Kommentare zur Literatur über antike Numismatik

KOMMENTARE ZUR LITERATUR ÜBER ANTIKE NUMISMATIK

Katerini Liampi

Argilos. A Historical and Numismatic Study

Athen; Λυδία Λίθος. Society for the Study of Numismatics and Economic History
Reihe 'Kerma' (1), 2005. 377 S., 27 Taf.
ISBN 960-88985-0-1, ISSN 1790-6768, € 85.

Gegenstand des vorliegenden Buches ist die nordgriechische Prägegruppe mit dem Pegasos, die bis vor kurzem unter dem Namen «Therma» lief. Katerini Liampi stellte vor Jahren die wahre Herkunft der Prägegruppe fest, als sie auf zugehörige Kleinmünzen stiess, die, anders als die grossen Nominale, eine Legende trugen: APKI, offenkundig eine verkürzte Form von Arkilos. Damit ist die kleine Polis Argilos am östlichen Halsansatz der Chalkidike, dicht bei der Mündung des Flusses Strymon, gemeint.[1] Ironischerweise hatte sie bis dato niemand auf der Rechnung, obschon ein Vorschlag der Lösung immerhin schon recht nahegekommen war; J. Svoronos hatte an die Krestones gedacht, einen Stamm im gebirgigen Hinterland von Argilos. Durchgesetzt hatte sich jedoch die Ansicht B. Heads, der die Prägegruppe aufgrund von Fundprovenienzen nach Therma gelegt hatte, einen Ort am westlichen Halsansatz der Chalkidike. Liampis Entdeckung nötigt jetzt dazu, die Zusammenhänge erneut zu durchdenken und zu bewerten. Es ist also nur sinnvoll, die Prägegruppe systematisch aufzuarbeiten. Die vorliegende Studie unterzieht sich dieser Aufgabe bravourös; nicht allein die numismatischen, sondern auch die historischen, archäologischen und siedlungsgeographischen Gesichtspunkte werden darin ausführlich aufgearbeitet.

Die Grundlage bildet eine gründliche Stempelstudie, die das Material in 140 Stempelpaare (inklusive der modernen Fälschungen) ordnet. Wer den Katalog durchblättert, wird bald bemerken, wie rar diese Münzen sind. Die Hortfunde von Taranto, Myt Rahineh, Zagazig und Asyut liefern mehr als die Hälfte des Bestandes an Statēren; unsere Kenntnis der Serie wäre ohne diese Hortfunde äusserst lückenhaft geblieben. Sie ist wahrscheinlich immer noch lückenhaft genug. Zwar haben die Grabungen in Argilos durchaus einige lokale Münzen erbracht, jedoch nur kleine und kleinste Nominale. Die Verfasserin musste ihr Material deshalb vorwiegend in der Auktionsliteratur zusammensuchen. Gut die Hälfte davon stammt aus kleinen Auktionen und Listen; hätte sie weniger akribisch gesucht, der Katalog hätte wohl nur die Hälfte seiner Länge erreicht. Da er auch in den Stempelzuweisungen verlässlich ist, hat die Forschung nun ein vorzügliches Instrument an der Hand, um die Prägung von Argilos zu studieren.

[1] K. Liampi, Argilos. History and Coinage, NomKhron 13, 1994, S. 7-20 (griech.), 21-39 (engl.).

Zunächst zum historischen Hintergrund. Argilos wurde im 7. Jh. von Kolonisten aus Andros gegründet. Die Nähe zu den Erzlagerstätten auf der Chalkidike und im Pangaion, die dem Ort im späten 6. und im 5. Jh. zugutekommen sollte, spielte dabei wohl noch keine Rolle. Allerdings ist es nicht ausgemacht, dass die Ausbeutung der nordgriechischen Minen erst im 6. Jh. einsetzte.[2] Der Stadtnamen weist freilich auf ein bescheideneres Gewerbe hin. Das Wort ἄργιλος bezeichnet einen zur Töpferei geeigneten Ton[3] und in einer übertragenen Bedeutung auch den anspruchslosen Bautypus des Grubenhauses (S. 37, 65 f.). Die Ausgrabungen in Argilos sind indessen noch nicht so weit gediehen, dass man sich ein klares Bild von der Bedeutung des Ortes machen könnte.[4] Im Hafenareal sind Apsidenhäuser des späten 7. Jhs. freigelegt worden, und die Stadtmauer soll ins 6. Jh. gehören. Wohnbebauung ist am östlichen Fuss des Siedlungshügels erfasst worden und ebenso auf dessen Spitze. Was indessen noch gänzlich fehlt, sind öffentliche Gebäude, Tempel, die Agora.

Den Grabungsbefunden nach zu urteilen, erlebte Argilos seine Blüte während der Pentekontaetie, genauer gesagt zwischen den Perserkriegen und der Gründung von Amphipolis (437 v. Chr.). Das deckt sich nicht ganz mit der Blütezeit seiner Prägung, die um 500 v. Chr. liegt, während die Periode, in der Argilos dem Attischen Seebund angehörte, sich eher als eine Zeit des langsamen Niederganges ausnimmt. Über diese Epoche wissen wir freilich ungleich mehr, dank der Überlieferung zur Seebundspolitik Athens und seinen Ambitionen, im silberreichen Nordgriechenland durch Kolonien Fuss zu fassen. Argilos, das als Hafen der Bisalten anfangs von den Reichtümern seines Hinterlandes profitiert haben dürfte, fand sich alsbald im Schnittfeld der Interessen mehrerer Mächte wieder: Athens, dessen Politiker schon im 6. Jh. den eigenen Vorteil in Thrakien gesucht und insbesondere ein Auge auf den thasischen Festlandsbesitz geworfen hatten (man denke nur an die Philaiden);[5] des Persischen Grossreiches, das nach den Niederlagen in Salamis und Plataiai sowie nach dem Verlust des am Ostufer des Strymon gelegenen Eion (476/5) seine Besatzungen aus dem makedonisch-thrakischen Grenzland abziehen musste; des makedonischen Herrschers Alexander I., der danach trachtete, die Grenzen seines Reiches nach Osten vorzuschieben; und natürlich des Stammes der Bisalten, der zwar einst sich dem persischen Diktat unterworfen, dann aber angesichts von dessen anrückender Armee mit dem Grosskönig gebrochen hatte und jetzt, befeuert sowohl von den Niederlagen der Perser als auch vom Himmelsgeschenk

2 Nach G. Markoe in: G. Kopcke / I. Tokumaru (Hrsg.), Greece between East and West: 10th-8th Centuries bc (Mainz 1992), S. 70 f., wurde im Griechenland des 8. und 7. Jhs. noch kein Silber produziert. Was Siphnos und Laurion angeht, hat sich das Bild jedoch inzwischen geändert: Z.A. Stos-Gale in: M.S. Balmuth (Hrsg.), Hacksilber to Coinage: New Insights into the Monetary History of the Near East and Greece (New York 2001), S. 61 f.

3 Vgl. L. Zgusta, Kleinasiatische Ortsnamen (Heidelberg 1984), S. 92 § 89-8.

4 Dazu jetzt auch E. Winter, Stadtspuren. Zeugnisse zur Siedlungsgeschichte der Chalkidiki (Wiesbaden 2006), S. 79-84.

5 Die Quellen sind in der RE Suppl. XII (Stuttgart 1970), Sp. 1095-1097 *s.v.* 'Thukydides' (O. Luschnat) zusammengestellt.

des explodierenden Ertrages seiner Silberminen, seinen politischen Einfluss vermutlich überschätzte.

Die von Thrakien in die Chalkidike führende Küstenstrasse, an der Argilos lag, war schwerlich eine wichtige Handelsroute; die Geschäfte zwischen dem Hellespont und den mittelgriechischen Poleis wurden über See abgewickelt. Im Jahr 480 jedoch wurde die Küstenstrasse zum Aufmarschgebiet der grössten Armee der damaligen Welt. Argilos fügte sich ins Unvermeidliche und gewährte den Persern den Durchzug. Man kann nur ahnen, was das für die Bürger hiess: Todesängste, aber zugleich auch Gelegenheiten zu hohem Profit. Liampi betont zu Recht, dass wir nicht wissen, wie es dabei herging, und gibt zu bedenken, dass der ununterbrochen kräftige Münzausstoss der Prägestätte Argilos vermuten lasse, dass die Stadt mit dem Schrecken davonkam (S. 75).

Nach diesem Abenteuer schloss sich Argilos dem frischgegründeten Attischen Seebund unverzüglich an; es ist bereits in der ersten Schatzungsperiode (478/7 v. Chr.) präsent. Kurz darauf eroberte der athenische Feldherr Kimon Eion, die persische Festung auf dem gegenüberliegenden Ufer des Strymon, und verschaffte dadurch auch den Leuten von Argilos Luft. Freilich werden diese den Aufstand von Thasos und dessen brutale Bezwingung durch Kimon (465-3) mit recht gemischten Gefühlen verfolgt haben, und wie betrachteten sie wohl den Vorstoss Athens, sich in ihrer nächsten Nähe, bei Ennea Hodoi, dem späteren Amphipolis, festzusetzen, der dann in einer Schlacht gegen die Edonen bei Drabeskos[6] ein unrühmliches Ende fand? In jenen Jahren waren nicht nur die Athener, sondern auch die Bisalten finanziell äusserst potent; in den grossen levantinischen Hortfunden des zweiten Jahrhundertdrittels mischen sich die attischen Dekadrachmen mit den Oktodrachmen der Bisalten. Noch wurde Argilos durch die beiden Mächte nicht die Luft abgeschnürt, doch ist es bemerkenswerterweise in jenen Hortfunden selbst nicht mehr vertreten, zumal es, wie wir dank Liampis Studie wissen, seit ca. 470 nurmehr Kleinsilber geprägt zu haben scheint. Im Jahr 454/3 hatte Argilos ausweislich der Tributquotenlisten plötzlich den exorbitanten Betrag von 10½ Talenten (63.000 attische Drachmen) an die Bundeskasse abzuführen; falls der Inschrift an dieser Position zu trauen ist,[7] war die Stadt damals alles andere als verarmt. In den folgenden acht Jahren fehlen alle Angaben; in den Schatzungslisten von 446/5 und 438/7 beläuft sich der Tribut dann nur noch auf je 1 Talent. Gerne wüsste man, in welcher Höhe der Tribut in der berüchtigten Kleonschatzung von 425/4 festgesetzt war, die dem thrakischen Steuerbezirk anstelle der bis dahin üblichen 120 plötzlich rund 320 Talente auferlegte; leider klafft hier eine Lücke in

6 Auf eine Spätdatierung dieser Schlacht, die den Bezugsrahmen für die Interpretation der Hortfundchronologie grundlegend ändern würde, sei hier nur hingewiesen: V. Parker, ArchAnz. 1994, S. 365-373. Sie stützt sich auf die Karriere des athenischen Strategen Leagros. Thukydides' Formulierung (I 100, 3) lässt es jedoch schwerlich zu, die Schlacht von den Vorgängen auf Thasos zeitlich weit abzurücken.

7 Der Betrag wird häufig zu 1½ Talenten emendiert. Anders hingegen R. Meiggs, The Athenian Empire (Oxford 1972), S. 159 Anm. 3, der damit rechnet, dass damals Brea und Tragilos zum Territorium von Argilos gehörten.

der Überlieferung. Die Nachbarstadt Tragilos, die in der Mitte des Jahrhunderts Argilos als Prägestätte förmlich abgelöst hatte, hatte damals 1 Talent Tribut zu zahlen.

Inzwischen war jedoch Einschneidendes geschehen: Athen hatte 437 v. Chr. bei Ennea Hodoi die Stadt Amphipolis gegründet und die umliegenden Bundesgenossen zu einem Synoikismos gezwungen; Argilos scheint durch diese Massnahme stark entvölkert worden zu sein (S. 83). Interessant, dass Argilos sich im Peloponnesischen Krieg auf die Seite des Spartaners Brasidas schlug, als dieser sich anschickte, Amphipolis zu belagern. In den Klauseln des Nikiasfriedens (421 v. Chr.) war vorgesehen, dass Argilos wieder in den Seebund eintreten und einen Tribut gemäss der allerersten Schatzung entrichten sollte; wie sich die Dinge dann entwickelten, ist unbekannt.

Für die Folgezeit fehlen tatsächlich fast alle Nachrichten. Die Stadt wurde kaum mehr wahrgenommen, obwohl sie durchaus noch weit über ein Jahrhundert lang existiert haben muss. In den Kriegen der Chalkidischen Liga gegen Philipp II. spielte Argilos offenbar keine nennenswerte Rolle, 357 wurde es mitsamt Amphipolis dem makedonischen Reich einverleibt. Im unruhigen 4. Jh. diente die zur Festung ausgebaute Zweigstadt Kerdylion Argilos als Fluchtburg, die um die Wende zum 3. Jh. zerstört wurde (nach Auffassung der Ausgräber: durch die Kelten). In diese Zeit sind drei Kammergräber makedonischen Typs zu datieren, die an den Ausfallstrassen von Argilos entdeckt wurden;[8] damit könnte angedeutet sein, dass eine makedonische Besatzung in der Stadt lag. Im 2. Jh. scheint der Ort dann endgültig verödet zu sein.

Argilos war nach den Perserkriegen nurmehr ein Spielball der verschiedenen Mächte, die sich in den Besitz der Silberminen in seinem Hinterland zu bringen suchten. Gerade ein Blick auf die zeitliche Verteilung seiner Prägungen erweist, dass die politische und wirtschaftliche Blüte des Ortes davor lag, genauer gesagt in den vier Jahrzehnten, bevor Argilos dem Seebund beitrat. Damit sind wir beim numismatischen Teil des Buches.

Liampi gliedert die Prägungen in acht Perioden auf. Alle Perioden sind recht kurz, sie decken selten mehr als zehn Jahre, häufig weniger ab. Ihre Eckdaten werden teilweise aus den oben erwähnten Hortfunden (Zagazig, Myt Rahineh, Taranto, Asyut), teilweise auch aus stilkritischen Untersuchungen gewonnen. Jede Periode bildet eine abgeschlossene Emission, wobei die Statēre von zugehörigen Kleinnominalen – Hekten und kleineren Werten – begleitet werden. Die Silberprägungen setzen gegen 520 ein und laufen kurz vor der Mitte des 5. Jhs. aus, überspannen mithin einen Zeitraum von nicht einmal 70 Jahren. Die Bronzeprägungen (es sind gerade mal vier Exemplare bekannt) gehören ins 2. Viertel des 4. Jhs.

Gliederung und Chronologie halte ich in allen wesentlichen Punkten für verlässlich; es sind nur wenige Bemerkungen anzubringen. Problematisch ist dagegen die metrologische Ansprache.

[8] WINTER (oben, Anm. 4), S. 81 ff.

