

**Zeitschrift:** Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau = Revue suisse de numismatique = Rivista svizzera di numismatica  
**Herausgeber:** Schweizerische Numismatische Gesellschaft  
**Band:** 82 (2003)

**Buchbesprechung:** Some Recent Corpora of Roman Provincial Coins  
**Autor:** Walker, Alan S.

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 03.08.2025

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

*Some Recent Corpora of Roman Provincial Coins*

Holger Komnick

*Die Münzprägung von Nicopolis ad Mestum*

Griechisches Münzwerk. Berlin 2003.

viii + 91 pp., 2 maps, numerous charts, 12 pls. Cloth. € 59.80. ISBN 3-05-003792-X

Eleni G. Papaefthymiou

*Edessa de Macédoine. Etude historique et numismatique*

Bibliothèque de la Société Hellénique de Numismatique 7. Athens 2002.

272 pp., including 3 maps,  
numerous charts and 12 pls. Card covers. € 62. ISBN 960-87457-0-5

Kay Ehling

*Die Münzprägung der mysischen Stadt Germe in der römischen Kaiserzeit*

Asia Minor Studien Band 42, Bonn 2001. xx + 184 pp.,

1 map, 8 figs., 5 pls. Cloth. € 49.

ISBN 3-7749-2994-7

The aim of each of these three recently published books is to provide us with a corpus of the coinage produced by a relatively small Greek city under Roman rule: Nicopolis ad Mestum in Thrace, Edessa in Macedonia and Germe in Mysia. In basic form all three books are quite similar: each contains a discussion of the city's location, history, and remains; each includes a catalogue and die corpus listing all of the coins of the city known to their respective authors, as well as commentaries on chronology, iconography, denominations and circulation patterns; each contains at least one map; the first two have a number of useful charts; and all three illustrate the coins discussed on a number of plates at the end. However, the books are also quite different from each other. The first is a typical numismatic corpus of classical form: a great deal of information is provided in a clear and concise way with no wasted space. The others are rather more prolix, perhaps because they were originally dissertations and their authors presumably could not bear to leave out the kind of information that serves to impress dissertation readers, but is often somewhat superfluous for others. It should also be noted that the first two books were published as volumes within two series devoted to numismatics (*Griechisches Münzwerk* and the *Bibliothèque* of the Hellenic Numismatic Society), and this goes

far to explain why both are so well designed for numismatic use. It is quite likely that one of the reasons why the third volume is so much less successful than the others is that it was published in a series devoted solely to archaeology and history (*Asia Minor Studien*).

As already noted, *H. Komnick's* corpus of the coinage of Nicopolis ad Mestum, a small city founded by Trajan on the right bank of the Nestos (known today, and since Roman times, as the Mestos) river in Thrace, is concise, carefully made and exemplary, though the coinage itself is not particularly exciting.

HK's short introduction provides us with all the necessary geographical, literary, archaeological, epigraphic and numismatic evidence for the city. The only coins known for Nicopolis were struck in the names of Caracalla and Geta (both with the title Augustus) and Julia Domna: by carefully studying the inscriptions, the form of the portraits, and the reverse die links between the two brothers, HK shows that the entire coinage was struck as a single issue in 211, between the death of Septimius Severus in February and the murder of Geta in December.

HK honestly admits that he is unable to provide a single reason why the city should have issued its coinage. A number of scholars see military movements or imperial visits as being the prime reasons why cities struck coins (so that the troops or the imperial entourage would be provided with small change). HK points out that this could not have been the case in Nicopolis in 211 since there were no troop movements at that period, and he rightly dismisses the theory that certain reverse types, which appear at a number of Thracian cities including Nicopolis, refer to actual visits by Caracalla and Geta. More surprisingly, HK comes to the conclusion that purely internal needs cannot be the reason why the city struck coins (i.e., to provide citizens with their own coins to use, rather than just imperial issues and those struck in more important nearby cities). He bases this on the fact that only two coins of Nicopolis have been found there, while all others with known findspots have turned up to the north. However, the idea that in a single year a city would produce a coinage consisting of a fairly large number of relatively minor coins solely for export strikes me as being inherently unlikely. Undoubtedly more extensive excavations at Nicopolis would modify this picture, especially if remains dating to the 3rd century were uncovered since the Bulgarian excavations of the early 1980s, in fact, seem only to have unearthed buildings dating to the late Roman period, beginning in the later 4th century (p. 5). Given the immense changes in the Roman monetary system that occurred in the later 3rd and 4th centuries, one wouldn't really expect to find too many early 3rd century coins in 4th century or later levels (these coins would have almost entirely gone out of circulation by the mid-270s). Thus, their absence from the archaeological record at Nicopolis as presently known cannot be taken to mean that the coins did not circulate there.

