

Die Münzprägung von Pharsalos [Stella Lavva]

Autor(en): **Lorber, Catharine C.**

Objektyp: **BookReview**

Zeitschrift: **Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau = Revue suisse de numismatique = Rivista svizzera di numismatica**

Band (Jahr): **82 (2003)**

PDF erstellt am: **21.09.2024**

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

Stella Lavva

Die Münzprägung von Pharsalos

Saarbrücker Studien zur Archäologie und alten Geschichte 14

(Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag, 2001).

xix + 254 pp., 29 pl., indices, diagrams of die links

Stella Lavva's monograph on Pharsalian coinage began as a doctoral dissertation. A foreword by Peter Robert Franke informs us that it was submitted in 1993 to the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of the Saarland, but that financial problems at the university press delayed its publication until 2001 and obliged Lavva to shorten her manuscript substantially.

The work now presented is overwhelmingly art historical in its approach. This is not inappropriate, for the coinage of Pharsalus at its best is exquisite, and overall it is aesthetically interesting. Nevertheless, many numismatists will be frustrated that so much space is devoted to lengthy art historical discussions of marginal or dubious relevance, while the hoard evidence receives short shift, and other common numismatic analyses, such as metrological tables and estimates of missing dies, are omitted altogether.

Lavva's catalogue divides the coinage of Pharsalus into two series. Series A comprises hemidrachms, obols, and hemiobols with a horse head reverse. (One obol, no. 23, has a rider reverse, but it is known from a single example, apparently quite worn, so that it is impossible to confirm the obverse die link from the plate.) Series B is broadly inclusive, comprising drachms with a horseman reverse (again, there is one exception, no. 78, a drachm with a horse forepart); associated hemidrachms and obols with a horse head reverse; an isolated emission of trihemiobols; and bronzes in three denominations. All silver of Series B bears letters or letter combinations on the obverse, and sometimes on the reverse. Letters and letter combinations also appear on some of the bronzes.

In her first chapter Lavva surveys the literature on Pharsalus and reviews the archaeological excavations at the city. She attempts to reconstruct Pharsalian history down to the involvement of Philip of Macedon in Thessalian affairs, based primarily on the prosopography of the city's leading men. Lavva claims that the coinage is a valuable supplementary source that can free us from the traditional scheme of dynastic history and can strengthen our understanding of economic and social life. Her analyses, however, do not live up to these promises. She associates a stylistic break in the early coinage (after nos. 1-4) with the fall of the Echekratid dynasty in 457 B.C., and dates the rest of the coinage to the reign of Daochos I, 440-405 B.C. The economic and social understanding provided by the coinage seems limited to the insight that Pharsalus prospered in this latter period. Lavva deduces this from the volume of the coinage, which she believes required the use of two anvils, and from the mint's alleged employment of a number of foreign die engravers.

The second chapter treats the coin types, a head of Athena on the obverse and a horse head, horse forepart, or horseman on the reverse. In the fifth century

these types set the coinage of Pharsalus apart from the other currencies of Thessaly, which were organized in two monetary conventions, a large northern group featuring *taurokathapsia* types, and a southern group featuring a horse forepart and grain kernel. Since the significance of these monetary conventions is unknown, no conclusions can be drawn about the aloofness of Pharsalus. Somewhat more productive is Lavva's attempt to expand on the testimony of the coinage for a cult of Athena at Pharsalus. She traces the development of the Attic helmet from vase paintings and contrasts its essentially symbolic or festive function with that of the Corinthian helmet, which was better suited for actual combat. Representations of Athena on Thessalian coins fall into two groups, those that portray the warlike Athena Itonia, and those that portray the peaceful patroness of cities, Athena Polias. The coin types of Pharsalus, which overwhelmingly show an Attic helmet on the silver, belong to the second category. Lavva cites evidence for cults of Athena Polias at Larissa, Phalanna, Atrax, Thebes in Phthiotis, and the Perrhaebian city of Gonnoi (where the goddess was honored in both her aspects). There are, however, no epigraphic or other remains attesting to a cult of Athena at Pharsalus, apart from the coinage itself.