Bildtypus: Die Münzen tragen fast durchweg nur ein Aversbild, der Revers besteht aus einem Quadratum incusum, das in wechselnder Weise vierteilig gegliedert ist. Das Aversbild stellt ein Flügelpferd dar, bei den Statēren das ganze Tier, bei den kleineren Nominalen dessen Protome. Die letzte Serie des mittleren Nominals (die sog. Hekten) zeigen dann ebenfalls das ganze Tier. Ein einziger Statēr weist ein Reversbild auf, einen laufenden Krieger, der sein Schwert zückt (Nr. 17). Liampi deutet ihn einleuchtend auf Bellerophon (S. 213), so dass man das Flügelpferd Pegasos nennen darf, eine Deutung, die bei archaischen Flügelpferden nicht vorauszusetzen ist. Der Pegasos von Argilos unterscheidet sich von den lampsakenischen dadurch, dass ihm deren divergierende Doppelflügel fehlen, ein Punkt, auf den in der Literatur nicht immer geachtet wird.[9] Ferner möchte ich in diesem Zusammenhang auf zwei andere, vermutlich makedonische Serien verweisen, auf die Liampi nicht näher eingeht: die spätarchaischen Didrachmen (attischen Fusses) mit dem aus Flügelpferd und Löwen gebildeten 'Tierwirbel'[10] und jene aus mehreren Kleinnominalen bestehende Serie (wenn es sich denn nur um eine einzige Serie handelt), die auf dem Avers ein Pferd, eine Pferdeprotome oder einen Pferdekopf zeigt und auf dem Revers entweder ein Quadratum incusum oder aber eine Ziege bzw. einen Widder.[11] Ernste Verwechslungsgefahr besteht nicht, auch von den korinthischen Pegasoi sind jene von Argilos infolge der gänzlich abweichenden Nominalgliederung leicht zu unterscheiden. – Erst in der Spätphase der Prägung nennt das 'Fensterincusum' den Prägeherrn (Nr. 128-130), in dieser letzten Silberserie erfolgt dann auch ein Wechsel des Aversbildes: Die vermutlich jüngste Münze (Nr. 130) trägt anstelle der Pegasosprotome einen von vorn gesehenen Löwenkopf à la Rhegion, ein Wechsel, der durch das ins Incusum gesetzte Reversbild der Kleinmünze einer älteren Serie vorbereitet wird (Nr. 85). Die Gründe für die Änderung sind unklar, andernorts (Akanthos, Mende) sind die Löwendarstellungen typologisch besser zu verstehen (S. 208, 215). Aber letztlich bleiben auch die Gründe für die Wahl des Pegasosmotivs im Dunklen, trotz aller Überlegungen, die Liampi dazu anstellt (S. 201 ff.).

Gliederung: Die Verteilung der Stempelreihen auf ihre acht Perioden überzeugt mich weitgehend. Skeptisch bin ich in lediglich drei Fällen. So scheint mir der Statēr Nr. 7 eher in die II. denn in die I. Periode zu gehören; stilistisch ist er entwickelter als der folgende Statēr Nr. 8. Liampis Zuweisung beruht auf der Gliederung des Quadratum Incusum: Vier oder acht Felder? Das Incusum des fraglichen Exemplares ist dermassen von Brüchen und Schrunden überwuchert, dass eine Entscheidung anhand des Photos nicht möglich ist. – In Ermangelung numismatischer Evidenz greift Liampi häufig zu stilkritischen Argumenten, eine Methode, der heute oftmals Geringschätzung entgegengebracht wird, zu Unrecht.

9 So etwa Peus 376, 2003, 253; CNG 72, 2006, 233.

10 Traité 2,I Taf. XXVIII, 10; J. Svoronos, JIAN 19, 1918/19, S. 236 Taf. 14, 24-25; SNG Lockett 3542; SNG ANS 7, 989.

11 SNG Lockett 3526; SNG ANS 7, 997; Boston Suppl. 48; R.A. Stucky, SNR 63, 1984, S. 6 Nr. 15 (ex Ras Shamra IGCH 1478). Der von Liampi (S. 22 und 243) erwähnte Neufund aus Stagira, ein Elektronstatēr mit Pferdedarstellung, hat hiermit nichts zu tun.

Freilich belastet Liampi ihre so gewonnenen Ergebnisse einigemale über Gebühr. Sowohl das Stempelpaar mit dem Löwenkopf auf dem Revers (Nr. 85) als auch dasjenige mit dem Doppelstrich-Incusum (Nr. 82) sind, da unverkoppelt, nur schwer in ihre Serie einzureihen. Liampi tut das mithilfe einer stilkritisch gewonnenen Entwicklungslinie. Nun kann man sich trefflich darüber streiten, ob es möglich ist, mit Dutzenden von Kleinmünzenstempeln nach stilkritischen Kriterien eine Reihe zu bilden, zumal wenn diese lediglich 17-18 Jahre überspannt (Periode IV, ca. 495-478/7 v. Chr.). Lassen wir das dahingestellt sein. Ich halte es indessen für unmöglich, die auf solche Weise erschlossene Reihenfolge tiefer zu interpretieren. Liampi tut das, wenn sie anlässlich der beiden genannten Fälle die Ausdrücke «after this» (S. 133) und «abandonment immediately in the next die» (S. 138) gebraucht. Das «internal development», soll heissen: die Ideallinie der Stilentwicklung, ist eine Abstraktion, die mit den Rhythmen des wirklichen Lebens wenig zu tun hat; es sei hier nur an die zahllosen 'Ungleichzeitigkeiten' erinnert, die man in den Kunstwissenschaften im Sinne des sog. Generationenproblems zu erklären pflegt (Künstler unterschiedlichen Alters arbeiten im Stil ihrer jeweiligen Lehrzeit nebeneinander).

Der dritte Kritikpunkt gehört derselben Kategorie an. Dass die kleine Gruppe von Münzen euböischen Fusses (Nr. E1-E3) in Argilos geprägt wurde, ist vorläufig nicht zu beweisen, da für keines der drei bekannten Exemplare ein Fundort bekannt ist. Es ist jedoch unbestreitbar, dass sich diese Pegasoi stilistisch hier einfügen lassen (vgl. z.B. die Nr. 46), auch wenn sie bildtypologisch (zusammengezogener Körper, versammelter Galopp) isoliert stehen; aber gerade das liesse sich als Folge der Absicht deuten, jeder Verwechslung der Münzstandards vorzubeugen. Die Schrägansicht des Pegasoskopfes auf dem Statēr liefert schwerlich eine Handhabe, die drei Münzen nach Argilos zu weisen: Zum einen steht der Kopf wahrscheinlich im Profil wie die anderen auch (zumindest der Unterkiefer ist im Profil; die Augenpartie ist zu abgeschliffen, um ein Urteil zu erlauben), und zum anderen steht der einzige Vergleich, den Liampi hier nennen kann, in seiner eigenen Serie isoliert da (O31, dazu S. 168 f.). Pferde, die aus dem Bild herausschauen, sind im übrigen so selten nicht.[12]

Chronologie: Liampis feinmaschige Chronologie leuchtet mir im Grossen und Ganzen ein. Freilich kann der vergleichsweise geringe Prägeausstoss von Argilos nicht dazu verhelfen, umgekehrt nun die Daten der herangezogenen Hortfunde zu überprüfen. Es würde kaum Stauungen oder Rupturen verursachen, wenn man in Argilos die Perioden da und dort dehnen oder pressen müsste. Schwieriger wäre dies bei der Prägung der Bisalten, die, bemerkenswert genug, erst dann auftaucht, wenn die Statērprägung von Argilos fast schon versiegt, nämlich nach dem Fund

[12] Bei Darstellungen mythischer Wagenrennen scheint es oftmals das Aussenpferd des Verlierers zu sein, das den Betrachter anblickt; vgl. CVA Tarquinia (1), Taf. 6. 7, 1; J.D. Beazley, The Kleophrades Painter (Mainz 1974), S. 20 Nr. 93 Taf. 32, 2; H.A. Shapiro, Personifications in Greek Art (Kilchberg 1993), S. 214 Abb. 178; S. 262 Nr. 139. Ob darin der Ausdruck mantischer Fähigkeiten des Pferdes (Hom. Il. XIX 399 ff.) zu suchen ist, wäre zu prüfen.

von Asyut. Liampi macht diese Beobachtung zwar, hält sie aber für «a matter of chance» (S. 141). Sie geht davon aus, dass Argilos und die Bisalten mehr oder minder simultan prägten. Das ist, im Lichte der grossen Funde von Elmalı (CH VIII 48) und Aleppo betrachtet, sehr unwahrscheinlich. Trotz ihres recht groben Stils scheint die Prägung der Bisalten erst gegen 475 einzusetzen, jedenfalls kommt sie dann im Jahrzehnt 470/60 zu einem Höhepunkt. In diesen Jahren hat Argilos gerade noch einen Statēr und ansonsten nur Kleingeld produziert. Der Prozess einer schlagartigen Verdrängung würde nur dann etwas abgemildert, wenn die makedonischen Münzen von 'Aigai' mit dem Bild eines Ziegenbocks, die Liampi nach Tragilos legt (S. 44), doch mit den Bisalten in Verbindung zu bringen sein sollten. Stilistisch gibt es da zwar gar keine Verbindung, trotzdem sind die Prägungen von 'Aigai' und der Bisalten durch ein aus Delta und Epsilon gebildetes Monogramm miteinander verknüpft.[13] Was dahinter steht – ein Herrschername? – bleibt vorerst ein Rätsel. Das führt mich zu einem weiteren Punkt. Liampi interpretiert den Fund von Asyut als zeitliche Grenze (ca. 475 v. Chr.) So legitim das ist, es bedarf des Nachsatzes, dass eine wenn nicht gar drei seiner Münzen nach diesem Datum liegen, also mit einem Abstand von gut zehn Jahren dem Hort noch hinzugefügt wurden, bevor er endgültig verborgen wurde: das Oktodrachmon Alexanders I. und zwei Statēre von 'Aigai'.[14] Argilos mag einer der Häfen gewesen sein, in dem sich der 'Einsammler' von Asyut wiederholt aufgehalten hat, und falls die Statēre von 'Aigai' in nächster Nachbarschaft geprägt wurden, ist auch bei Argilos Vorsicht angebracht. Das Enddatum 475 ist zwar wahrscheinlich, aber keinesfalls sicher.

Katalog: Hier bleibt kaum etwas anzumerken. Der Katalog macht durchweg einen hervorragenden Eindruck, doch hätte ihm eine Schlussredaktion gutgetan. Es stört, dass der Stammbaum der Exemplare bald mit Strichpunkt und «ex... », bald mit «=» gegliedert wird; ein Unterschied wird hier nicht gemacht. Ausserdem erschwert das Aufspalten in Stammbaum und Zitatenreihe die Orientierung; die zahllosen Siglen nach dem Harvard-System («Liampi 1994» u. dgl.) sind ja ohnehin schon verwirrend genug, wer soll das alles für's rasche Nachschlagen fortwährend genau im Kopf haben?

Ich schliesse ein paar Addenda und Corrigenda an:

- 8a = Vinchon 13. Nov. 1986, 113.
- 9a = Leu 45, 1988, 118.
- 12b kommt neu hinzu: G. Hirsch 233, 2004, 1309 (13,54 g, Reversstempel unsicher).
- 24 = Sammlung Welzl von Wellenheim I, 4014.
- 26a ist ein antikes Falsum und hat in dieser Gruppe nichts zu suchen.

[13] C. Lorber in: C. Arnold-Biucchi / S. Mani Hurter (Hrsg.), Pour Denyse. Divertissements numismatiques (Bern 2000), S. 114 f. 127.

[14] M.J. Price / N. Waggoner, Archaic Greek Silver Coinage. The Asyut Hoard (London 1975), S. 38 Nr. 150-152. Zur Datierung H.A. Cahn, SNR 56, 1977, S. 284, und J.H. Kagan in: I. Carradice (Hrsg.), Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires, BAR 343 (Oxford 1987), S. 22 f. 27.

- 30b = AMNG III 2, S. 116 Nr. 4 Taf. 26, 27.
- 32a = Gemini 2, 2006, 48.
- 39a = NFA 23, 1989, 273.
- 54: Die Notiz zu dem Stempel R44 gehört zu Nr. 53c.
- 59a = Künker 94, 2004, 634; jetzt Bonn, Akademisches Kunstmuseum.
- 68a = Leu 81, 2001, 160.
- 74a: Berlin, Sammlung Dannenberg.
- 93b kommt neu hinzu: Triton 10, 2007, 131 (13,57 g).

Metrologie: Das dornigste Kapitel. Liampi spricht von Statēren, Hekten, von Zweiunddreissigsteln und Achtundvierzigsteln. Damit bricht sie mit dem Usus, die Sechstel des Leitnominals in Anlehnung an den attischen Standard als Tetrobola zu bezeichnen, und sie hat recht damit. Was in Katalogwerken so alles als Tetrobol bezeichnet wird, ist einfach lächerlich. Wie kann es Tetrobola da geben, wo es weder Drachmen noch Oboloi gibt? Auch wenn der Begriff der Hekte an kleinasiatische Elektronstückelungen erinnert (und Liampi erliegt deshalb auch einem alten Irrtum), so ist er doch neutraler.

Um nun gleich wieder Wasser in den Wein zu giessen, ich bezweifle, dass Liampis Hekten wirklich Hekten sind. Zu dieser Einschätzung komme ich über einen Umweg. Um die Teilstücke korrekt zu bezeichnen, muss man natürlich zuerst das Normgewicht der Statēre kennen. Das ist nun in Argilos besonders schwierig, denn deren Gewicht schwankt gänzlich regellos zwischen 14,3 g und 12,3 g; eine gewisse Massierung ist oberhalb von 13,45 g festzustellen. Eine Entwicklung zeichnet sich dabei nicht ab; das schwerste Exemplar (14,52 g) stammt aus Periode IV A. Lassen wir also die Statēre vorerst beiseite und wenden uns den kleineren Nominalen zu.

Liampi bestimmt das Normgewicht der sog. Hekten mit 2,46 g (S. 238 f.). Da ich die von Liampi für ihre Kalkulationen gewählten Intervalle für viel zu gross halte (0,5 g für Statēre, 0,2 g für Hekten und 0,1 g für das Kleingeld), lege ich meinen Überlegungen eine eigene, anhand von Liampis Katalog erstellte Frequenztabelle zugrunde (siehe Tabelle 1, S. 185).

Eine Frequenztabelle bildet keine Basis für ein strenges Kalkül, da man mit dem Zufall der Überlieferung ebenso zu rechnen hat wie mit dem Zufall der Erhaltung. Man darf aber davon ausgehen, dass das Normgewicht oberhalb der Massierung liegt, weil die Münzen allesamt mehr oder minder abgerieben sind. Zudem wird auch der antike Staat eher geizig als grosszügig gewesen sein, das Normgewicht wurde also wahrscheinlich sehr viel häufiger unterlaufen als überschritten.

Bei Kleingeld ist noch ein weiterer Punkt zu beachten, bevor man zur Interpretation einer Frequenztabelle schreitet. Der Aufwand an Zeit und Arbeit für die Prägung der einzelnen Münze ist bei einem Tetartemorion schwerlich viel geringer als bei einem Tetradrachmon. Was man hier an Kraft verausgabt, verbraucht man dort durch die geforderte Präzision. Das heisst, die Kosten pro Münze sind unterm Strich identisch. Je kleiner also das Nominal, desto rascher wird es für den Prägeherrn zum Verlustgeschäft. Bei Elektronteilstücken darf man wohl davon ausgehen, dass noch irgendein Schlagschatz erzielt wurde, aber bei silbernen Oboloi und kleineren Nominalen muss man es füglich bezweifeln. Es sei denn, es

	I Hekten	II Hekten	III Hekten	IV A-B Hekten	IV C Hekten
2,76-2,80 g	I				
2,71-2,75 g					I
2,66-2,70 g	I	I			I
2,61-2,65 g			II	II	
2,56-2,60 g	II			I	
2,51-2,55 g	I	II	I		
2,46-2,50 g		III		II	I
2,41-2,45 g		I		I	
2,36-2,40 g		I		II	IIII
2,31-2,35 g				I	I
2,26-2,30 g		II		I	I
2,21-2,25 g		I		I	I
2,16-2,20 g				I	
2,11-2,15 g					I
2,06-2,10 g		I			
2,01-2,05 g					
1,96-2,00 g					
1,91-1,95 g					
1,86-1,90 g		I			

Tabelle 1

wurde geschnipfelt. Man bedenke, dass attische Oboloi kaum einmal ihr theoretisches Normgewicht von ca. 0,71 g erreichen, aber häufig genug nur 0,4 g wiegen. Nun wurde der Obol – selbstredend eine Prägung *al marco* – nie auf die Waage gelegt.

Kurzum, das theoretische Normgewicht der Hekte, das man zur Konstituierung des Statērgewichtes benötigt, muss ein wenig oberhalb der Massierung liegen, die in diesem Falle im Intervall zwischen 2,35 und 2,65 g zu verzeichnen ist (und nehmen wir den Durchschnitt, bei 2,50 g). Als Normgewicht der Hekte darf man also getrost 2,60 oder gar 2,65 g ansetzen. In der letzten Phase der Hektenprägung (Periode IV C) scheint die Gewichtsnorm leicht zu sinken, ich komme darauf zurück.