HK provides us with concise treatments of the legends on the coins of Nicopolis and of their denominations. Using excellent charts and tables HK shows that only two denominations were produced (he terms them 3 and 4 *assaria* pieces) and that they were meant to be told apart by diameter, rather than weight. The diameters of the lower denomination are a consistent 23 to 24 mm; while the diameters of the higher denomination range from 26 to 32 mm, die links within the group make it clear that they were, in fact, all meant to have the same value.

At present, the circulation pattern of the coinage of Nicopolis is somewhat strange. Of the 51 coins that have known findspots, all, save one from a 3rd-century grave in East Prussia and another from Rumania, come from modern Bulgaria (and almost all of those from north of Nicopolis, as shown in a map on p. 36). As noted above, the fact that only two coins of Nicopolis have actually been found at the city has led HK, probably wrongly, to suggest that the coins were not necessarily meant to circulate there.

HK's longest chapter is devoted to the iconography of the coinage. His discussions of the obverse and reverse depictions are short, to the point and free from unjustified speculations as to their meaning. He sees both the obverse portraits and the reverse figures as being standard iconographic types rather than relating to specific events. For example, his careful analysis of the left-facing Caracalla bust with spear and shield proves that it has nothing to do with the eastern expedition of 213 (as has been suggested by others) and is more likely related to the supposed dynastic connection with Marcus Aurelius. Many of the 31 reverse types (including minor variants, there are only 17 substantive types) are paralleled by those found at other Thracian cities during the Severan period, though, as the very useful table (pp. 49-52) comparing the types of Nicopolis with those of Augusta Traiana, Hadrianopolis, Pautalia, Philippopolis, Serdica, Traianopolis and Topirus shows, three minor variants are found nowhere else.

For his catalogue HK has divided the 237 coins known to him into 84 different types, struck from 18 obverses and 71 reverses (the discrepancy between the 79 reverse dies listed in the table on p. 47 and the 71 here comes from the fact that eight reverses were shared by Caracalla and Geta). The catalogue is very carefully done and includes notes on a considerable number of coins known from rubbings kept in the archives of the *Griechisches Münzwerk* but now no longer verifiable. Virtually every die is illustrated, usually from the best-known example: the plates are somewhat difficult to use since the reverse dies are shown in alphabetical order by type, but once the system is understood it becomes slightly less confusing. The photographs themselves are admirably clear. The catalogue ends with a 17th-century invented forgery in the name of Commodus, a list of coins supposedly from Nicopolis but so briefly published that their types are unknown, and a list of coins previously ascribed to Nicopolis but now known to be from somewhere else. There is a bibliography, a list of collection provenances, a complete list of every legend, and name and subject indices. Misprints seem to be very rare: on p. 60 *Tafel 2 Vs.* is wrongly placed at coin 22.2: it should replace *Tafel 5 Rs.* opposite 23.1.

\* \* \* \* \*

*Eleni G. Papaefthymiou's* corpus of the coinage of the Macedonian city of Edessa was originally her dissertation and this explains her often astonishingly elaborate commentaries on various aspects of the coinage (she tends to make her points so exhaustively as to preclude counter arguments), as well as the far too extensive descriptions of the coins themselves (as that for obverse die D1 of Macrinus on p. 67 – it runs for 14 lines and takes up a ¼ page and could be replaced by *laureate and cuirassed bust of Macrinus to right* with no real loss in clarity).

This book also begins with a comprehensive introduction presenting all the geographical, archaeological and historical evidence for the city (it is important to note that Edessa is not on the site of, nor should it be identified with, Aigai, the ancient royal capital of Macedonia). EGP suggests that the city may have belonged to the Panhellenion (the league of Greek cities founded by Hadrian). There is actually no evidence for this, save for the fact that there was a break in minting activity at Edessa between the reigns of Tiberius and Hadrian, and that the new coinage bore a reverse showing a seated Roma crowned by a personification of Edessa (this reverse became the standard type for virtually all subsequent coinage at Edessa). Hadrian's coinage at Edessa was extremely small (a two assaria piece struck from a single pair of dies, and an assarion known from two die pairs) and the idea that it was somehow commemorative in nature seems far-fetched (and the date ascribed to it, 131/2, is derived from purely circular reasoning).