Lavva's study of the artistic aspects of Pharsalian coin types focusses primarily on the various figural appliqués that appear on Athena's helmet. Most of these Lavva derives from prototypes in South Italian or Sicilian coinage. The exception is the three coiled serpents on the earliest dies (V1-V5), a motif that occurs nowhere else on Greek coinage. Lavva sees the serpents as an allusion to Echidna, the mother of Skylla, and thus considers them a link to the Athena Skyletria variant; citing the quality of the dies, she tentatively attributes them to engravers from South Italy or Sicily. Two Pharsalian obverse types, a profile head of Athena with a griffin ornament on her helmet and the head of Athena in three-quarter view with triple-crested helmet, occur in Cilicia as well as in Magna Graecia, and Lavva suggests that Pharsalus played a role in their transmission from the west (despite a thorough lack of evidence that Thessalian coins ever travelled to Cilicia). In all this discussion the comparisons are only to other coins, though a later section claims the Phidian cult statue of Athena Parthenos as the ultimate prototype. Here Lavva's exposition has an old-fashioned flavor, due to her reliance on the work of Poole, Furtwängler, and Lermann.¹ It is a pity she did not consult the invaluable LIMC for a broader and more current view of the iconography of Athena.

Lavva has far less to say about the reverse types. She does illuminate a reverse variant of the bronze coinage that shows the rider accompanied by a boy. She interprets this design in light of Pausanias 10.13.5, which describes a nearly lifesize votive offering of the Pharsalians at Delphi, showing Achilles on his horse, followed by Patroklos.

Chapter III examines some of the evidence for the chronology of Pharsalian coinage. Lavva first discusses a presumptive chronology derived from general nu-

¹ R.S. POOLE, NC 1883, pp. 269-277; A. FURTWÄNGLER, *Meisterwerke der griechischen Plastik* (Leipzig 1893); W. LERMANN, *Athenatypen auf griechischen Münzen* (Munich 1900).

mismatic works, most of which place her Series A between 479 and 400 BC, and her Series B between 400 and 344. The artistic argument supporting this chronology is that the Thurian and Heracleian prototypes for the drachms must be dated no earlier than 425/420 BC. Lavva extracts meager chronological indicators from the few Pharsalian coins found in excavations. She reviews just five coin hoards reported to contain issues of Pharsalus – IGCH 45, 49, 111, 116, 182 (but not IGCH 304) – and denigrates their value because they did not come from controlled archaeological excavations. Lavva records three countermarks that occur on Pharsalian coins and argues that one of them, a Boeotian shield, was applied in 368 by Pelopidas. Since she mentions a host coin in mint state, the reader gains the impression that the host coin, a drachm of Series B with the letters TH above MI on the obverse, should be dated only shortly before 368. This conclusion may not be warranted, however; it is a little difficult to accept a military origin for a countermark that is known in only two examples.

Ultimately, in Chapters IV and IX, Lavva endorses a higher chronology. She accepts uncritically an hypothesis put forward by E. Babelon (unaccountably confused with J. Babelon on p. 54). Babelon argued that the retrograde legend TEΛEΦANTO on a reverse die (R58) of Pharsalus is the signature of Telephanes Phocaeus, a sculptor mentioned by Pliny the Elder.² According to Pliny, NH 34.68, sculptors who had written treatises on their art (presumably Xenocrates and Antigonus) ranked Telephanes with Polyclitus, Myron, and Pythagoras, and attributed his obscurity to his residence in Thessaly; whereas other sources attributed Telephanes' obscurity to his service at the courts of the Persian kings Xerxes and Darius. Lavva follows Babelon in identifying these kings as Xerxes II and Darius II Nothus, thus establishing the *floruit* of Telephanes ca. 424-405/4 BC. Lavva parts company with Babelon when she identifies the letters that appear on many coins of Series B as the signatures of die engravers rather than magistrates. The letters T, TE, and TH are all interpreted as the abbreviated signature of Telephanes. Other letters – III, Δ, Θ, and MI – appear below the supposed initials of Telephanes and sometimes separately; these are interpreted as the signatures of apprentices or assisting artists. Still other letters that only appear separately – A, E, Λ, K, and the group AM–N – are also interpreted as die engravers' signatures. The pervasiveness of the alleged signature of Telephanes is offered as proof that the entirety of Series B should be dated ca. 424-405/4 BC. This high chronology cannot easily be reconciled with the dates of the West Greek prototype coins. Lavva's claim that artists from Magna Graecia worked at Pharsalus is perhaps intended to resolve this difficulty.