Legt man das Gewicht 2,6 g pro Hekte zugrunde, dann wog der Normstatēr 15,6 g. Nun, das ist hier völlig unmöglich. Das Normgewicht des Statērs dürfte sich zwischen 14,0 und 13,5 g bewegen, vorsichtig geschätzt. Die Hekten können also keine Hekten sein. Vielmehr liegt es nahe anzunehmen, dass es Fünftel sind: 5 x 2,6 g = 13 g. Da man bei den Teilstücken die erwähnte Differenz zwischen theoretischem und effektivem Normgewicht zu berücksichtigen hat, kommt man mit diesen Werten wohl hin (zumal die 2,60 g ja noch recht niedrig veranschlagt sind).

Der Statēr ist also ein Pentedrachmon, und die Hekten sind schlicht Drachmen. Das ist so seltsam nicht. Pentedrachma sind im nordgriechisch-makedonischen Raum wiederholt belegt. G. Le Rider stellte fest, dass die Tetrobola Philipps II. in

Wahrheit Fünftel seines «Tetradrachmons» waren,[15] und M. Price wies anhand einer epigraphisch bezeugten Bezeichnung nach, dass auch die Tetrobola von Mende Drachmen und Fünftel des Statērs waren.[16] Das makedonische Pentedrachmon wird überdies von Polyaen erwähnt.[17] Die ältere Zeit, um die es hier geht, ist weniger gut erforscht. C. Lorber verdanke ich den Hinweis, dass wir in den abderitischen Statēren des späten 5. und frühen 4. Jhs. (Mays Perioden V und VI) wahrscheinlich Pentedrachma zu erblicken haben.[18] Ferner gilt es die von Liampi herangezogenen Vergleiche zu prüfen. Terone gibt keine Parallele ab, denn dort wiegt um 490/80 der Statēr ca. 14,5 g und das Teilstück ca. 3,6 g; es handelt sich also um eine Viertelung.[19] Sermylia bildet schon eher eine Parallele. Ausser auf Münzen im attischen Standard trifft man dort auf Statēre à 13,85 g und «Tetrobola» à 2,6 g,[20] also auf so ziemlich dieselben Verhältnisse wie in Argilos. Der Fall bleibt noch genauer zu prüfen, insbesondere ist in Sermylia zwischen regulären Geprägen und Beischlägen zu scheiden. Daran, dass wir es hier wie dort mit Pentedrachma zu tun haben, ist aber wohl nicht zu rütteln.

Gehen wir nun noch eine Stufe tiefer, zu den Kleinstnominalen, die von Liampi als Zweiunddreissigstel bzw. als Achtundvierzigstel angesprochen werden. Hier stutzt man schon: Wieso stehen Zweiunddreissigstel als Vertreter einer Viertelung neben Hekten? Das eine ins andere umzurechnen ist nicht einfach, das kleinste gemeinsame Vielfache ist bereits ein halber Statēr: 3/6 = 16/32. Bevor wir uns jedoch auf eine Erörterung dieses Problems einlassen, werfen wir lieber einen Blick auf die entsprechende Frequenztabelle. Die wirft nämlich ganz andere Fragen auf (siehe Tabelle 2, S. 187).

In der Tabelle sind alle Kleinstnominale von Argilos rubriziert; in der Periode III wurden keine geprägt. Die interne Aufspaltung der Perioden IV und VI habe ich vorgenommen, um dadurch den Prozess, der sich hier abspielt, deutlicher zum Ausdruck zu bringen. Wir können eine sukzessive Minderung des Normgewichtes verfolgen, und zwar nur eines einzigen Normgewichts. Ich kann keinen Unterschied zwischen den Normgewichten in Periode V und VI A feststellen. Kurz gesagt, was Liampi einmal für Zweiunddreissigstel und einmal für Achtundvierzigstel hält, ist ein und dasselbe Nominal. Näher läge es, die Exemplare in VI A und VI B für unterschiedliche Nominale zu halten, doch dafür gibt es typologisch keinerlei Anhaltspunkte. In dieser Hinsicht bestünde tatsächlich eine gewisse Differenz zwischen V und VI, insofern die Pegasosprotome in Periode V nach links gerichtet

15 G. Le Rider, Le monnayage d'argent et d'or de Philippe II (Paris 1977), S. 359.

16 M.J. Price, The Coinage in the Name of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaeus (London-Zürich 1991), S. 38 f.

17 Polyaen. III 10, 14; dazu S. Psomá, RN 155, 2000, S. 123-136 [*non vidi*]. Nach Alexanders Tod wurde der Terminus auf eine Goldmünze übertragen, siehe G. Le Rider, Monnayage et finances de Philippe II. Un état de question (Athen 1996), S. 15.

18 Brieflich, 16. August 2007.

19 N. Hardwick in: R. Ashton / S. Hurter (Hrsg.), Studies in Greek Numismatics in memory of Martin Jessop Price (London 1998), S. 123. 132.

20 Statēre: SNG ANS 7, 722-724; Slg. Dewing 1077. «Tetrobola»: SNG ANS 7, 725-726; Winterthur I 1407.

	II D	IV A-B	IV C	V	VI A	VI B	VII
	1/32	1/32	1/32	1/32	1/48	1/48	1/48
0,71-0,75 g		I					
0,66-0,70 g							
0,61-0,65 g							
0,56-0,60 g		I					
0,51-0,55 g		II					
0,46-0,50 g	I	I	II		I		
0,41-0,45 g	III	III	III	III	III		I
0,36-0,40 g		IIII	VV III	V I	VV I	I	
0,31-0,35 g	III	III	VVV II	III	V I	III	
0,26-0,30 g	I	I	VV	I	V I	VVVV II	II
0,21-0,25 g			V II	II	V	V III	III
0,16-0,20 g				I	II	II	
0,11-0,15 g						I	

Tabelle 2

ist, in Periode VI aber nach rechts. Allerdings ist der Unterschied typologisch weniger bedeutsam, als es zunächst den Anschein hat. Die nach rechts gerichtete Protome herrscht in der vorangehenden Periode IV vor, so dass man allein nach dem Augenschein unmöglich zwei Nominale unterscheiden konnte.

Dass wir es hier durchweg mit nur einem einzigen Nominal zu tun haben, entnehme ich nicht nur der äusseren Uniformität dieser Münzen. Ein Absinken des Normgewichtes war geradezu zu erwarten: nicht infolge einer Inflation, sondern als Folge der Anpassung an ein verändertes Prägekonzept. Ich habe oben erwähnt, dass die 'Hekten' der letzten Phase (Periode IV C) im Durchschnitt etwas leichter sind als davor. Zu dieser Zeit prägte Argilos erstmals Kleingeld im grossen Stil, d.h. die Prägekosten pro Münze stiegen abrupt an. Um das auszugleichen, senkte man das Normgewicht der 'Hekten' geringfügig ab; das Kleinstnominal wurde simultan dazu auch ein wenig leichter. Der Prozess musste sich beschleunigen, sobald man die Statērprägung einstellte. Aus der Periode V kennen wir noch ein einziges Exemplar (Nr. 93), danach nichts mehr. Die Prägestätte kam jetzt nicht mehr umhin, die Normgewichte zu rejustieren, andernfalls drohten Verluste.

Aber um welches Nominal handelt es sich hier denn nun eigentlich? Grob geschätzt, scheint das Normgewicht ursprünglich zwischen 0,40 und 0,45 g gelegen zu haben. Nun, das entspricht recht genau einem Sechstel der 'Hekte' bzw. Drachme: 2,6 g : 6 = 0,43 g. Oboloi also.

Zum Schluss noch ein Wort zur Herkunft des Münzfusses. Liampi bezeichnet ihn als «a reduced variation of the Thraco-Macedonian standard» (S. 236), eine Formulierung, die schon zu erkennen gibt, wie unsicher der Boden ist, auf dem man sich hier bewegt. Der thrako-makedonische Standard ist ein unsicherer Kantonist, er wurde in der Literatur bereits für so unterschiedliche Normen in Anspruch genommen wie etwa jene der Statēre des Archelaos und jene der

Chalkidischen Liga.[21] Indessen spielt Liampi mit dem schon von Svoronos aufgebrachten Gedanken, dass der Standard von Argilos letztlich auf den milesischen Münzfuss zurückzuführen sei (S. 242); deshalb wohl auch der Griff zu dem Terminus Hekte. Als Kronzeugen nennt sie die Elektronstatēre aus dem sog. Western Thracian Field Hoard (CH II 1), zu denen sich jetzt noch ein in Stagira entdecktes Exemplar hinzugesellt (o. Anm. 11); diese Elektronprägung ist wahrscheinlich nicht kleinasiatischen, sondern nordgriechischen Ursprungs. Da sie ohne jeden Zweifel dem milesischen Standard folgt (die Statēre wiegen fast durchweg 14,02 g), hat man immer an den Tyrannen von Milet Aristagoras gedacht, der den Ionischen Aufstand anzettelte und sich dann, als die Dinge sich nicht in seinem Sinne entwickelten, ins thrakische Myrkinos zurückzog, wo er 497 v. Chr. in einem Gefecht mit den Edonen den Tod fand. Ich neige dazu, diese Elektronprägung für ein bis zwei Jahrzehnte älter zu halten, was Liampis Überlegungen chronologisch entgegenkäme. Trotzdem bezweifle ich, dass der milesische Standard – der ja zuvörderst ein Elektronstandard ist – den in Argilos gebrauchten Münzfuss für Silberwerte in irgendeiner Weise angestossen hat. Um solche Zweifel zu hegen, muss man meinem Vorschlag, wie die Stückelung in Argilos zu deuten sei, gar nicht zustimmen; es reicht, einen Blick auf die angeblichen Hekten zu werfen. Eine Hekte milesischen Fusses wiegt 2,33 g. Die 'Hekten' von Argilos sind dafür viel zu schwer, zumal man damit rechnen muss, dass sie ihr theoretisches Normgewicht ständig unterlaufen. Und welcher Sinn soll darin liegen, Silber nach einem Elektronstandard zu prägen? Für Prägungen des 6. Jhs. pflegt man eine *ratio* EL : AR = 1:10 anzusetzen,[22] doch sank diese *ratio* kontinuierlich ab, übrigens auch, weil der Goldgehalt des Elektrons immer wieder reduziert wurde.[23] Einen festen Wechselkurs konnte es also nicht geben.

[21] S. Psomá, Klio 89, 2007, S. 17 f.; *dies.* in: Το νόμισμα στο Μακεδονικό χώρο, Kolloquium Thessaloniki 1998 (Thessaloniki 2000), S. 25-36; J.A. Schell, AJN 12, 2000, S. 1-8; Hardwick (oben, Anm. 19), S. 123; E. Raven, NC 1967, S. 295 f.

[22] G. Le Rider, La naissance de la monnaie (Paris 2001), S. 69; R. Wallace in: Balmuth (oben, Anm. 2), S. 128; M.J. Price in: Festschrift für Leo Mildenberg (Wetteren 1984), S. 214.

[23] F. Bodenstedt, Phokäisches Elektron-Geld von 600-326 v. Chr. (Mainz 1976), S. 15. 83-85.

Fazit: Trotz der Bedenken, die ich an einigen Stellen vorbringen musste, ist Liampis Studie ein vorzügliches und lesenswertes Werk, das die Forschung zu den nordgriechischen Prägungen in mancher Hinsicht auf eine neue Grundlage stellt. Noch gar nicht erwähnt habe ich jene Kapitel, die sich der Legende, den technischen Fragen, den in der Grabung aufgefundenen Münzen (u.a. ein Hortfund mit Kleinmünzen von Akanthos) und den modernen Falsa widmen. Die Einführung bietet eine sehr nützliche Bestandsaufnahme der archäologischen und epigraphischen Zeugnisse aus der Bisaltia, die hoffentlich ausgiebig konsultiert werden wird. Abgerundet wird das Buch durch eine lange Literaturliste, gründliche Indices, eine neugriechische Zusammenfassung und einen opulenten Tafelteil, der auch mit einigen Vergrösserungen aufwartet. Der Druck ist gut.

Dr. Wolfgang Fischer-Bossert
Nohlstr. 21
DE – 16548 Glienicke
fischerbossert@hotmail.de

Haim Gitler and Oren Tal

The Coinage of Philistia in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC: A Study in the Earliest Coins of Palestine.

Collezioni Numismatiche 6. Milano and New York: Edizioni Ennere and Amphora Books/B. & H. Kreindler, 2006
411 pp., 106+17 b/w pls., b/w illus. throughout. ISBN 88-87235-38-4.

At the second Nickle Numismatic Conference held at the University of Calgary in the autumn of 2004, the present reviewer had the distinct pleasure of seeing a dramatic multi-media presentation given by Haim Gitler on the subject of Philistian coinage - a topic that he had been pursuing for some time with his colleague Oren Tal. The content of the lecture combined with a truly magnificent set of Power-point slides allowed the speaker and an obscure group of silver coins from the southern Levantine coast (mostly drachms and fractions) to hold the audience spellbound from beginning to end. Upon the conclusion of the presentation all that remained for the listeners were their hastily scribbled notes and the excited but slightly hollow feeling that comes from knowing that there was much more left unsaid and unshown. Thankfully, two years later, Gitler and Tal's *The Coinage of Philistia* has appeared in print, at last ready to reveal the latest thinking on the Philistian coin series.

The first two chapters serve as an introduction to coinage in Philistia (the Philistine Pentapolis of the Bible) and the southern Levant in general from the sixth century to the fourth century BC, with special attention to the influx of foreign coins from mainland Greece, Anatolia, and the islands. Using the evidence of Archaic coin finds from Achaemenid-period strata in controlled archaeological excavations, it is shown that some of these early coins arrived in the region soon after they were issued, but were treated as bullion and frequently cut up. Somewhat more significant is the view that the vast majority of Athenian-type coins found in the Levant are actually local imitations («Athenian-styled» in the parlance of the authors) based on prototypes datable to 454-415/13 BC, and that these coins represent the progression towards a moneyed economy in the region. Useful tables of excavated specimens of Archaic Greek coins and locally produced Athenian-styled coins from sites in modern Israel are also included in these sections.

In Chapter 3, the authors plunge into Philistian coinage proper, which they divide into two distinct categories, «Athenian-styled» issues featuring elements taken from the ubiquitous Athenian tetradrachm, and «Philistian-styled» issues involving local types. To begin, Gitler and Tal trace the history of Philistian numismatic scholarship from the work of Joseph Eckhel in the eighteenth century to that of Leo Mildenberg in the late twentieth century. As part of this historical review, Gitler and Tal make a strong case for rejecting the various terminologies that have been used to describe the coins (i.e., Graeco-Persian, Greco-Philistian, Philisto-Arabian, Philisto-Egyptian, and Philistine) on the grounds that they are based on erroneous ethnic and iconographic assumptions. Instead, the term «Philistian», which refers only to the geographical area in which the coins are found is to be

preferred, as it implies nothing about the ethnicity of the coin producers or users. This choice of terminology essentially mirrors the decision made by Ya'akov Meshorer and Shraga Qedar to refer to the related coinages of fourth-century Samaria as «Samarian» rather than «Samaritan».[1]

Although of very minor importance to the discussion, readers should be aware that the drachm depicted in Fig. 3.5, 2 and identified as coming from the collection of Anton von Prokesch-Osten is actually a different coin. The drawing of the Prokesch-Osten piece in Fig. 3.3, 35 (erroneously referred to as Fig. 3.1, 35 at Fig. 3.5) clearly shows a coin with a different flan shape and an obverse that is struck off the flan to the left, whereas the coin photographed in the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin is off the flan to the right.

Having established a more fitting terminology for the coinage, the authors provide a solid historical and archaeological overview of the three cities named on Philistian coins (Ashdod, Ashkelon, and Gaza). Here it is pointed out that the populations of the Philistian cities were multiethnic and included elements from the original Philistine peoples as well as Judean, Edomite, Arab, Egyptian, and especially Phoenician elements. This cosmopolitan aspect may partly account for the eclectic typology of the coins, which draws on a variety of Near Eastern artistic traditions.