Coins were issued at Edessa by Augustus, Tiberius, Hadrian, Marcus Aurelius, Septimius Severus (along with Julia Domna, Caracalla and Geta), Caracalla (during his sole reign, along with Julia Domna), Macrinus, Elagabalus (along with Julia Paula), Alexander Severus, Maximinus (along with Maximus), Gordian III (along with Tranquillina), and Philip I. Only a single coin is known that does not bear an imperial portrait. The coins are described in very great detail and all of their dies, each presumably taken from the best-preserved example known to EGP, are illustrated on twelve plates. Most of the photographs are from casts and are clear and usable; however, in a surprising lapse, none of the coins used for the illustrations are noted in the catalogue (or anywhere else)!

In the second part of the book EGP's first chapter contains her numismatic commentaries. She begins with a very exhaustive discussion of all the coins bearing imperial portraits, divided by emperor. In it she has investigated all the die links within the coinage itself, as well as stylistic parallels with imperial and other provincial coinages, so that she has usually been able to divide the coinages of each ruler into chronologically distinct issues, or into specific series or groups within a single issue. In addition, in comparing the coins of Edessa with those of a number of other Macedonian mints (as Thessalonica) EGP has found no evidence of the existence of a central mint producing coins for more than one city (i.e., no obverse dies are known to have been shared between cities). In fact, HK made the same study for Nicopolis and both are convinced that no form of central mint producing coins on contract existed in Macedonia or Thrace.

EGP then proceeds to a long section on iconography: mostly devoted to portraits since the city only used a very small number of reverse types for its coinage, primarily that of Roma crowned by Edessa. All legends are listed and commented upon. In an excellent chapter on metrology the weights and diameters of all the coins of Edessa are summarized and clearly organized on a number of clear charts. EGP identifies the three denominations of coins struck at Edessa as the double assarion, the assarion and the half assarion, and believes, quite rightly, that these denominations continued to be struck throughout the city's numismatic history. She also includes a weight and diameter chart for standard imperial bronze as well as an extensive chart comparing the weights and diameters of what she has identified as 4, 2 1, ½ and ¼ assaria from Edessa, Amphipolis, Cassandreia, Dion, Pella, Phil-

ippi, Stoboi and Thessalonica. This is done reign by reign from Augustus through Gallienus and provides a very useful overview of which cities struck what when.

According to EGP the mint at Edessa was not a permanent establishment, but, rather, was organized on an *ad hoc* basis whenever the city decided to produce the fairly small issues that were its norm. She firmly believes the coins were struck at Edessa from dies made there; and she emphasizes that no central mint or contractor was involved since absolutely no obverse die links between the coinages of different Macedonian cities are known.

The book ends with a detailed discussion of the circulation of the coinage of Edessa (illustrated by charts and a good map). Aside from a few minor exceptions, the coins only circulated within the confines of ancient Macedonia, and they have been found as chance finds, in excavations and in hoards. Of interest is the fact that few pieces were found in the excavations of Edessa itself. Unlike HK, however, EGP rightly suspects that more pieces would be found at Edessa should the area be more extensively excavated.

Once again we have a model corpus, showing how much information can be gleaned from the careful study of a minor mint, whose coinage was both relatively unimportant and of little iconographic interest. The care with which EGP has laid out the denominational system is particularly welcome.

\* \* \* \* \*

Germe was a much more important mint than either Nicopolis or Edessa, boasting a far larger volume of coinage and a wealth of iconographically interesting obverse and reverse types. It is a real pity that *Kay Ehling's* corpus of the city's coinage, a revised version of his dissertation, falls below HK's and EGP's standards. It still provides us with a useful contribution to the monetary history of Roman Asia Minor, but, as we shall see, it is a seriously flawed one.

After a useful bibliography, we have a preface, which, in outlining the scope of the work, contains a particularly ominous announcement on p. xix:

Das Herzstück jeder numismatischen Arbeit bildet der Katalog ... der hier etwas über 860 Münzen verzeichnet. *Leider konnten aus finanziellen Gründen nicht alle, sondern nur die wichtigsten Stempel auf den Tafeln abgebildet werden.* Niemand bedauert dies mehr als der Verfasser. Es sei an dieser Stelle aber daran erinnert, dass bei den alten Berliner Corpora von Gaebler (1906, 1935), Pick (1898, 1910), Regling (1910), Strack (1912) und v. Fritze (1910, 1913) *praktisch sogar nur die wichtigsten Rückseitentypen abgebildet sind.* (additions and italics mine)

Since the whole point of a die corpus is to illustrate all known dies, illustrating only 'the most important' dies is disastrous. Even though modern computer technology has made illustrations ever more inexpensive, the publisher of this book was only able to afford 5 small plates, one map and 8 text figures.<sup>1</sup> In fact, fewer than 10% (88) of the known coins of Germe are illustrated in this *corpus* of the city's coinage! Very surprisingly, nowhere in this book does KE provide the total of

<sup>1</sup> ...And this despite the fact that five prominent German coin firms generously supported the publication through a series of advertisements at the end of this volume.

dies used at Germe, but by my count there were 234 obverses (only 80, or 34%, are illustrated) and 393 reverses (only 87, or 22%, are illustrated): anyone trying to use this book to identify newly discovered coins of Germe by die pair will find it almost impossible to do so.