Lavva's need to support her many suppositions leads her into a number of strange excursus that occupy more than four chapters. She examines the etymology of West Greek artists' names in an attempt to prove that the signature TEΛEΦANTO could not belong to a magistrate. She documents the use of abbreviated names (hardly necessary) and records coin issues where different signatures appear on the obverse and reverse (a very different matter from two artists' signatures on a single die). Chapter VIII seeks to demonstrate that West Greek artists

² *Traité* vol. 4, cols. 275-280.

worked in the Greek homeland by cataloguing instances in which similar letters appear on coins from different regions. There is at least one serious mistake here: Lavva dates tetradrachms of Acanthus bearing the letter Θ after 424 B.C., so that this «artist» can be equated with the Θ who signed at Pharsalus. But the Acanthian tetradrachms in question are of late archaic style. Desneux (whom Lavva cites) dated them before 480 B.C., Price and Waggoner to the 470s B.C.³ Among the other examples are two tetradrachms of the Chalcidian League with artists' signatures, for which Lavva proposes dates even higher than those of Robinson and Clement,⁴ whereas lower chronologies have been advocated by Westermarck and by the reviewer on the basis of hoard evidence.⁵ Of Lavva's six «transregional die cutters», two do not even involve Pharsalus. Only one signature – MI – occurs both at Pharsalus and at a West Greek mint, and the dates assigned by Lavva would indicate that MI worked at Pharsalus before travelling west to Syracuse. Lavva's examples of «transregional die cutters» thus fail to document the movement of artists from Magna Graecia to Pharsalus, and instead (if accepted at face value) should argue more strongly for North Greek artistic influence at Pharsalus.

Lavva's chronology for Series B rests on highly speculative premises. She herself concedes that the majority of art historians have associated Telephanes Phocaeus with the building projects of Darius I (522-486 B.C.), not with Xerxes II and Darius II. But even if Telephanes lived later, his identification with the Telephantos of Pharsalian coinage remains a possibility at best. The pervasiveness of his signature is another disputable point. Babelon, unlike Lavva, insisted on the spelling of ΤΕΛΕΦΑΝΤΟ (*not* ΘΛΕΦΑΝΤΟ) and argued that the letters TH represented a magistrate, whereas T or TE represented the abbreviated signature of the artist.⁶ The association of the letters TH with other letters is consistent with various control systems that have been observed on Greek coinages. In contrast, Lavva's claim that such pairings represent artists' signatures requires us to believe that two engravers collaborated on coin dies, not just on drachm dies, which are small enough, but on tiny hemidrachm dies. This idea is just not credible.

³ J. DESNEUX, *Les tétradrachmes d'Akanthos*, RBN 1949, nos. 48-85, and see the rubric on p. 46; M. PRICE and N. WAGGONER, *Archaic Greek Silver Coinage: The «Asyut» Hoard* (London/Encino 1975), pp. 41-42.

⁴ D.M. ROBINSON and P.A. CLEMENT, *Excavations at Olynthus*, vol. IX: *The Chalcidic Mint and the Excavation Coins Found in 1928-1934* (Baltimore 1938). The tetradrachms in question are Robinson and Clement 14 or 15 (die P15, signed AM) of Group G, dated ca. 412-410 by Robinson and Clement but ca. 430 by Lavva, and a Group N signed by the magistrate Asklepiodoros and KPA, dated ca. 379-376 by Robinson and Clement but 383 by Lavva.

⁵ U. WESTERMARK, *The Coinage of the Chalcidian League Reconsidered*, in: A. DAMS-GAARD-MADSEN *et al.*, eds., *Studies in Ancient History and Numismatics Presented to Rudi Thomsen* (Aarhus 1988), pp. 91-103; C.C. LORBER, *Amphipolis: The Civic Coinage in Silver and Gold* (Los Angeles 1990), pp. 165-175. Westermarck's study implies a date in the 390s B.C. for the Group G tetradrachm and a date in the last years of the league's existence for the Group N tetradrachm. Lorber suggested that the latter coin should be dated to 358 B.C.

⁶ *Traité* 4, cols. 273-275. (I do not understand how Babelon reached this interpretation for the letter T alone.)