The illustrated catalogue of Philistian coins found in controlled archaeological excavations that follows the historical exegesis is remarkable for the great predominance of larger denomination Athenian-style issues in the finds and the complete absence of coins naming Ashdod or Ashkelon. The suggestion that greater use of soil sifting and the addition of metal detectors to the arsenals of controlled excavations are needed in order to avoid losing the archaeological contexts of the smaller coins to looters should not be taken lightly. Still, based on the limited evidence available, it is clear that Philistian coinage circulated somewhat beyond the borders of Philistia proper and into neighbouring Samaria and Judaea.

One of the most important features of this chapter is the coherent argument for the origin of Philistian coinage in the fifth century, rather than in the fourth century BC, the date championed most recently by Mildenberg. In support of this early dating, the authors look to the distinctly archaic features (i.e., frontal eye and archaic smile) found on many of the Athenian-style types and Philistian-style types featuring human heads. More compelling than the stylistic evidence is the presence of Philistian issues in the Jordan, Tell el-Maskhouta, and Delta hoards (IGCH 1482 and 1649-1650), all of which can now be dated to the fifth century, in part thanks to new advances in our understanding of the chronology of the contemporary coinages of the Phoenician cities and a reassessment of the hoard contents by the authors. The suggestion that the Phoenician cities first produced anonymous imitations of Athenian coins before issuing their own well-known civic coinages and that the influence of these series spurred the Philistian cities to strike their respective Athenian- and Philistian-styled issues seems quite reasonable. After all, the cities had fallen under Tyrian and Sidonian control by c. 500 BC and some Phoeni-

[1] Y. Meshorer / S. Qedar, The Coinage of Samaria in the Fourth Century BCE (Jerusalem 1991), p. 10.

cian stylistic influence is visible on the coinage (see below), although the latter is not nearly as prevalent as on the related coinage of Samaria.

A recurring theme in this section is that of Philistian coinage as an expression of autonomy. While it is certainly true that the bewildering variety of types, few of which directly refer to Persian authority or Sidonian and Tyrian hegemony in the region,[2] indicate artistic freedom, it is far from certain that the right to coin under the Achaemenids devolved to cities and dynasts by royal grant. If the Great Kings had truly recognized coinage as a symbol of autonomy,[3] it is remarkable that a number of the Persian satraps (governors who were regularly spied upon by the King's Eyes and Ears as a means of curtailing their autonomy) struck coinages in their own names and occasionally even with their own portraits (i.e., the issues of Pharnabazus at Cyzicus, Maussolus in Caria, Mazaeus at Tarsus, etc.). This is not to mention the host of disruptive Greek cities of western Anatolia that coined under Persian rule, but are not likely to have earned special privileges from the Great King considering their actions during the Ionian Revolt and in the aftermath of Xerxes' withdrawal from Greece. Likewise, if coinage had such symbolic force under the Achaemenids, it is very peculiar that the Great Kings did not have a more developed imperial coinage policy aimed at projecting the image of their authority throughout their empire. Instead, Herodotus (3.96) reports that they stored their vast metallic wealth in ingots and only struck coinage as need arose (primarily to hire Greek mercenaries and foment disunity among the Greek cities). One tends to doubt that the production or failure to produce coinage was of any great importance to the Great King, so long as local rulers provided the appropriate tribute on time and supported imperial political and military objectives when called upon.[4]

Even if there were some solid evidence for coinage as a privilege of autonomy in an Achaemenid context, we would still doubt the authors' interpretation of Philistian coinage as primarily political rather than economic in function. This view is partially based on Otto Mørkholm's remarks concerning civic bronze coinages of the Hellenistic period, but an article in the present volume of SNR 86 (pp. 63-90) shows the very close association between episodes of coin production and financial necessity at Gaza in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. While we would never doubt that the Philistian coin types and inscriptions naming Ashkelon, Ashdod, and Gaza have political meaning, it is very difficult to resist the thought that the coins were first and foremost intended to have an economic function. The fact that the coastal cities (i.e., those most closely involved with international trade) struck coins in their own names, but not the inland cities of Ekron and Gath, which

2 The Great King may be depicted on XXIII.1, XIV.36, and XXV.1. Fortifications probably derived from the types of Sidon appear on XIV.1-XV.3.

3 The classic arguments against coinage as an indicator of political autonomy in the ancient Greek world have been presented in T.R. Martin, Sovereignty and Coinage in Classical Greece (Princeton 1985).

4 For a similar view, see I. Carradice / M. Price, Coinage in the Greek World (London 1988), p. 84.

appear to have been in decline under the Achaemenids also tends to favour a financial over a political motivation for Philistian coinage.

The primary text of Chapter 4 serves to introduce the impressive typological catalogue assembled by the authors, who should be congratulated for their restraint in limiting the attribution of coins to specific cities to those with toponyms inscribed on them. Anepigraphic coins and those bearing inscriptions other than city names are all separated from those of the named cities, even when shared types might make attribution to Ashdod, Ashkelon, or Gaza very tempting. This admirable caution is somewhat undermined by the suggestion (modifying an idea of Mildenberg's) that a central mint may have operated in Philistia to provide inscribed coinage for use in particular cities and anonymous issues for intercity use. The evidence adduced for this hypothesis is very slender indeed: a common weight standard, supposed unified die axes (3, 6, 9, and 12 o'clock), and shared iconography. Using these very same criteria, one would have to conclude that the vast majority of the coinage struck in the Seleucid empire was produced at a single central mint, despite the fact that the evidence of control marks, epigraphy, and finds refutes this possibility. The inscriptions also tell against the central mint theory for the Philistian issues. As the authors themselves point out, lapidary Aramaic was preferred for coin inscriptions at Ashdod, Phoenician script at Ashkelon, and no particular preference between these two at Gaza. Surely a central mint would not have employed several different North-West Semitic scripts at once and furthermore taken care to distinguish their use between cities.

The bulk of this chapter is taken up by 106 plates of excellent black and white enlargements (3:1) arranged in Sylloge-style with catalogue descriptions on facing pages. Because of the difficulties involved in classifying the marvellously eclectic coins of Philistia, the catalogue is arranged first by city, then by general style (Athenian-styled or Philistian-styled), and lastly by iconographic themes (i.e., Oriental heads, *bovidae*, etc.). The anonymous issues follow those of the named cities and follow the same principles of arrangement. The photographs are of very high quality and in many cases additional line drawings have been included when the details of the type have been rendered unclear by wear or test-cuts. The sheer variety of unusual types is stunning and will certainly be a boon to both numismatists and students of Near Eastern iconography, particularly since a great many of the coins have never been published before now. Nevertheless, the catalogue, which curiously fails to take advantage of the material that has appeared in commerce, should be supplemented by the list of sale specimens (and some omitted pieces from public collections), which will appear in an article by Wolfgang Fischer-Bossert in SNR 87, 2008. The reasons for this omission are opaque, especially when private collections were very closely studied. Indeed, the vast majority of the corpus for Ashdod resides in the Gil Chaya collection.

A number of Philistian-styled types are worthy of special comment because of the glimpse that they afford us of Philistia as a crossroads of Near Eastern cultures. For example, a bearded figure with grotesque leonine features and the feathered headdress normally associated with the Egyptian god Bes appears with some frequency on issues of Ashdod (II.3 and II.10-11), Gaza (VI.3 and VI.13-14), and several anonymous Philistian series (XIII.14, XVI.23-24, and XVIII.1-8). However,

on these coinages, the traditional form of the god is often modified or he is placed in a distinctly non-Egyptian context. For example, on the II.3 series of Ashdod, Bes has four wings, as on some Phoenician scarabs,[5] yet in Egypt he was normally a wingless deity. Likewise, on the anonymous and Gazaean issues he is wingless, depicted facing and armed with his distinctive knife (*des*) following Egyptian custom. However, he is often poised to strike one or two facing animals, thereby usurping the position normally given to gods, heroes, and Great Kings in the Assyro-Babylonian and Persian artistic tradition. This Bes type is well known from Phoenician, Persian, and other Near Eastern glyptic evidence.[6] These peculiarities of iconography make one wonder whether this is really Egyptian Bes on the Philistian coinage or some local deity who has adopted the iconographic features of Bes, in the same way that Phoenician Ba'alat-Astarte often took on the attributes of Egyptian Isis-Hathor. It has been suggested that in Phoenecia, Bes may have represented the native Eshmun.[7] Thus Philistian Bes may possibly represent an important local god. Like Bes on series II.3, Kronos-El of Byblos reportedly had four wings sprouting from his shoulders (Philo of Byblos, *FGrH* 790 F2) and sometimes wears a feather headdress similar to that of Bes on the autonomous bronze coinage of Byblos in the first century BC.[8] Likewise, Yahweh of Samaria may have been depicted as a Bes-like figure if the controversial inscription on Pithos A from Kuntillet 'Ajrud actually refers to the illustration that accompanies it.[9]

The head of Zeus-Ammon on an anonymous issue (XIII.2) was probably imitated from a fifth-century issue of Cyrene (BMC Cyrenaica 10, no. 42). The same plaited hairstyle found on Cyrenean tetradrachms of 470-440 BC also appears on the Philistian drachm, as do the apparent remains of the KV[PA] legend before the god's face. See also drachm XVI.10 for Zeus-Ammon apparently copied from a different issue of Cyrene from the same period (*BMC* Cyrenaica 11, no. 45). Likewise, some of the janiform head types (II.13, V.3, V.6, XIV.28, XV.4, XVIII.6-7, XIX.19) appear to be derived from the late sixth- and early fifth-century issues of Tenedos (BMC Troas p. 19, no. 2). It is perhaps unnecessary to point out that the imitation of these foreign types also supports the authors' dating of the start of Philistian coinage to the fifth century. It also tends to suggest a relatively early movement away from completely Athenian-styled types towards Philistian-styled types.

5 J. Boardman, Classical Phoenician Scarabs: A Catalogue and Study (Oxford 2003), nos. 22/95-96.

6 Boardman (as n. 5), nos. 22/17-68 and 22/72-73; K. Abdi, Bes in the Achaemenid Empire, Ars Orientalis 29, 1999, pp. 113-140.

7 W. Culican, The Iconography of Some Phoenician Seals and Seal Impressions, *Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology* 1, 1968, pp. 93-98.

8 He actually has six wings on the Hellenistic and Roman issues of Byblos. See, for example, SNG Spaer nos. 1070-1071 and SNG Cop. Phoenicia nos. 135 and 137.

9 W.G. Dever, Asherah, Consort of Yahweh? New Evidence from Kuntillet Ajrud, BASOR 225 (Summer 1984), pp. 21-37; W.A. Emerton, Yahweh and His Asherah: The Goddess or Her Symbol? Vetus Testamentum 49.3 (July 1999), pp. 315-337. It is perhaps no coincidence that Bes is also featured on Samarian coinage. See, Y. Meshorer / S. Qedar, *Samarian Coinage* (Jerusalem 1999), p. 33 and nos. 53-54, 120, 152-153, 158, 198.

Phoenician influence is readily apparent throughout the corpus in the form of the guilloche borders (I.1, II.9, VI.16, XVI.7-8, XVI.25, XVIII.8), types involving raised and incuse (or pseudo-incuse) design elements (XIV.36, XIX.11), fortification types (XV.1-4) and the Tanit symbol (XII.19), which is mistakenly described as Egyptian in the text. A number of types, such as Bes the animal-slayer (mentioned above), the Archaic-style satyr-heads (II.9, VI.15), gorgons (XIII.24, XVIII.3), and even some of the janiform and «elusive motif» heads (XIV.22, XIV.35, XVI.19, XVIII.8, XIX.20) also seem to come to Philistia through the intermediary of Phoenician glyptic art.[10] The Persian (and Assyro-Babylonian) iconographic tradition is also recognizable in the treatment of double-protome bulls and horses (II.1II.16-17, VI.1-12, XIII.17), the occasional depiction of individuals wearing the headgear normally associated with the Great King (XIV.36, XXIII.1, XXV.1), and types featuring Bes as animal-slayer (XVIII. 5-7, XXVIII.5).

Also notable is the decision to bring the controversial British Museum drachm (XVI.25Da) with the types of helmeted head three-quarter r./male deity on wheeled throne, back to the Philistian fold after it had been reattributed from there to Judaea by Sukenik and Mildenberg. The authors make a strong case for a Philistian origin on the basis of style and metrology, but unfortunately are unable to offer a new reading of the Aramaic legend. YHW, YHD, or even YHR still remain paleographical possibilities, although Gitler and Tal clearly prefer YHW as a potential reference to Jewish Yahweh.

Chapter 5 is composed of several brief studies of notable typological, paleographic, metrological, and metallurgical features of the coins. Included among these is a discussion of the so-called «elusive motif» types that appear with remarkable frequency on Philistian coinage and involve the use of secondary types hidden within the main type. Here, the authors put the Philistian «elusive motifs» into context with similar types of Samaria and Lesbos. However, we have some doubts about the profusion of Athenian owls that are reportedly hidden within the bodies of other animals. Comparison with other coins in the Philistian series shows that the supposed eyes of the owl are simply an archaizing treatment of shoulder muscles, while the feathered body is merely a collection of ribs.

The tables of paleographic forms and unidentifiable linear devices, as well as the presentation of four instances of graffiti are important for expanding the corpus of North-West Semitic inscriptions, while the tables documenting the XRF metallurgical analysis shows that Philistian coinage was produced to a high degree of purity. An extensive discussion of weight standards and die axis preference with numerous supporting statistical tables makes a convincing case for a local Philistian standard, probably founded upon a reduced Attic standard with its associated denominations. However, the use of the statistical evidence to argue for the production of Philistian coinage by a central minting authority seems a little misguided, as we have mentioned above.

A summary of the authors' conclusions appears in Chapter 6, which is followed by an appendix on modern forgeries of Philistian coins and an index of type motifs.

[10] Boardman (*supra*, n. 5), nos. 31/1-3 (satyr-heads), 34/1-8 (gorgons), 37/1-33 (janiform and 'elusive motif' heads).

The extensive bibliography will be a great asset to anyone wishing to pursue further study of the Philistian series, while the seventeen black and white plates that conclude the volume show the coins at 1:1 scale.

Despite our reservations about some of the interpretations offered by the authors, there can be very little doubt that *The Coinage of Philistia* represents a landmark in the study of southwestern Levantine coinage in the Achaemenid period, correcting many errors of the past and providing the primary point of departure for all future enquiries into the Philistian series. The extremely high quality of the plates and the lively discussion of the text live up to the pre-press scholarly «marketing» that it received in Calgary three years ago. We only wish that the book had also included a supplementary CD-ROM of the original presentation.

Oliver D. Hoover
The American Numismatic Society
96 Fulton Street
New York, NY 10038 USA
oliver.hoover@sympatico.ca

M. Caccamo Caltabiano, L. Campagna, A. Pinzone (eds.),

Nuove prospettive della ricerca sulla Sicilia del III sec. a.C. Archeologia, Numismatica, Storia. Atti dell'Incontro di Studio (Messina 4-5 luglio 2002) Pelorias 11 (Soveria Mannelli 2004)

Pp. 322 + numerous black and white plates and tables within the text.
No ISBN number. € 70.–

Led by energetic rulers such as Agathocles and Hieron II, and tied to a network of international relations, Sicily was a bastion of Hellenism throughout the 3rd century BC. During its course Syracuse reached the apogee of her power, Carthage lost all her Sicilian possessions, and Rome ultimately gained control of the island that became her first overseas province. This dynamic period of prosperity, artistic achievement, warfare, and pivotal change, is the broad theme of the sixteen essays by historians, archaeologists, and numismatists (comprising the proceedings of a conference held at Messina in 2002) collected in this miscellaneous volume.

