865. Eukarpeia, *BMC Phrygia* 6; *RPC* online no. 1983.
2866. Eukarpeia, *RPC* Online no. 2906.
2867. Eukarpeia, *BMC Phrygia* 16; *RPC* online no. 1981.
2868. Eukarpeia, *BMC Phrygia* 17; *RPC* online no. 1982.
2869. Eukarpeia, *BMC Phrygia* 7-8; *RPC* online no. 1984.
2870. Eukarpeia, *RPC* online no. 1986.
2871. Eukarpeia, *BMC Phrygia* 9-10; *SNG Cop* 366; Svoronos *JIAN* (1904), 384 no. 241; *RPC* online no. 1985
2887. Kidyessos, von Aulock (1980), 533; *RPC* online no.1849.
2888. Kidyessos, von Aulock (1980), 509-510; *RPC* online no.1850.
2904. Synnada, Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 295, no. 21; *RPC* online no. 2213.
2905. Synnada, *BMC Phrygia* 49-50; *SNG Cop* 732; Webber 7187; *RPC* online no. 2217.
- 2909 Synnada, *SNG Aul* 3988; *SNG Cop* 731; *RPC* online no. 2216.

2910. Synnada, *BMC Phrygia* 51; *SNG Aul* 8450; Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 295, no. 22; *RPC* online no. 2218.
2911. Synnada, *BMC Phrygia* 48; *SNG Aul* 3987; Imhoof-Blumer (1890), 749 no. 743a; *RPC* online no. 2215.
2912. Synnada, *SNG Aul* 3989; *RPC* online no. 2219.
2926. Prynnessos, von Aulock (1987), 1085; *RPC* online no. 1915.
2927. Prynnessos, *BMC Phrygia* 28; Imhoof-Blumer (1901), 286 no. 2; von Aulock (1987), 1089; *RPC* online no. 1918.
2928. Prynnessos, von Aulock (1987), 872; *RPC* online no. 1921.
2960. Kotiaeion, *RPC* online no. 2961.