To give Lavva her due, the letters on the coins present some problems when interpreted as elements of a control system. The drachms consistently bear letters on their obverse dies, but occasionally also on their reverse dies. Apart from the one die signed ΤΕΛΕΦΑΝΤΟ, the reverse letters (T or TH) seem only to repeat a part of the information on the obverse, so that it is difficult to imagine what their control function might have been. Still, this does not strike me as an insurmountable obstacle to interpreting the obverse letters as controls, and to classifying the coinage accordingly.

Happily, we need not accept Lavva's chronology or her art historical interpretations to benefit from her organization of the numismatic material. Undoubtedly there are mistakes in her catalogue, for die identification in this series can be very tricky. I offer a few corrections below, but readily confess that I made many corrections in my own materials based on Lavva's catalogue.

The overall sequence of Series A, based on stylistic development, is persuasive. This series presents two oddities. The first is its orthographic inconsistency: the early form R appears on nos. 1-15, is replaced by P on nos. 18-21, reappears on nos. 24-32, and permanently disappears only with no. 33. Lavva posits parallel series of different style, struck on two anvils, but her treatment of this point is enormously confusing. On p. 16 she identifies the two series as comprising nos. 5-47 and nos. 48-77; on p. 131 she identifies them as nos. 1-23 and nos. 24-47; but the die diagram on p. 256 shows nos. 24-47 as parallel to nos. 48-77. The second of these arrangements makes sense of the orthography, but it is not entirely plausible because the Athena heads of nos. 24-47, with mostly profile eyes, seem stylistically too advanced to be contemporary with those of nos. 1-23, all with frontal eyes. The second anomaly is the group of apparently hybrid hemidrachms at nos. 49-51. No. 51 revives an earlier obverse die (V14) with a reverse die of later type. According to Lavva, nos. 49 and 50 use an earlier reverse die (R14) in combination with later obverse dies V31 and V32. On the plates the same photo is used in error for the reverse of both coins, and the die it illustrates is not in fact identical to R14. Let us call this die R14A: among other differences, the letter A above the horse's nose has a different shape, and the second A beneath the horse's neck has either been erased or worn away. Lavva's misidentification is insignificant, however, because R14 really was used at this juncture, in addition to a third die of the same exceptional configuration, which we may call R14B.⁷ Lavva characterizes the hybrids as transitional pieces. The evidence, including the change from the archaizing style of nos. 5-47 to the truly classical style of nos. 48-77, instead seems to point to another break in the coinage, like that following cat. nos. 1-4. The hybrids may reflect a hasty resumption of mint activity, speeded by the reuse of older dies. According to

⁷ I have in my possession and expect to publish photos of a hemidrachm from CH IX, 77 that pairs V32 with R14. See also C.C. LORBER, *Thessalian Countermarks*, in: M. AMANDRY and S. HURTER, eds., *Travaux de Numismatique Grecque offerts à Georges Le Rider* (London 1999), pl. 21, 41 and 42. The former of these is a coin from the same die pair as Lavva pl. iii, 49, showing R14A in its original state, with A present in both locations. Pl. 21, 42 illustrates R14B, which is distinguished by a die break between the horse's head and neck.

Lava, die R14 was revived once more for no. 110, the first hemidrachm of Series B. Again she has erred in her die identification, but without important consequences: this is not R14, but R14B.⁸

The drachms and hemidrachms of Series B.I have letters on every obverse die, but the size of the letters and their position behind Athena's neck make it difficult to read them except on very well preserved specimens with favorable centering. I offer a few corrections, all but the last based on my photographic records of Thesalian hoards. V41 probably has TH above III rather than simply TH. I can confirm TH above III on V42 and V43, where Lava only suspected the lower letters. V46 definitely has TH above III rather than simply TH. V61 has TIII, not III. The reverse die R41 has a letter T (possibly followed by H) in the exergue. One hemidrachm obverse die bears the letters TH above Θ; I believe it is V66, but the examples illustrated in Lava's plates are too worn to permit a positive die identification. V71, whose catalogue description is ambiguous, has a letter T above the Θ. The catalogue description of V74 does not mention a letter, but the illustrated example on pl. viii shows a letter A behind the neckpiece of the helmet. After these corrections, it is probably useful to recapitulate the known varieties of Series B.I drachms and hemidrachms and to give some indication of the relative sizes of the various issues.