Three keynote papers by A. Pinzone (on the Sicilian *socii navales*), N. Bonacasa (on the potential for archaeological research on Hellenistic Sicily), and M. Caccamo Caltabiano (on the methodology and results of recent work on the coinages of Sicily in the 3rd century BC), illustrate this interdisciplinary approach. In Pinzone's view Sicily was not extensively Romanized after the Roman conquest, despite an obligation to provide naval assistance to the Romans incurred by several Sicilian cities in the first two Punic Wars. Bonacasa highlights various seminal contributions to the study of Sicilian town planning, domestic and funerary architecture, and the visual arts between the late 4th and the late 3rd centuries BC, when the island was a recipient and a disseminator of multiple cultural influences, as well as a crucible of artistic activity, at the crossroads of the Mediterranean. Caccamo Caltabiano surveys a slew of numismatic studies (particularly by young scholars trained at the University of Messina, where she teaches), with emphasis on the coinage of Hieron II, the introduction of the *denarius*, and the municipal issues of Henna, which she proposes to date between 217-214 BC.

The rest of the volume is divided into three sections following the same three-pronged line of inquiry. Accordingly, S.N. Consolo Langher traces the evolution of the ideology of royal power and the establishment of a ruler's cult in Sicily from the reign of Agathocles to that of Hieronymus, while R. Marino reviews the historiographic tradition on Pyrrhus' Sicilian expedition. A.M. Prestianni Giallombardo's essay is focused upon the strengthening of city walls and the building of granaries by some cities in central and north-eastern Sicily during the reign of Hieron II, and on this king's generous provisions of grain to Rome. She regards these actions as defensive strategies aimed at protecting the island (and Syracuse in particular) from enemy attack in the face of an impending confrontation between Carthage and Rome. G. Sfameni Gasparro briefly examines the reception of oriental religious influences in eastern Sicily at the end of the 3rd century BC.

Five essays deal with topics of archaeological interest. M. Bell discusses the plan of a peristyle building in the agora of Morgantina, which he proposes to identify as a public bank that may have functioned as the local branch of an otherwise unattested royal bank between c. 250-211 BC. L. Campagna disagrees with Bell about the extent of direct patronage by Hieron II of towns in the periphery of the Syracusan kingdom, such as Morgantina. He focuses instead his analysis upon the architectural complexes at Syracuse (the temple of Zeus Olympios in the agora, and the buildings in the *Neapolis*) which have been ascribed to Hieron II. Campagna suggests that all these monuments were designed to confer legitimacy to the King's autocratic rule and to promote dynastic continuity. Ideological goals, including the desire to be seen as champions of Hellenic identity and civic values, may also have motivated Hieron II and his son Gelon to support Sicilian gymnasia, according to F. Ferruti. C. Parisi Presicce and E.C. Portale link the construction of the largest known sacrificial altar at Syracuse and Hieron's dedications to Olympia and Lyndos to the establishment of a ruler's cult at home and to Hieron's interest in projecting Syracusan power and influence abroad.

Four numismatic studies (all by former students of professor Caccamo Caltabiano) complete the volume. A. Carbè expounds on the iconographic history of the horseman on the reverse of the large bronzes of Hieron II, a coin type which is also found on a bronze issue of Agathocles (310-304 BC). Carbè suggests that Hieron II deliberately chose it to associate the legitimacy of his monarchic rule to that of his predecessor. She also believes that the image of the horseman (which she proposes to identify as Gelon) may have recalled the iconography of the Dioscuri and hinted at the dual reign (beginning c. 227 BC) of Hieron II and his son. B. Carroccio's is the only essay devoted to the coinages of Sicilian cities under Roman rule, which he (following M. Caccamo Caltabiano) dates between the late 3rd and the 2nd centuries BC both on iconographic grounds and because of the presence of value marks.

The last two papers deal with monetary circulation under Hieron II in Bruttium and Sicily. After reviewing the evidence from site finds at Castiglione di Paludi, Crotone, Capo Colonna, Strongoli, Oppido Mamertina, and Locri, D. Castrizio points out that the bronzes with Head of Athena / Hippocamp minted under Dionysius I, and Hieronian bronzes with Head of Kore / IE Butting bull, comprise the largest groups of Syracusan coins that circulated in present-day Calabria. Since the bronzes with R/ IE Butting bull (which Castrizio, following B. Carroccio, dates to the beginning of Hieron II's rule) are found more abundantly in Calabria than in Sicily, he surmises that they were minted to provide pay to Syracusan forces serving with Hieron in Calabria under Pyrrhus, or during the first years of Hieron II's reign. His conclusions are echoed by M. Puglisi, who briefly discusses the activity of the mints operating in Sicily under Hieron II before summarizing the evidence from Sicilian coin hoards and single finds (including both site finds and stray finds) dated between 276-215 BC. Her study shows that, while most hoards are concentrated in central and eastern Sicily and belong to the Second Punic War period, Hieronian bronze issues (especially the litras with Head of Poseidon / Trident) travelled widely across the island. Puglisi believes that these bronzes were essentially a military coinage. Both Castrizio and Puglisi use bar graphs to quantify

the finds of the Syracusan issues which they discuss. Puglisi also illustrates the distribution of Sicilians mints, hoards and finds of single coins from Hieron II's reign in a series of eight maps.

Regrettably, the editors have made no attempt to draw some general inferences from the papers presented in this volume, which would have been more user-friendly if all bibliographical references had been integrated, and if an analytical index had been provided. As a result, one will have to cross-reference several essays and comb through lengthy footnotes for items of interest. Moreover, there is considerable overlapping with essays by the same authors published in the proceedings of previous conferences. Thus, Pinzone's study takes up where he left off in 'La 'romanizzazione' della Sicilia occidentale in età repubblicana',[1] and Bonacasa's essay is an updated version of his essay 'Per una revisione della cultura figurativa ellenistica in Sicilia'.[2] Caccamo Caltabiano's review combines ideas and themes from her 'Identità e peculiarità dell'esperienza monetale siciliana'.[3] S. Consolo Langher also builds her essay on an earlier study on 'Aspetti giuridici del potere regale in Sicilia. Diritto successorio, trasformazioni socio-culturali e agrarie e natura e ruolo della monarchia da Agatocle a Gerone II.[4] Lastly, G. Sfameni Gasparro's thesis on the arrival of oriental cults in Sicily in the 3rd century BC and Sicily's role as the intermediary «fra Oriente e Occidente» reiterates the conclusions of her previous work on 'Le attestazioni dei culti egiziani in Sicilia nei documenti monetali',[5] without addressing the recent criticism of H. Mattingly, Methodology and History in Third Century Sicilian Numismatics.[6]

Much more disappointing, though, is the absence of any contributions from recent scholarship on southern and western Sicily, particularly on the Punic zone. This limits the scope of the book (regardless of its title) to the sphere of Syracusan and specifically Hieronian territorial and political control. For information on the results of archaeological and numismatic investigations on other areas of Sicily, readers will have to consult the reports published in the Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Antike Kunst, the Atti delle giornate internazionali di studi sull'area elima, Kokalos, and Sicilia Archeologica.

1 Atti terze giornate internazionali di studi sull'area elima (Gibellina / Erice / Contessa Entellina, 23-26 ottobre 1997), I (Pisa-Gibellina 2000), pp. 849-878.

2 M. Barra Bagnasco, E. De Miro, A. Pinzone (eds.), Magna Grecia e Sicilia. Stato degli studi e prospettive di ricerca, Atti dell'Incontro di Studi Messina 2-4 dicembre 1996 (Soveria Mannelli 1999), pp. 259-273.

3 Magna Grecia e Sicilia (*supra*, n. 2), esp. pp. 306-310; *Ead.*, Dalla moneta locale alla provinciale? La Sicilia occidentale sotto il dominio romano, in Atti terze giornate internazionali di studi sull'area elima (*supra*), esp. pp. 202-207; *Ead.* – M. Puglisi, La funzione della moneta nella Sicilia antica, in G. Gorini (ed.), Ritrovamenti monetali nel mondo antico: problemi e metodi. Atti del Congresso Internazionale, Padova 31 marzo - 2 aprile 2000 (Monselice 2002), esp. pp. 38-42.

4 Magna Grecia e Sicilia (*supra*, n. 2), pp. 331-349.

5 La Sicilia tra l'Egitto e Roma: la monetazione siracusana dell'età di Ierone II, M. Caccamo Caltabiano, ed., Atti del Seminario Messina 2-4 dicembre 1993 (Messina 1995), pp. 80-149.

6 SNR 79, 2000, pp. 36-41.

However, despite these shortcomings, Nuove prospettive is a collection of essays well worth reading. Its contents encompass some of the key issues with which classical scholars have grappled in the last decade, and provide stimulating insight into one of the most complex centuries in the history of ancient Sicily.

Dr. Paolo Visonà
Dept. of Art
207 Fine Arts Bldg.
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506, USA
Paolo.Visona@uky.edu

Catherine Grandjean

Les Messéniens de 370/369 au 1er siècle de notre ère. Monnayages et histoire

BCH Supplément 44 (2003). xv + 332 p., 28 planches
ISBN 2-86958-193-9. € 100.–

The southwest sector of the Peloponnese, blessed (or perhaps cursed?) with abundant fertile land, had a variegated political history. In the Bronze Age the palace of Pylos flourished. For a long stretch of the Archaic and Classical periods with the inhabitants of Messenia subordinated to the Spartans, she functioned as Laconia's bread basket. Liberated by the Theban Epaminondas in 370/69 BC Messenia became a city-state, but in the precarious Hellenistic world at times subject to Macedon. In 191 BC Messene joined the Achaian Confederacy (but was in revolt 183/2 BC). After the Achaian War of 146 BC Messenia was eventually to be exploited by the Roman settlers.

It is a pleasure to welcome this meticulously researched book by a scholar who is a professional ancient historian as well as a numismatist, a combination which, regrettably, is not always found together. Roebuck, originally, was criticised for limiting his history of Messenia to political history;[1] since t hen the rich epigraphic record has received attention; now Grandjean (p. 2) uses the numismatic evidence to widen the focus.

The first coins of Messene, staters from only one obverse die and one reverse, backed by a tiny issue of triobols (only two obverse and two reverse dies recorded), are an astonishingly potent assertion of the new city-state, in or soon after 370/69 BC, visually as powerful as the new city's spectacular walls. The dating bracket '370/369 – 330 BC' given on pp. 21, 22, 271 is obviously too extensive for such minimal issues.[2] Throughout the book Grandjean's policy of prudent caution in dating issues, especially on historical probabilities, leads her to give far wider dating brackets than the numismatist reader might expect. As has long been noted staters issues at this time of the Achaian Confederacy, Arkadian Confederacy, Tegea, Pheneos and Stymphalos were equally small.[3]

The history of the Messenians before the liberation of 370/69 BC, based largely, but not altogether, on the second century AD account of Pausanias, is complex and controversial and has been much discussed by historians.[4] Grandjean asserts the relevance of the coin types chosen to this debate. The choices of the Demeter head for obverse type and standing Zeus for the reverse are well argued; these remain

1 C.A. Roebuck, A History of Messenia from 369-146 BC (Chicago 1941).

2 But p. 99: «Le témoignage des premières monnaies a l'ethnique des Messéniens (du Péloponnèse), que je date des années 365-361 ….»

3 Achaian Confederacy: 1 obv. die (NC 1902, pp. 324-327, pl. XVI.4); Arkadian Confederacy: 3 obv. dies (D. Gerin, SNR 65, 1986, pp.13-31); Tegea: 1 obv. die (W. Schwabacher, NC 1939, pp. 15-19); Pheneos: 3 obv. dies (S. Schultz, SNR 71, 1992, pp. 47-74).

4 Pp. 49-59. See e.g. N. Luraghi, Becoming Messenian, JHS 122, 2002, pp. 45-69.

the standard types throughout most of the coinage except when replaced by other specific types, e.g. those of the Alexanders or of the Achaian Confederacy.

For the rest of the fourth century Messene produced obols and bronze coins; it may be suspected that as bronze coinage became more familiar in the Peloponnese it supplanted the obols, so that Grandjean's dating bracket for the bronzes, 370/69-330 BC (p. 33) again may perhaps be too generous. Her identification of the bronzes of Série IV as 'chalques' rather than as hemiobols may at first sight seem implausible, since at other mints – Athens, Corinth, Sikyon – the chalcous was of smaller module (c. 2gm). However, as she rightly noted (p. 46): «le mot chalque, qui signifie simplement «bronze», a dû logiquement avoir au début de l'histoire des monnayages de bronze un sens simplement générique.»

The early second century saw a very small issue (*Série* VIII: only one obverse die) of Messenian Attic weight tetradrachms with Alexander types, which are plausibly attributed to the war against Antiochus III (c. 191-188 BC: pp. 109, 226). Next, a smallish issue of Attic weight tetradrachms with Messenian types (*Série* IX) can convincingly be attributed to the Messenian revolt from the Achaian Confederacy of 183/2 (pp. 227, 271).

Série X, however, Zeus head triobols of reduced aiginetic weight (symmachic standard), dated by Grandjean broadly to the second half of the second century – the end of the second third of the first century, is more open to controversy. These civic triobols – most at least, certainly *émissions* δ – μ are part of a large group of federal and concomitant civic Peloponnesian triobols which traditionally were dated to immediately before the Achaian War of 146 BC, but which on account of Christof Boehringer's scrutiny of the Poggio Picenze hoard have been downdated to the first if not to the end of the second century BC.[5] Grandjean discusses this massive shift of coinage and is broadly comfortable with it, if not with all of the historical questions it raises and specifically a Laconian drachm mentioned in a Delian inscription of 162/1 BC.[6]

But what of *Série* X *émission* α? Série X *émissions* β – λ differ noticeably from émission a: whereas on émission a Zeus is laureate and the eye is cut realistically, on émissions b-l Zeus is diademed and his eye is a mere blob. *Émission* α, as Grandjean notes, shares an obverse die with a Messenian Achaian federal triobol in the Agrinion hoard, whose burial can be dated c. 129 BC.[7] The present reviewer believes that the 'Late' silver coinage of the Achaian Confederacy may not have been struck after the Third Macedonian War, and was subsequently followed by the federal

5 CHR. BOEHRINGER, Zur Geschichte der Achäischen Liga im 2. und 1. Jh. v. Chr. im Lichte des Münzfundes von Poggio Picenze (Abruzzen), in: A.D. RIZAKIS (ed.) Achaia und Elis in der Antike, ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ 13 (Athens 1991), pp. 163-169; J. WARREN, The Achaian League Silver Coinage Controversy Resolved: a summary, NC 159, 1999, pp. 99-109.

6 P. 142. Professor H. Mattingly and the present reviewer both feel, however, that a federal triobol of Sparta could be intended (see M. THOMPSON, The Agrinion Hoard, NNM 159 (New York 1968), p. 48, 468); human beings are not always consistent in naming, and anyway the inscription was Delian, not Laconian.

7 See M. THOMPSON, (*op. cit.* n. 6), p. 68-70.

bronze coinage[8] (Messene of course struck both federal silver and federal bronze.) What then of Grandjean's *émission* α, which certainly was struck before 129 BC, since there were two specimens in the Agrinion hoard? Were they perhaps struck at the time of the Third Macedonian War, with Messene, a reluctant member of the Confederacy abandoning the federal monogram, or was the obverse die held over and reused, as it is known that Messene did not take part in the Achaian War (Polybios XXXVIII. 16)?

What then of the considerable *émission* β (22 obverse dies)? Was there a possible chronological gap between *émissions* α and β?

The considerable volume of triobols in the Achaian federal format were struck at the time of Sulla, as it is now generally believed, largely by *poleis* on the coast of the Corinthian Gulf: Patrai, Dyme, Aigion, Aigeira, (also very small issues of Kleitor, Sikyon, and probably Elis),[9] but also astonishingly, Sparta, whose dies were cut by the same engraver who worked at Patrai. There was also a substantial volume of civic issues struck by Sparta, Messene, Korone, Megalopolis, Argos and Sikyon.[10] Of the civic triobols of Sparta,[11] it would appear that substantially fewer were struck before Sparta's triobols in the federal format (i.e. between c. 129 BC, the burial of the Agrinion hoard, and c. 83/2 BC, the Poggio Picenze hoard), than were struck afterwards. To infer, therefore, from the coinage of Sparta between 146 BC, and c. 48 BC, there appears to have been a gap in the production of coins in the second half of the second century BC. May we not suspect that the other quite substantial issues of civic triobols (Messene, Korone, Megalopolis, Argos and Sikyon) may similarly have started towards the beginning of the first century, rather than soon after 146 BC and the dissolution of the Achaian confederacy in its original form, and indeed after 129 BC, as they are not in the Agrinion hoard? Certainly there was no call for coinage for military purposes as there had been in the first half of the second century (until and excepting the triobols in the federal format – Patrai, Sparta, Dyme, etc), and as I have argued elsewhere,[12] the new feature of life in the Peloponnese in the first half of the first century approximately was the arrival of the Roman and Italian *negotiatores*. Yet Price and Crawford have noted the late appearance of denarii in the Peloponnese.[13] That denarii brought by the *negotiatores*

8 J. Warren, The Bronze Coinage of the Achaian Koinon. The Currency of a Federal Ideal (London 2007), pp. 145-149, 165-169, 174-179.

9 See J. Warren in M. Amandry / S. Hurter (eds), Travaux de numismatique greque offerts à George Le Rider (London 1999), pp. 376-377.

10 Art. cit. (n. 9), p. 377.

11 S. Grunauer-von Hoerschelmann, Die Münzprägung der Lakedaimonier, AMuGS VII (Berlin 1978). *Groupe* VIII: triobols (not c. 219-196 BC as there dated) *Séries* 1-8 (excluding Serie 3 which has only one coin) have triobols from the Olympia hoard, but *Séries* 9-25 do not. *Séries* 9-25 can often be seen to have a snake wound round the amphora.

12 Art. cit (n. 9), p. 382.

13 M. Price, Southern Greece, in: A.M. Burnett / M.H. Crawford (eds), The Coinage of the Roman World in the Late Republic. BAR Int. Series 326 (Oxford 1987), p. 99. M.H. Crawford, The Coinage of the Roman World under the Roman Republic. Italy and the Mediterranean Economy (London 1985), p. 116: «Roman coinage hardly circulated in Greece before Sulla…».

(for land purchase, and other financial transactions) were *restruck* as the local coinages, is, certainly, a hypothesis, (and rejected by such as Grandjean, p. 148) but it does go some way to explain the facts. Of the civic triobol issues of Messene two of ΠΟΛΩΝ (*Series* X *émission* ε) were in the Poggio Picenze hoard (burial 86 BC); the other 7 issues as indeed Grandjean arranges them, follow, terminating in that of ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΣ; for that rare issue (*Série* X *émission* μ) the obverse Zeus head is replaced by a female one (Artemis?), whose elongated neck is characteristic of coins of the time of Actium.[14]

The relations of Messene with the small towns of Messenia are interesting, complex, and analysed by Grandjean in detail (pp. 99-105). Korone struck Achaian federal silver triobols (p. 231), and probably much later, in the first century, produced a series of some sixteen numbered triobols (and a very rare bronze hemiobol) (pp. 153-155). Thouria produced three quite rare bronze issues, also probably first century (pp. 222-224) but no Achaian silver or bronze coins. Achaian federal bronze hemiobols were struck by Asine (p. 231), but also by Korone and Kolonides (c. 167 BC?).[15] Mothone, of whom two third century (?) bronze coins are known has not been included in the study.[16]

The study ends with *Série* XVI, hemiobols (/) of the Julio-Claudian period, whose distinctive reverses have a bust of Messene wearing a turreted crown. It is to be regretted that the Severan issues of Messenia, with their wealth of reverse types, and with issues attributed to Messene, Thouria, Asine, Kolone, Mothone, Pylos and Kyparissia, could not be included, as S. Grunauer-von Hoerschelmann's study is not yet completed.[17]

Jennifer Warren
15 Rochester Road
GB-London, NW1 9JH
jennifer.cargillthompson@virgin.net

[14] J. Warren, Towards a Resolution of the Achaian League Silver Coinage Controversy: some observations on methodology, in: M. Price *et al.* (eds), Essays in Honour of Robert Carson and Kenneth Jenkins (London 1993), p. 96. (Note also the late form of sigma.)

[15] J. Warren, op.cit (n. 8), p. 25. Only three and two specimens respectively are known, but it is unlikely that further Messenian mints striking this coinage will appear.

[16] P. 222: SNG Cop. 537, and now also 'Coins of Peloponnesos', The BCD Collection. Auction LHS Numismatics 96, 8-9 May 2006, p. 203, 803.

[17] 'The Severan Emissions of the Peloponnesus, Proceedings of the International Numismatic Convention on Greek Imperials, INJ 6-7, 1982-83, pp. 39-46, pls. 8-9. But see now The BCD Collection (*op. cit.* n. 16), 765, 766 (Messene); 768-774 (Asine); 766, 767 (Kolonides); 791-802 (Kyparissia); 804-813 (Mothone); 814-822 (Pylos); 828-838 (Thouria).

Marguerite Spoerri Butcher

Roman Provincial Coinage vol. VII
De Gordien Ier à Gordien III (238-244 après J.-C.), 1: *Province d'Asie*

British Museum Press (London) and
Bibliothèque Nationale de France (Paris), 2006
324 pp., 6 maps, 67 plates. £ 150.–
ISBN BM Press-978-0-7141-1813-0j
BNF-978-27177-2303-8

The need for a series of comprehensive catalogues of the coinages of the Roman provinces under the Empire has long been obvious, but the sheer quantity and baffling diversity of what used to be called the «Greek Imperials» have defeated all attempts hitherto to provide some equivalent of the works devoted to the Roman imperial coinage «proper» (*BMCRE* [1923-62, Augustus to Balbinus and Pupienus], based primarily on the British Museum collections, and the volumes of *Roman Imperial Coinage* [1923- , currently being updated]). Both *Die Antiken Münzen Nord-Griechenlands* (1898-) and the *Recueil général des monnaies grecques d'Asie Mineure* (1904-) foundered after a few volumes had been published, so that until now anyone working on the provincial coinages has had to hunt for information through dozens of disparate catalogues of collections ranging from Mionnet (1806-) to the *BMC* Greek to the fascicles of *SNG* as they gradually appeared. The Roman Provincial Coinage project (*RPC*) was launched in the 1980s in the hope of meeting this need; vol. I, covering the period from 44 BC to AD 69, was published in 1992,[1] followed in 1999 by vol. II (Vespasian to Domitian).[2] The courageous begetters of the project, Michel Amandry and Andrew Burnett, had to make difficult decisions about coverage, contents, format, etc., not to mention dealing with all the practicalities of publication. As well as acting as Series Editors, they co-authored vol. I and its *Supplement* (with Pere Pau Ripollès) and vol. II (with Ian Carradice). Several further volumes are in preparation: the catalogue part of vol. IV (Antoninus Pius to Commodus) is already available on-line, as is a listing of further addenda and corrigenda to vols I and II.

Vol. VII.1 is thus the third volume of *RPC* to be published, and while in general it follows the pattern set by the first two, it differs from them in several significant respects. First and foremost, it is the work of a single scholar, and Marguerite Spoerri Butcher (MSB) deserves unstinting praise for tackling on her own the daunting task of marshalling the vast amount of information presented here and then writing very thoughtful and well-informed commentaries both on the coinages of the individual cities in the catalogue and on the general topics covered in the Étude historique. It is an extraordinary achievement which should not be

1 A. Burnett / M. Amandry / P.P. Ripollès, Roman Provincial Coinage I; From the Death of Caesar to the Death of Vitellius, 44 BC – AD 69 (London/Paris 1992).

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

obscured by the criticisms offered later in this review – it is in the nature of reviews to focus on what is wrong rather than what is right, and I must stress at the outset that to my mind this is work of the highest possible standard. As will become clear, too, some of my critical remarks relate to aspects of the book over which I suspect that MSB had little control.

Unlike the previous volumes of *RPC*, which covered several decades and the whole of the «Greek» world, vol. VII.1 focuses on the coinage of only six years (238-244) and just one part – albeit a very important part – of the Greek East: the Province of Asia. In practical terms, probably the only sensible way to cope with the abundant third-century material is to divide it up by region, though this has its drawbacks in scholarly terms. In this case, MSB has done an admirable job of setting the Gordianic coinages of the Asian cities in the context of what preceded and followed, as well as what was going on in the adjoining regions of Asia Minor, but as she says herself, it would have been much better if she had been able to refer to other third-century volumes of *RPC*. Her work will obviously facilitate the task of producing those volumes (and also the remainder of vol. VII, apparently not yet allocated).

Although the ultimate aim was to produce another volume of *RPC*, MSB's work started out as a doctoral thesis for the University of Neuchâtel, which has led to other departures from the basic *RPC* model. Most conspicuously, the language is French and the style is rather more discursive (to anglophone eyes) than the terseness (to francophone eyes) of the earlier volumes. In the manner of theses, each topic is examined from every possible angle and much space in the catalogue is devoted to discussion of types and iconography. A major bonus is that in compiling her catalogue MSB has drawn on a far wider range of sources than the 'core collections' that the Series Editors had to choose as the only feasible way of coping with the huge amount of material scattered in public and private hands around the world. She has then analysed this material die-by-die, an enormously painstaking and time-consuming task that was not possible in the earlier volumes of *RPC* and that she has done with rare accuracy. The decision was taken (p. 20) not to illustrate all the *dies* but instead to show *coins* (with both obverse and reverse), and preference was clearly given to illustrating as many reverse *types* as possible (naturally, there were far too many reverse dies), although this meant repeating some obverse dies and omitting others (more on this below). The plates – a mix of conventional photographs of plaster casts and digital images from a variety of sources – are excellent and as legible as can be achieved for bronze coins that often lack sharp relief. One reverse is the wrong way up (Pl. 2 no. 19).

I shall start by discussing the second part of the book (Étude numismatique), since that has a bearing on what I wish to say about the first part (Étude historique).

The Catalogue

In all, 71 cities in the Province of Asia issued coins for Gordian III augustus (only Prymnessus made coins for Gordian I, whose reign lasted 3 weeks; Prymnessus, Hadrianopolis and Miletus made coins for Balbinus, Pupienus and Gordian III

caesar). This is less than half the number striking for Septimius Severus and family at the beginning of the third century (as is clear from a glance at Maps 2 and 3, though Map 2 does not show all the cities in the Province that issued coins in the third century). MSB corrects the erroneous attribution of coinage for Gordian III to a further 18 cities, in particular in the charts in the Index volume to *SNG von Aulock*; some could not be found in the collections where they were alleged to be, others were misread or retooled (see below). She also corrects misreadings (e.g. of magistrates' names in Münsterberg's list).

The cities are arranged by *conventus*, the administrative districts into which the Province of Asia was divided from the Roman Republican period onwards (and perhaps originally under the Attalids). This order was one of the original decisions of the Series Editors and one that I deplore, though I fear that we are now locked into it for all the volumes of *RPC* (the arrangement is also being used for some *SNG* volumes, e.g. Cambridge Lewis, Hunterian). I can see no justification whatsoever for adopting this infuriating arrangement rather than B.V. Head's practice in the *BMC* Greek and *Historia Numorum* of using the traditional «tribal» divisions (Ionia, Lydia, Phrygia, Caria, etc.). For many years, Louis Robert was convinced that the *conventus* was the key to understanding the patterns of coin production and circulation in Asia, but as the Editors admit in discussing the options for the geographical arrangement in *RPC* I (pp. xiv-xvii), even he eventually «more or less abandoned his previous attitude» (p. 366), and they acknowledge themselves that «the conventus does not, however, really seem to be a very helpful explanation for either» (p. xvi). Why, then, have they foisted it on us? Even if Strabo says specifically that the Romans did not use the tribal divisions (XIII.4.12), they clearly had some meaning for the locals (cf. the coin legends that still in the third century distinguish Metropolis ΤΩΝ ΕΝ ΙΟΝΙΑ from Metropolis ΦΡΥΓ, or Sardis calling itself ΑCΙΑC·ΛΥΔΙΑC·ΕΛΛΑΔΟC·Α·ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΙC), and it is increasingly clear that civic coinages were largely a *local* rather than a Roman affair. Furthermore, cities sometimes shifted *conventus* as new districts were created or boundaries were redrawn, and sometimes there is no evidence apart from proximity for assigning a city to a *conventus*, so that a good deal of guesswork is required. Worse still, the *conventus* are not listed in the same order (even allowing for the creation of new ones) in *RPC* VII.1 as in *RPC* I; within the *conventus*, *RPC* I lists the cities according to some notional geographical order whereas in *RPC* VII.1 they are listed in alphabetical order (and although MSB states (p. 19) that «la graphie grecque» has been retained for placenames – hence Kadoi, Kibyra, Kyme, Akrasos – we also have Colophon, Cyzique, Ancyre). And to crown it all, there is no index of placenames: in order to find the entry for a city you can hunt for it either in the table of contents (by *conventus*) or in the «Liste des cités» (again by *conventus*) on pp. 103-4 at the beginning of Catalogue, or on the map of *conventus* (p. 310). After much cursing, I finally compiled my own alphabetical *index locorum* (using Head's latinised spellings) and I strongly urge the publishers to do likewise in the interests of the sanity of future users (cp. the insert supplied with *SNG France* 2, *Cilicie*).

The entries in the catalogue are grouped by emperor/magistrate/size/reverse type, so (e.g.) Gordian, archon A, 40, 35, 30mm; archon B, 35, 30, 22mm; «anonyme» (i.e. no magistrate's name), 20mm, 18mm; then Tranquillina, archon A, 30, 22mm;

archon B, 30, 22mm; «anonyme», 22mm (followed, as necessary, by «pseudo-autonomes» and then by *homonoia* issues by partner city, magistrate and size, see e.g. Smyrna), whereas *RPC* II groups all of one signed issue together, hence for Smyrna, Vespasian: M. Vettius Bolanus: 27mm Vespasian, 22mm Titus, 16mm Thea Rômê; then Italicus *et al.*: 29mm Vespasian, 26mm Vespasian, 23mm Titus, 23mm Domitian, 21mm Titus & Domitian, etc., then the issues for Domitian. I find the latter arrangement clearer than MSB's decision to present the issues only in tabular form in the introduction to each city, after a discussion of the known magistrates and denominations. For Smyrna, this gives (p. 178, modified):

	35mm	**30mm**	**25mm**	**21/22mm**	**19mm**
Pollianus	GIII (*homonoia*)	GIII (*homonoia*)	GIII/ps-a		
G. Iul. Menecles	GIII	GIII (*homonoia*)	GIII/ps-a		
Cl. Rufinus	GIII	T			
M. Aur. Tertius	GIII	ps-a	ps-a		
unsigned			GIII/ps-a	GIII/T	ps-a

One problem is that the entries in the table can become misplaced, computers being what they are, and this has indeed happened on p. 178 (the rows for both Menecles and Tertius had slipped one column to the right – the correct version is given here). Then it is up to the reader laboriously to match the laconic information in the table with the catalogue entries, rather than being able to see each signed issue at a glance in the catalogue, as in *RPC* II.

For every city, at the beginning of each section of the catalogue (Gordian, Tranquillina, «pseudo-autonomous») the obverse dies are listed and numbered (AV1, AV2...) with their legends, types and cross-references to die-numbers in any relevant monograph (e.g. Klose's on Smyrna, MacDonald's on Aphrodisias),[3] plus references to die-links with other cities giving either the reference to Kraft, *System* or noting «Kraft –».[4] The individual numbered entries are then arranged, as just mentioned, by emperor/magistrate/size/reverse type, and for each catalogue entry the reverse dies are listed (legends plus full description of types), followed by the die-combination (e.g. A1/R2) for each example with its weight, diameter and die-axis (or the average weight where several examples have already been published in a standard reference work), and a note of any countermark. Illustrated examples are printed in bold type and the typography in general makes the entries very clear and legible. The amount of work that this represents is breathtaking, yet it has been done with great care and accuracy. It therefore seems churlish to complain about what has not been done, and the remarks that follow are aimed above all at the Series Editors and authors of subsequent volumes.