Drachms

TH on obv., AM – N on rev. (1 obverse die)	V 40
TH above III (11 obverse dies)	V41-V46, V48-V51
TH (1 obverse die)	V47
T above III (1 obverse die)	V52
TIII (1 obverse die)	V61
TH above Δ (1 obverse die)	V65
T above Θ (1 obverse die)	V68
TH above MI (2 obverse dies)	V 72, V73
E (1 obverse die)	V76

Hemidrachms

TH (2 obverse dies)	V53, V54
TH above III (1 obverse die)	V55
T above III (4 obverse dies)	V56-V58, V60
III (2 obverse dies)	V62, V63
TH above Θ (1 obverse die)	V66 (?)
TH above Δ (1 obverse die)	V67
T above Θ (4 obverse dies)	V68-V71
A (2 obverse dies)	V74, V75

⁸ The reverse die of Lava pl. vi, 110 is identical to that of Travaux Le Rider, pl. 21, 42.

It is clear from this listing that the drachm issue marked TH above III was overwhelmingly larger than any other drachm emission and in fact comprised more than half of Pharsalus' entire output of drachms.

Series B.III, a small emission of trihemiobols featuring a three-quarter head of Athena, is grouped with the bronzes for typological reasons and is easily overlooked.

As noted earlier, Pharsalus struck its bronze coinage in three denominations. Lavva does not evince much interest in the monetary aspects of these bronzes, neglecting such topics as metrology and possible face values. Series B.II comprises coins of the middle and small denominations, with a profile head of Athena on the obverse and usually a rider reverse. A few obverse dies of the middle denomination bear the letters T, MI, or K. One issue of the small denomination (Lavva's Series B.II.6) has a horse head reverse instead of the rider and is inscribed with the letter Δ on obverse.

Lavva's Series B.IV comprises large and middle bronzes featuring a three-quarter head of Athena in a triple-crested helmet and a rider reverse. The letters for this group, again found only on a minority of obverse dies, include TE, A, AΔ, and III. Lavva's classification of Series B.IV needs a bit of fine-tuning, for typological variants are not always grouped together: Nos. 339 and 347 intrude dies showing Athena's head three-quarters right into Series B.IV.8 and B.IV.9, which otherwise depict her oriented three-quarters left. In Series B.IV.3 and B.IV.4. reverses with Patroklos alternate with those showing the rider alone.

The catalogue ends with a listing of forgeries, followed by indices of public and private collections, historical figures, die engravers, ancient artists, ethnic and place names, and general topics. The diagrams of die links are arranged on the page so as to illustrate stylistic or other connections between different denominations. These diagrams would have been easier to use had the different denominations and metals been clearly labelled.

Sadly, the plates of *Die Münzprägung von Pharsalus* are unworthy of their subject. Most coins are illustrated from casts, though actual photos and previously half-toned images are interspersed. Essential details are often impossible to make out because of the worn state of some coins, overexposure of the casts, or poor reproduction of the photos. The images are not necessarily 1 : 1, so that a reader perusing the plates could well gain the impression that nos. 111-127, 129, 133-134, 148, 150, and 160-162 are drachms with a horse head reverse, or that nos. 270 and 271 are examples of the middle rather than the large bronze denomination. The deficiencies are not limited to the printing process. Nos. 16 and 17 use the same reverse image, as do nos. 29 and 31 (also nos. 49 and 50, already noted). No. 19 is labelled as from obverse die V12, but the absence of an earring indicates either that the die was misidentified, or that the wrong image was used on the plates. Nos. 46 and 47 are labelled as both from obverse die V29, but the illustrations clearly depict two different obverse dies. No. 81, representing the die combination V41/R49, shows obverse die V42, while the reverse die appears different from R49 as illustrated in nos. 83 and 137. There are places where the numbering on the plates does not match the indications in the catalogue, e.g., for nos. 148-151 and nos. 157-159 the reverse dies are numbered one digit lower on the plates than they are

in the catalogue. The tendency to error, combined with the overall poor quality of the plates, makes it difficult to confirm some of Lavva's key points.