[3] Smyrna: D.O.A. Klose, Die Münzprägung von Smyrna in der römischen Kaiserzeit, AMuGS 10 (Berlin 1987); Aphrodisias: D. MacDonald, The Coinage of Aphrodisias, RNS Special Publications 23 (London 1992).

[4] K. Kraft, Das System der kaiserzeitlichen Münzprägung in Kleinasien (Berlin 1972).

Ideally, *all* the obverse dies should be illustrated, and it would be helpful if the catalogue number of an example illustrated in the plates (or '–' if there isn't one) were added to the listing of obverse dies; as it is, one has to search through the catalogue to discover whether/where each die is illustrated. Take Ephesus, for example: six of the fifteen 21/22mm obverse dies of Gordian turn out not to be illustrated. It would also be helpful to state the die-number at the 'sharing' city where dies were used to strike the coins of more than one city. Half of the 35 obverse dies of Gordian at Ephesus were also used at other cities (Colophon, Magnesia ad Maeandrum, Metropolis, Neapolis, Nysa, Samos), a fact that is duly noted, but it is left to the reader to work out which of the different Ephesian dies corresponds to which dies elsewhere (the information is in fact provided in MSB's article on the organisation of coin production in *SNR* 85 (2006), of which more anon, but that does not help the user of *RPC* VII). This task is reasonably straightforward if there is a cross-reference to Kraft, but less so where Kraft did not see the die-link with Ephesus, e.g. AV23 die-link with Magnesia ad Maeandrum [AV15] and Metropolis [AV10, Kraft, pl. 18.72], the information in square brackets here is not supplied in *RPC*. (In this instance, by no means unique, the die in question is illustrated for the two other cities but not for Ephesus so that one cannot verify the link. Fortunately, MSB's eye can be trusted, and in fact the die is illustrated in the *SNR* article, but there is no way of knowing that from *RPC* VII.)

It is also tantalising when a coin is discussed but not illustrated. MSB refers to a coin of Germe (no. 132) as having a strange Δ intercalated in the legend (p. 129), yet it is not illustrated. Ehling in his corpus of Germe[5] calls the letter a «Verschreibung» but MSB thinks it is part of the type. Readers might like to judge for themselves (the coin, not illustrated by Ehling, can now be found in *SNG Paris (Mysie)* 999 = P353C).

Inevitably, given a work of this scale and complexity, some slips have crept in and will come to light as the catalogue is used (see Appendix 1 for some examples).

As mentioned above, the catalogue includes some «pseudo-autonomous» coins, i.e. those without imperial portrait on the obverse. This category is always problematic and will be a major headache for *RPC* because of the difficulty of dating the coins precisely unless they happen to be signed by a magistrate or have some idiosyncratic stylistic feature that allows them to be attributed to a specific period; a few can be dated thanks to an obverse die-link with another city where the reverses provide a firm date. MSB has usually included only those coins securely datable to Gordian's reign by a magistrate's signature, plus those attributed in a monograph such as Klose's *Smyrna*, where the author was able to propose dates for the «pseudo-autonomous» coins after having studied all the material. It would have required a superhuman effort to do otherwise, but it does mean that we do not always have a full picture of the coinage of 238-244, especially of the lower denominations.

MSB notes in the catalogue and illustrates a number of «false» coins: either tooled «genuine» coins which she elucidates (such as the coin of Julia Domna of Mytilene retooled as Tranquillina, or of Severus Alexander of Maeonia retooled as

[5] K. Ehling, Die Münzprägung der mysischen Stadt Germe in der römischen Kaiserzeit, Asia Minor Studien 42 (Bonn 2001).

Gordian III) or the notorious cast coins, mainly of Ephesus and Samos, apparently based on genuine originals, which H.-D. Schultz has published.[6]

The indexes – to the catalogue only and not, alas, to the text as well – cover obverse and reverse types, obverse and reverse legends, followed by an «index thématique» (gods and heroes, games, dates, civic titles, magistrates and their functions). There is no index of *homonoia* coins, though there is a map and a list of the cities so linked (p. 40), and none of countermarked coins.

The six maps show (1) the physical relief of the Province with the *conventus* centres, (2) the *conventus* boundaries at the time of Gordian III with all the member cities (but no indication of what is guesswork), (3) the *homonoia* links, plus all the cities that struck coins between 238 and 244 (though this is not stated explicitly), (4) the titles and functions of magistrates known from coins by city, (5) volume of issues for each city based on estimated numbers of obverse dies, (6) Gordian III's route to Persia across Asia Minor. Curiously, Samos is shown joined onto the mainland on Maps 2-4, but the maps are otherwise clear and helpful.

Étude historique

The first part of the book covers the usual range of topics clearly and thoroughly, with copious references to the archaeological, epigraphic and literary evidence as well as the numismatic (the bibliography reflects the breadth of MSB's research). She begins by placing the Province of Asia in its geographical and historical setting before describing the administrative arrangements in the Province, in particular the evidence for the *conventus* and their extent at different periods. Whatever my criticism of using the *conventus* as the basis for arranging catalogues, this is a very valuable summary. MSB does not in fact make any claims for the *conventus* as anything but the framework for the administration of justice, plus arguing that they had «très certainement une importance administrative plus large, incluant des usages fiscaux ou cultuels» (p. 23); she does not allude to the discussion in *RPC* I and the reservations expressed there as to the relevance of the *conventus* for the organisation of coin production.

Next follows an account of the political events of 238 to 244, starting with the attacks on the Empire at the end of Severus Alexander's reign. Curiously, the revival of the (debased) antoninianus by Balbinus and Pupienus is relegated to a footnote (p. 26 n. 40), despite the significance of this event for subsequent monetary history. The emphasis instead is mainly on the military history and the Eastern campaign(s) for which troops and the emperor crossed Asia Minor.

Chapter II, «L'autorité impériale», looks at the obverse types, with a discussion first of the portraits and titulature of the emperors and Tranquillina, then of the «pseudo-autonomous» types. MSB notes that the radiate crown was not used consistently to indicate a particular denomination or double value (as on the Roman imperial *aes*) since it is found on coins of many different sizes. She sees a definitely warlike significance in the types showing Gordian III wearing a cuirass or aegis, holding a shield and/or spear or lance; on such types the emperor often

6 H.-D. Schultz, Fälschungen ephesischer Münzen, MÖNG 35, 1995, pp. 7-14.

wears a radiate crown, as he never does on the imperial coinage, and she suggests that this may be intended to portray him as a «new Helios», a title ascribed to him on inscriptions from Ephesus. There may be some truth in the military connotations of the type with shield, but in most instances I would be reluctant to see in the radiate crown more than a wish to differentiate denominations within an issue, as at Dorylaeum (where, incidentally, none of the reverse types is remotely warlike):

35mm	**30mm**	**23/25mm**	**19mm**
radiate	laureate	radiate	radiate

I am even sceptical about Acmoneia, where MSB (perhaps influenced by Lindner's *Mythos und Identität*, which she cites) dates at least one of the issues to the period of the Persian campaign because of the «attributs prophylactiques». In any case, it should be noted that the 'warlike' obverses are in fact few (bust radiate left, holding shield and spear: Miletopolis AV4, Germe AV15, Sardis AV7, Alia AV1; similar but bust laureate: Saittai AV2; lance over shoulder: Miletopolis AV1, Acmoneia AV1, Hadrianeia AV2 = Germe AV4; add Germe AV7, which Ehling describes as lance over shoulder but MSB does not, presumably reading the hand and lance as a die-break).

I would point out that radiate portraits are extremely rare at any time at Ephesus and Smyrna or at the cities supplied by the «Ephesus» and «Smyrna» workshops, where the denominations were well defined by size and reverse type so that there was less need to differentiate them by obverse design (the exception in this period is Tralles AV3). By contrast, radiate busts (both left- and right-facing) were much used by «Nicaea» from Gordian onwards, hence the instance at Alia (AV1 = Kraft pl. 102.31a).

The discussion of the «pseudo-autonomous» types by category (personifications, gods, and heros or legendary ancestors) is characteristically clear and thorough. (Germe should be added to the list of cities showing their City Tyche on p. 34: Ehling's monograph was published after MSB's cut-off date of 2000, and although she has taken account of it in the catalogue, she understandably has not done so in the text.)

Chapter III, «Le monde des cités», turns to the reverse legends and types: ethnics, titles (e.g. neocorate(s), rank in Asia), *homonoia* linkages, dates, magistrates, (pictorial) countermarks, iconography. Again, the facts and the commentary are laid out with admirable clarity and this could well serve as a model for other third-century volumes of *RPC*, though to my mind the section on *homonoia* linkages belongs better at the end of the chapter. Inevitably, new work has been published since the chapter was written, notably Barbara Burrell's book on neocorates[7] and Howgego and Heuchert's *Coinage and Identity*,[8] which includes Peter Weiss's important paper on magistrates and magistracies. While we await the commentary

7 B. Burrell, Neokoroi: Greek Cities and Roman Emperors (Leiden/Boston 2004).

8 C. Howgego / V. Heuchert / A. Burnett (eds.), Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces (Oxford 2005).

volume of Franke and Nollé's study of *homonoia* coinages,[9] MSB's discussion of the possible reasons behind the issues is especially valuable. She is, as almost always, admirably cautious and nuanced in her interpretations. In particular, having presented the types and probable dates of the issues, she finds little evidence for the hypothesis that the *homonoia* coinages were linked to Gordian's Persian campaign. The section on magistrates is an exhaustive treatment of the formulae (*epi* + genitive, *para* + genitive, etc.) and the functions of those named (summarised in a useful table and shown on Map 4, which brings out the geographical pattern – *strategoi* mainly in the north and west, *grammateis* along the Maeander valley, first archons from Sardis eastwards). MSB notes the three instances of what appear to be boards of *grammateis* at Magnesia ad Maeandrum (12 names plus 3 iterations), Nysa (6) and Tralles (4 + the president); at Magnesia there are many more names than regnal years, but it is not possible to determine from the plentiful die-links how many magistrates acted together there or at Nysa and Tralles, where multiple magistracies were also the norm. MSB avoids the difficulty of how to transliterate the names by giving them in Greek throughout.

The section on pictorial countermarks is not user-friendly because in most cases readers have to discover for themselves the examples on which the countermarks occur (as mentioned, there is no index of countermarked coins) and consult Howgego, *GIC*, to ascertain the date of the latest coin known with each countermark.[10] The most interesting addition is the variant of *GIC* 198 with an M (for Magnesia ad Sipylum) beside the Tyche head on no. 286.1 (not 268.1 as given in n. 174). MSB is mainly concerned with the circulation patterns revealed by the countermarks. The value countermarks are treated separately in Chapter VII on metrology.

The final section of Chapter III focuses mainly on the emperor, war and athletic contests as the three general themes chosen by several Asian cities for their reverse types – most of the types had predominantly local significance and are therefore discussed city-by-city in the catalogue – with a short introduction about other common themes such as foundation myths and the gods who were widely venerated throughout the Province (e.g. Artemis Ephesia), if not the whole Greek world. Note that the coins of Sardis proclaiming the city as first in Asia, Lydia, Greece, etc. (nos. 244-246) show not the Senate (as stated on p. 54) but the City Tyche on the obverse. MSB is laudably cautious about reading too much into the reverse types with imperial and military themes, and she notes that the numismatic evidence underrepresents the full range of civic athletic contests. Aphrodisias was the only city to institute *Gordianeia (Attaleia Capitolia)*, and continued to celebrate the event – at least on its coins – under Philip (MacDonald, *Aphrodisias* R445, omitted by MSB on p. 239), Trajan Decius, Valerian and Gallienus.

9 P.R. Franke / M. Nollé, Die Homonoia-Münzen Kleinasiens und der thrakischen Randgebiete I: Katalog, Saarbrücker Studien zur Archäologie und Alten Geschichte 10 (Saarbrücken 1997).

10 C. Howgego, Greek Imperial Countermarks (*GIC*). Studies in the Provincial Coinage of the Roman Empire, RNS Special Publication 17 (London 1985).

Chapter IV, «Production monétaire», is the least satisfactory part of the book. The second section, on «volume des émissions», goes into detail that is of doubtful value and it is highly regrettable that the third section, on the organisation of production – an investigation of Konrad Kraft's work on the role of ateliers supplying dies (and perhaps coins) to more than one city – has been deliberately omitted; it has now been published instead in *SNR* 85 (2006), pp. 97-128. The reason given («afin de ne pas surcharger outre mesure les planches») seems feeble in view of the fact that the 38 images of obverse dies that make up the two plates in *SNR* could have fitted onto the blank 1 1/2 pages at the end of the *RPC* plates, though admittedly it would have been desirable to illustrate more than this bare minimum. The volume makes frequent reference to Kraft's work, in both text and catalogue, so that the omission is extremely frustrating – all the more so because MSB's article helpfully pulls together material that is scattered through Kraft's book, adds significantly to it and draws interesting conclusions. Ultimate responsibility for this choice lies with the Series Editors and it is to be hoped that they will avoid any similar lacuna in other volumes of *RPC*.

The chapter starts with an overview of how many cities in the Province issued coins for each emperor from Severus Alexander to Claudius II (222-270) in order to set the coinage for Gordian in context and to test the hypothesis that there was a peak of production during his reign. The raw data for reigns other than Gordian's are derived from Leschhorn's Index volume to *SNG von Aulock* and his subsequent article in *PACT* 5 (1981). (It should be noted that not only are these figures now 25 years old, as MSB points out, but for Gordian, she herself has eliminated nine cities from that source alone, i.e. a 10 % overestimate should perhaps be allowed for the other reigns until more refined figures become available. Also, the coinage of Gallienus' sole reign cannot at present be separated from that of the joint reign with Valerian and the combined figure is misleading.) Once the crude totals have been adjusted for length of reign, it transpires that the 73 cities striking between 238 and 244 did not represent a peak, though the figures do not indicate the *scale* of the issues. Before trying to find a means of estimating the total volume, MSB breaks down the same data by *conventus* in order to capture changes in the geographical distribution between 222 and 270; for what it is worth, this reveals the greatest rise to be in the *conventus* of Apameia, i.e. central Phrygia, but once again she is unwilling to see the Persian campaign as the cause of many Phrygian cities making issues after an interval without coinage, given the highly sporadic nature of most provincial coinage. She does not discuss whether this might reflect workshop activity, a topic to which I shall return.

Next, MSB looks at «émissions» for Gordian per city, estimated where possible in terms of magistrates or, if there are no signatures but few dies per denomination, on the assumption that there was just a single issue. The results are set out in Table 5 by city and *conventus*, and by rough date. She observes that there seems to be little correlation between a city's political or economic importance and the frequency of its issues. Almost half the cities struck at least one issue after 241, but she concludes later that this was not related to the Persian campaign.

We then reach the section on «volume des émissions». Quite apart from the debate about whether it is ever worthwhile to estimate coin production statistically

from numbers of dies and surviving examples, the exercise is particularly meaningless for the Roman provincials: bronze coins in a wide variety of modules produced sporadically by individual city mints or workshops. Few Asian cities appear to have struck coins regularly, Ephesus being the one probable exception. Output was determined by factors other than die use or wear – probably above all the quantity of metal allocated for coinage by the city or paid for by a benefactor, the range of images and denominations chosen (plus the budget to pay for dies and/or the availability of competent engravers), perhaps even the marketing skills of the supplying workshop. The fact that obverse dies were commonly used for more than one city indicates that dies were rarely worked very hard.

MSB limits herself to concluding from her calculations that her corpus appears to be a representative sample as regards the obverse dies, less so for the reverse dies because cities tended to opt for a variety of reverse types. Sensibly, she refrains from attempting to calculate production per city from the die figures but she does rank the cities by the estimated numbers of obverse dies used according to the Good formula (also shown on Map 5). Ephesus leads her ranking because of the large issue celebrating *homonoia* with Alexandria. A glance at the (actually recorded) dies and types shows how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make general statements about this material beyond a vague «more dies must reflect larger output» (as she herself remarks at the end of the section, in n. 220).

Ephesus	**35mm**	**30mm**	**21/22mm**	**19mm**	**16/17mm**	total
«civic»						
obv. dies	G5 (∞ 3)	G3 (∞ 2) + T2	G6 (∞ 4)	T1	G3 (∞ 1)	20 (∞ 10)
rev. dies	4	17 + 14	20	1	6	62
rev. types	3	11 + 8	9	1	4	36
homonoia						
obv. dies	G6 (∞ 1)	G3 (∞ 3)	G9 (∞ 4)	–	–	18 (∞ 8)
rev. dies	10	26	15	–	–	51
rev. types	8	8	3	–	–	19

(Not shown: one obverse and one reverse die for the 50mm *homonoia* «medallion») As this table shows, a high proportion of the obverse dies for both the «civic» and *homonoia* issues at Ephesus were used at other cities (indicated by her useful shorthand ∞; only two dies, AV2 and AV26, were used for both «civic» and *homonoia* issues, which appear to be largely separate). For the «civic» issue(s), though roughly the same number of obverse dies was used for each of the three highest denominations, many more reverse dies were used for the 30 and 22mm sizes than for the 35mm, as one might expect if the need for small change was a factor in the decision-making (by this period, the smallest denominations had been abandoned at many cities, though Ephesus continued to strike some into the 250s). For the *homonoia* issue, the pattern is quite different, with many more reverse types and dies for the 35mm size (presumably the most prestigious, apart from the exceptional 50mm) than for the «civic» coinage, the same number of reverse types for the 30mm as for the 35mm, and only 3 reverse types for the (?least prestigious) 22mm. More reverse

dies were employed to strike the 30mm and 22mm denominations than the largest size, just as we have seen for the «civic» coinage, but twice as many dies per type were required for the *homonoia* issues (on average 3 dies per type for the 30mm and 5 per type for the 22mm). Given these differences, do the total figures reveal anything meaningful? I am extremely doubtful.

At Smyrna, four magistrates signed «civic» issues, two of whom also signed *homonoia* issues with eight other cities and with the *koinon* of Asia; in addition, there are «pseudo-autonomous» and unsigned 25mm, 21mm and 19mm dies. The pattern of die use has few similarities with that at Ephesus, even though roughly the same number of obverse dies was used for the «civic» issues (one 35mm die was also used for the *homonoia* with the *koinon* of Asia, hence G1*). Note the very large number of reverse dies (again, the table shows known, not estimated, dies).

Smyrna	**35mm**	**30mm**	**25mm**	**21/22mm**	**19mm**	total
«civic»						
obv. dies	G3 (∞ 2)	T1 (∞ 1) + ps-a 1	G1 + ps-a 5 (∞ 3)	G4 (∞ 2) + T5 (∞ 1)	ps-a 3	23 (∞ 9)
rev. dies	8	4 + 2	9 + 37	8 + 24	16	108
rev. types	5	2 + 1	4 + 10	1 + 1	3	27
homonoia						
obv. dies	G1*	G2	–	–	–	2
rev. dies	1	8	–	–	–	9
rev. types	1	8	–	–	–	9

Much further down the ranking, Sardis (with 10 obverses) appears to score below the small Phrygian cities of Bruzus and Lysias (11 each), which gives a misleading impression of the scale of its output because Sardis produced a wider range of denominations – six, as against four and three respectively – in its two signed issues (the addition of the «pseudo-autonomous» types not included in *RPC*, in italics here, makes little overall difference in this case). With 10 obverse dies used exclusively for the city's coinage and 60 reverse dies, Sardis' output for Gordian is not that different from the «civic» issues at Ephesus.

Sardis	**40mm**	**35mm**	**30mm**	**25mm**	**21/22mm**	**18mm**	total
obv. dies	Tyche 1	G2 (∞ 1)	G1 + T1 (∞ 1)	G4	T1 (∞ 1) + *Mên 2*	*Tyche 1*	13 (∞ 3)
rev. dies	3	2	3 + 2	32	8 + *7*	*3*	60
rev. types	3	2	2 + 2	6	2 + *2*	*2*	21

The chapter should have ended, as in MSB's thesis, with a discussion of the role of ateliers in production. Instead, we are left in suspense. The existence of the workshops was far more relevant to patterns of production in the third century than the *conventus*, as MSB concludes in her article (*SNR*, p. 120), yet we are not told anything about them here. The spotlight on a single short reign offers a splendid opportunity to examine all the material, to identify the geographical

extent of each «Lieferbezirk» and to suggest answers to questions about the way the workshops operated. This MSB has done very intelligently in her article, which I urge everyone to read. There she sets out the obverse die-links, workshop by workshop, clearly in tabular form (by size and obverse type: Gordian, Tranquillina, «pseudo-autonomous») with full cross-references to the die and catalogue numbers in *RPC*. She was naturally unable to illustrate all 563 (!) obverse die-links that she identified and has had to limit herself to a few from the main workshops which were not illustrated in *RPC*. There is also a helpful map showing the geographical extent of the workshops, including stylistic similarities as well as die-links (for example, no actual die-links have been found for «Aphrodisias», though it is obvious that the same engravers, one more competent than the other, supplied the dies for Aphrodisias, Harpasa and Attuda). She concludes that the workshops did not all operate in the same way: some appear responsible for a greater degree of homogeneity in the choice of denominations and reverse types than others.

Only roughly a third of the cities seem to have produced all their own dies, and it is not clear whether the workshops supplied the flans as well as the dies (she does not mention overstrikes, though she notes the use of a centring tool by the «Cyzicus» workshop). My quibbles are few and trivial. It seems improbable that cities should ever have been given only written descriptions of the emperor's appearance (suggested (*SNR*, p. 124) as the reason for the lack of similarity between the portraits of Gordian from «Cyzicus» and «Acmoneia»). Where cities seem to have used dies of the «wrong» size, it is unlikely to have been because they were physically or financially incapable of producing dies of the «right» size (*SNR*, p. 121) – in the case mentioned of the obverse die-link between Acrasus, Stratoniceia Lydiae (both 25mm) and Hypaepa (21/2mm), the reverse dies are of appropriate size (and flans anyway were not always carefully made).

Reference is made to the (unexplained) workshops in Chapter V, on metrology, though MSB chooses to arrange the material according to *conventus* and plays down the role of the workshops – wrongly, in my view. In some cases the area supplied by a workshop and the corresponding *conventus* were roughly coterminous at this period (e.g. «Cyzicus», «Pergamum», «Smyrna», «Ephesus»), so that they reveal much the same picture, whereas the boundaries of the «Sardis» workshop area, for instance, were less stable – cities on the periphery, such as Germe and Thyatira, switched supplier during the third century and their denominations are less obviously connected with their source of dies. MSB uses the example of Thyatira (p. 72) to show that the supplying workshop was not significant since Thyatira did not follow the same pattern of obverse types/denominations as Sardis and Saitta despite being supplied by the same atelier, but there is in fact little difference apart from the «pseudo-autonomous» obverse types of the 30mm:

	Sardis	**Saitta**	**Thyatira**
40mm	ps-a (Tyche)	ps-a (Senate)	ps-a (Senate)
35mm	GIII	GIII	GIII
30mm	GIII/T	T	ps-a (*homonoia*)
25mm	GIII	GIII	GIII
21/22mm	T	T	–

The denominations can be distinguished by diameter rather more readily than by weight, and in my view MSB attaches too much significance to the weights. The averages can hide wide variations – as MSB acknowledges, the coins were struck *al marco* in the first place and suffered varying degrees of wear – and I suspect that what mattered was that a coin was recognisably denomination X rather than Y. After examining the diameters and weights within broad regions, MSB tentatively identifies two systems, a western (the Aegean coast plus the Maeander valley, Sardis and Thyatira) and an eastern (inland Mysia and Caria, Phrygia), set out in Table 7. She cautiously suggests that the eastern flans may have been slightly smaller than the western, and the weights sometimes lower too. Yet even within these «systems» there is considerable variation in the average weights and the choice of denominations struck (from among eleven in the western or nine in the eastern, ranging in diameter from 15mm to 50mm). I am not convinced by this breakdown, and I would have liked to see an analysis by workshop, with the main emphasis on the choice of denominations struck rather than on weights. MSB herself perceives that «Smyrna» and «Ephesus» determined which denominations were made in their areas, and it would have been interesting to see whether the others had a similar influence on the cities they supplied. (Also, what happened at the cities that did not rely on workshops? How far did they align their denominations on their neighbours'?)

The main reason for her «réponse nuancée» to the question of the workshops' influence is the variation in the average weights of coins at cities supplied by the same workshop, e.g. 35mm coins of Cyme (25.72 g) and Temnus (19.52 g), both supplied by «Smyrna». In fact, she has picked the two extremes: the corresponding figures for the other cities whose 35mm coins were die-linked with those of Cyme and Temnus are Magnesia ad Sipylum 24.15 g, Phocaea 22.86 g, Smyrna 22.13 g. A similar spread can be observed for the 30mm (15.55 g at Magnesia to 11.29 g at Cyme), but little difference (10 %) for the lower denominations. Admittedly Temnus comes out bottom almost every time, and I like her point that these variations may suggest that the production of dies was separate from that of flans and coins. Out of curiosity, I checked the range of weights at four cities supplied by «Ephesus» (Colophon, Ephesus, Magnesia ad Maeandrum, Metropolis) and found them consistently much lower than for «Smyrna» for both the 35mm (17.41–19.30 g) and 30mm (9.05–10.56 g), though not for the lower denominations. Is this significant?

The next step after the denominations have been differentiated is to try to attach values to them – a step that MSB prefers not to take, quite understandably in view of the lack of evidence. The only clues that we have for the Province of Asia are the labelled but undated coins of Chios and some value countermarks, mostly applied much later than Gordian's reign. She quotes my own preliminary suggested denominations for Sardis and Smyrna and finds them in general convincing, apart from the smallest (average weight 2.88 g), which I called a half-assarion but which she thinks must be worth more than that because the labelled hemiassarion at Chios in the second century weighed around 2 g and it is unlikely that the weight would have increased when all other weights were declining. This is a valid point, yet I am reluctant to accept the idea of a three-quarter-assarion and would simply reiterate my argument that precise weights mattered less than recognisability, which was often indicated by the types as much as by the size.

I have been foolhardy enough to extend my work on denominations to the whole of Asia Minor in the third century (a publication is imminent), but I share MSB's misgivings about attributing values blindly across the board. There were significant variations from city to city and from region to region, as the data assembled in her Table 8 show, and discretion is required. Nevertheless I believe that it *is* possible to identify the main denominations, though the task is obviously much easier if one can look at the whole of a city's coinage and not just that of a single reign.

MSB does not comment on the very large pieces beyond stating that the 50mm, and perhaps also the 45mm and 40mm, are «certainement à considérer comme des médaillons» (p. 77) «non destinés à la circulation» (p. 80). The term «medallion» is now viewed with disfavour in English since in most cases the large sizes merely extend the top end of the normal range of denominations (as MSB observes) and many show signs of wear suggesting that they did circulate like other coins. Whatever their function, more cities in Asia seem to have produced denominations larger than 35mm for Gordian than for any other emperor (with the possible exception of Caracalla). Why? Or is this just an accident of survival? I had hoped that MSB might offer some answers. Some of the reverse types of these large coins explicitly show the emperor or could be interpreted as alluding to his strength (e.g. Heracles), but many others have no imperial connotations and some even have the Senate or City Tyche rather than Gordian on the obverse. Very puzzling.

The chapter concludes with a table noting the occurrence of value countermarks on coins of the period. The table is arranged, once again, by *conventus* and city, and the information about countermarks is added against the background of selected denominations so that one can see at once that, for instance, at Ephesus the CAP Δ countermark (*GIC* 561) is found on both 35mm and 30mm coins; Γ countermarks occur on both 35mm (*GIC* 776) and 22mm (*GIC* 774) flans; and B (*GIC* 763) and two η̃ countermarks (*GIC* 811, 812), as well as CAP Δ, occur on the 30mm size. The result is confusing rather than enlightening, and the few lines of commentary on p. 90 do not attempt to offer any interpretation. No catalogue references are supplied (and, as already mentioned, there is no index of countermarked coins), so readers have to chase them up for themselves. Four countermarks are accorded «remarques».

(i) *GIC* 560 (CAP Γ) on Bruzus is alleged to be quite unlike the punch illustrated in *GIC* and a footnote sends us to another footnote in the catalogue, which states that Howgego identified the countermark as CAP Δ. The countermarked coin (no. 707.7 = Vienna 30285) is unfortunately not illustrated so that there is no way of judging who is correct. (ii) *GIC* 561 (CAP Δ): the punch found on the 35mm examples of Ephesus is said to be larger than other countermarks of the same type – there is no catalogue reference, but searching revealed n. 573 attached to no. 362, where we learn that all the known examples on 35mm flans are cast pieces, probably all derived from the same model; none of the recorded examples of no. 362 has the countermark. This surely also merited a cross-reference.

(iii) *GIC* 812 (5): MSB identifies an example of this countermark for the first time on a coin of Ephesus, which she says confirms Howgego's suggestion that 812 may have been a variant of 811. Howgego hesitated to include the only example of 812, on Bria, with the 91 examples of 811 because the style of the numeral was

«unparalleled» and because Bria lies «on the edge of the area from which coins were drawn for *cmk* 811». Since there were several styles of 811 and many punches, one would like to be sure that this is indeed the same punch as 812 but the coin is not illustrated (no. 415.4 = Falghera 2125, there read as Γ?). In fact MSB appears to be correct: the numeral is small and neat, as 812. However, *GIC* 811 was probably not Ephesian, even though large numbers of Ephesian coins are known with the countermark, because the value ϟ does not fit the standard there at the time of countermarking. *GIC* 811 and 812 could have been applied almost anywhere north of the Maeander.

Chapter VI examines how far the coinage reflects the two major political events of the period: the revolt of Gordian I and II in 238 and the Persian campaign of Gordian III. On the first point MSB makes the wise general observation that the Roman provincials cannot be taken as a reliable indicator of the recognition of an emperor in a province or region because issues were too sporadic and the accession of a new emperor was not in itself an adequate reason to strike coins. On the second, she summarises the evidence offered by other scholars for Gordian's route across Asia Minor before rehearsing the arguments already presented in earlier chapters and her conclusions, *viz.* that other, purely local factors were far more significant in determining coin types, *homonoia* issues and pattern of output. The whole chapter is a welcome example of how not to push the numismatic evidence too far.

The Conclusion is a very lucid summary of her main findings, ending with a brief discussion of the possible motives for the issues, which mostly appear not to be related to economic, political or commercial considerations.

All in all, this is an impressive piece of work and one for which scholars will be grateful for many years to come.

APPENDIX 1: corrigenda

1. Colophon: there are confusing errors on pp. 189-190 and Plate 30. The coin illustrating no. 348 is not Paris 323 (348.1) but the Berlin example (348.2, illustrated by Milne and by Kraft pl. 17.65); the die-combination is AV2/RV1 (not RV2). AV1 (= Kraft pl. 19.76a-c, the link with Colophon not noted in Kraft) is illustrated by the obverse of no. 350, but it is not the correct photograph of the Winterthur coin, which has the same obverse die (AV2) as 348.2 (see Schulten, March 1990, lot 872); the reverse is correctly shown. Presumably the stray photograph of AV1 is in fact of Paris 323; the reverse (RV2, not RV1) is not illustrated.
2. Metropolis, no. 452: the example illustrated is not 452.2 (AV6/RV1) but the other Boston example, 452.7 (AV9/RV3).
3. Miletus: entries for Aur. Minnion in table of denominations on p. 226 have slipped one space to r.

Ann Johnston
Clare Hall
Herschel Road
Cambridge, CB3 9AL, Great Britain
annjohnston3@tiscali.co.uk

APPENDIX 2: RPC VII.1 Index of cities