Our normal expectation is that a numismatic die study and corpus will yield results that will stand for a number of years, until the accumulation of new evidence eventually triggers a reassessment. Lavva's analyses do not meet this very high standard. Nevertheless, her collection and presentation of the numismatic material represents an extremely valuable contribution that – with some caution – will allow all of us to study the coinage of Pharsalus, compare it to other Thessalian coinages, and assess its role in history.

Postscript: New Thoughts Inspired by Lavva's Monograph

Lavva's equation of the letters TH, TE, and T as variant signatures of Telephantos obscures a significant pattern. The letters TH appear only on silver coins, the letters TE only on bronze coins (on one obverse die of Series B.IV.1, to be precise). The letter T appears on both metals. On silver it occupies the same positions as the letters TH and clearly functions as an abbreviation for them. On bronzes, however, there is no comparable relation between T and TE: the letter T appears on a different denomination with different types (Series B.II.1), and in a different position. It is therefore far from certain that it represents an abbreviation for TE.

The letters TH (sometimes abbreviated as T) occur on all but one of the nineteen drachm obverse dies, and on twelve of sixteen hemidrachm obverse dies. It is possible that these letters had some special function relating to silver coinage, different from the function of the other letters that appear on these obverse dies. The letters TH or T could not usefully serve to identify different emissions; this must have been the function of the changing letters, usually inscribed below TH or T. The letters TH could be the signature of a principal magistrate who provided a second level of supervision over production of precious metal coinage. Or they could perhaps abbreviate some form of the verb τηρεω (to guard carefully), advertising the vigilance of the mint administration over its silver coinage, or some form of the verb τηκω (to melt or smelt), indicating the stage of the production process overseen by the magistrate signing below.

Several of the letters or letter combinations on the bronze coinage correspond to the lower letters on the obverses of the silver. They do not fall into the same sequence, however. This may not be important if they are die engraver's signatures, as Lavva argues. But if they are controls, their use should probably be contemporary on both metals. Assuming that Lavva's arrangement of the bronze coinage is correct – and it seems plausible to place the profile heads before the frontal heads – the sequence of silver issues should be revised. Those marked TH above MI and TH above Δ belong before the issues control linked to the facing head bronzes. If, as again seems likely, the bronzes with a frontal head showing the raised cheek guards preceded those omitting the cheek guards, then the letter A preceded the letters III. These corrections suggest a near-inversion of Lavva's die sequences for the silver.

The isolated drachm issue no. 163, marked with the letter E, probably belongs near the beginning rather than the end of the drachm coinage; its obverse die, V76, appears to be the work of the same hand as V39, the last hemidrachm die before the introduction of drachms according to Lavva's arrangement. The issues involving the letter Θ are also isolated and probably early: The drachms were struck from two reverse dies (R84 and R85) that were not used for any other emission, and the corrected reading of hemidrachm die V66 creates reverse die links between hemidrachms with the controls TH above Θ and T above Θ, but no linkage to other varieties. On the other hand, the TH above MI issue is reverse die linked to TH drachms by die R55, and TH above Δ drachms are linked to the TH above III drachms by R49. Multiple reverse die links between the drachms marked TH above III and obverse die V47, marked simply TH, establish their close association. These many changes yield the following sequences of emission for drachms and hemidrachms:

Proposed order of drachm emissions


E (1 obverse die)
 TH on obv., AM – N on rev. (1 obverse die)
 T above Θ (1 obverse die)
 TH above MI (2 obverse dies)
 TH above Δ (1 obverse die)
 TH (1 obverse die)
 TH above III (11 obverse dies) – rev. die signed TELEΦANTO in this emission only
 T above III (1 obverse die)
 TIII (1 obverse die)

Proposed order of hemidrachm emissions

TH above Θ (1 obverse die)
 T above Θ (4 obverse dies)
 TH above Δ (1 obverse die)
 A (2 obverse dies)
 TH (2 obverse dies)
 TH above III (1 obverse die)
 T above III (4 obverse dies)
 III (2 obverse dies)

The proposed new sequence for the drachms also reverses the evolution of the reverse type, which initially showed the rider brandishing his lagobolon above his head. The transition to the horseman resting the lagobolon on his shoulder occurs with the emissions marked TH above Δ and TH, each of which employs both types. All subsequent drachms use the less dynamic variant. The pattern of die linkage from the TH emission suggests that the TH above III drachms were struck on two anvils: The main series, employing dies V46 and V48-V61, continued through the

emissions marked T above ΠΠ and TΠΠ. A supplementary series, employing dies V41-V45, was confined to the TH above ΠΠ emission.



Lavva will probably come in for criticism for her neglect of the hoard evidence. But none of the hoards available to her would have established the chronology of her Series B. The hoards listed in IGCH and CH I-VIII all close either too early or too late to be very helpful. There do not seem to be any hoards on record whose closures can be securely dated to the period 425-405 B.C. Hoards that I have studied also fail to give clear indications, but they do at least provide some suggestive patterns. Several hoards noted in CH IX demonstrate that the entire silver coinage of Pharsalus had been produced by the time Larissa's early facing head drachms⁹ came to an end.

- 1) CH IX, 64 contained 28 Larissaeon early facing head drachms of Lorber's Groups 1-4 and 6, but no later coins of Larissa. Also represented were 4 Pharsalian drachms marked T above Θ, TH above MI, and TH above ΠΠ (2); and 2 Pharsalian hemidrachms marked T above Θ and ΠΠ. Estimated date of deposit: c. 370 B.C.

⁹ See C.C. LORBER, *The Early Facing Head Drachms of Thessalian Larissa*, in: H. NILSSON, ed., *Florilegium Numismaticum: Studia in Honorem U. Westermark Edita* (Stockholm 1992), pp. 259-282.

- 2) CH IX, 65 was the source of the 308 Larissaeon early facing head drachms published by Lorber, i.e., Groups 1-7 in their entirety. The hoard contained 20 Pharsalian drachms with the following letters: T above Θ (2), TH above MI (2), T above Δ, TH above III (9), and TIII (3). The component of Pharsalian hemidrachms included the following issues: TH above Θ, T above Θ (5-6), T above III (5), and III (2). Estimated date of deposit: c. 370 B.C. (A group of late facing head drachms was intrusive.)
- 3) CH I, 67 contained 38 Larissaeon early facing head drachms of Lorber's Groups 1-4 and 6-7, as well as 3 Aleuas head drachms and 3 middle facing head drachms with mare and foal reverse. The 8 Pharsalian drachms in the hoard were marked E, T above Θ (2), TH above Δ, TH above III (3), and TIII; also represented were hemidrachms with the letters T above Θ (4) and T above III. Estimated date of deposit: c. 360-355 B.C.

These hoards clearly exclude a date as late as 344, given as the lower limit for Pharsalian silver in many general numismatic works. Of the three hoards, CH IX, 64 is probably the most useful. It contained very little Larissaeon coinage earlier than the 28 early facing head drachms of Larissa – 2 bull wrestler drachms and 3 profile head drachms – and no coinage of Pharsalus earlier than Lavva's Series B. This small hoard thus suggests that Pharsalian silver of Series B was contemporary with the Larissaeon early facing head drachms. The latter have not been dated very precisely, but must precede several other classes of Larissaeon drachms that occur in hoards with later closures, such as CH IX, 77 – bull/horseman, Euainetus-type profile head, middle facing heads, and late facing heads.¹⁰ The first two of these were short-lived issues, but the middle and late facing heads were series that must have occupied some years. Phase L-III (mass coinage) of the late facing head drachms was under production before 348.¹¹ The middle facing head drachms and Phases L-I and L-II of the late facing heads may be assigned, tentatively, to the second quarter of the fourth century. Even allowing for intervals of mint inactivity, it is hard to see how the early facing head drachms could be earlier than the first quarter of the fourth century. As a working hypothesis, I propose the same chronology for the drachms and hemidrachms of Lavva's Series B.

Catharine C. Lorber
 5450 Fenwood Avenue
 Woodland Hills, CA 91367
 USA

¹⁰ For the first two varieties, see F. HERRMANN, *Die Silbermünzen von Larissa in Thessalien*, ZfN 35 (1925), Group VI, pl. vi, 17-18, and Group V, pl. iv, 16. For the facing head varieties, see C.C. LORBER, *A Hoard of Facing Head Larissa Drachms*, SNR 79, 2000, pp. 7-15.

¹¹ LORBER (n. 10), pp. 10-11.