KE justifies this situation by pointing out that the early Berlin corpora (and others, like Ruzicka's Pautalia, which he does not note) normally only illustrated reverses, and then only one of each type. Quite true, but all of those corpora were published from around 70 to 100 years ago at a time when plates were more expensive than they are today, so that illustrating obverses and variant reverses was considered to be an unnecessary luxury. This is certainly not the case now: all serious corpora produced since World War II, especially those of the *Griechisches Münzwerk*, have included virtually every possible die pair, and this is now the norm everywhere. As, for example, in the two works reviewed above where all 18 obverses and 71 reverses from Nicopolis and all 115 obverses and 230 reverses from Edessa are illustrated. In addition, the coins illustrated in those early corpora, and in more recent ones, are invariably the best-preserved examples known, and the plates themselves are clear and useful.

KE states that he has illustrated all the most important dies, but the user will quickly discover this is not true, since many pieces that would have provided evidence for the author's theories have been omitted. In addition, not only are many of the coins poorly photographed (compare KE's pl. 2, 110.1 with the same piece as illustrated as SNG Paris Mysia, 976), but also many of the coins chosen for illustration are definitely not the best examples known. For example, of the seven existing coins of Germe struck in the name of Plautilla (161-165), only one has been illustrated (163.2, the Munich piece, p. 27, fig. 5), an extremely worn coin. However, five out of the seven, e.g. Bern (163.1 = SNG Righetti 715), are better and allow far more details to be seen. So why the Munich piece?

The remainder of the book is divided into four chapters: an introduction, a long section devoted to the coinage, a summary, and the catalogue.

The introduction reviews the geography of northern Mysia, lists all the ancient testimonia that mention Germe, provides a history of the scholarly controversy over the location of the city (along with KE's very convincing reasons for locating ancient Germe at the modern Turkish town of Gönen). KE is surely correct in departing from Robert's theory that Germe was located at Savatepe, to the south on the route to Pergamon, but the reader will be annoyed to note that a surprising number of the sites discussed by KE, including that of Germe = Gönen itself, do not appear on the map in this book. Since KE often refers to places as being on his map, as «... dass Germe bei Savatepe (nordöstlich von Pergamon) zu lokalisieren sei (Karte 1)» [p. 11], etc., but which are not to be found there, I have the strong suspicion that the map used by KE when he was writing this chapter, and that he refers to as «Karte 1», is not the one that appears in this book.

The second chapter is divided into six parts, all of which deserve comment: denominations, chronology, magistrates, iconography, the so-called 'pseudo-autonomous' types, and findspots.

KE finished his thesis in 1998, and he unfortunately missed seeing Ann Johnston's important article on Provincial denominations, especially those of Asia (it is the printed version of her speech from the Munich colloquium of 1994),<sup>2</sup> which came out late in 1997. In a mere 16 pages she manages to simplify and clarify the general denominational scheme for the coinage of 1st-3rd century Roman Asia. She makes a good case that specific denominations, wherever issued, would be roughly similar in diameter.

In the 2nd and 3rd centuries Germe produced a considerable number of coins of varying denominations, similar to the output of many other cities in northwest Asia Minor. The first issue is of Titus and Domitian, and in his discussion of them KE falls into an error, which clouds his interpretation of all the later denominations of the city. Titus struck coins of three sizes, a large one (KE 32-34, c. 22 mm and 5.6-7 g) with the head of Titus and a seated Apollo, a medium one (KE 35-46, c. 20 mm and 3.6-5.2 g) with the head of Titus and a standing Apollo, and a small one (KE 1-31, c. 17 mm and 2.5-4.6 g) with a head of Titus on the obverse and one of Domitian on the reverse. The coins all form a single series as can be seen by the close stylistic links between all the heads, which not only show they were all produced from dies made in a single atelier, but that they were almost certainly contemporary. KE is tempted by the idea that the smallest denomination was struck under Vespasian; this suggestion has been rightly rejected by the RPC.<sup>3</sup> Their relative sizes and differing reverse types also make it clear that we are dealing with three distinct denominations.<sup>4</sup>

Curiously, specimens of all these types are countermarked with an «S» within a rectangle, and this leads KE into a remarkable trap. C. Howgego identified this mark, which is only found on coins of Germe and must have been struck there, as standing for the denomination *semis* (i.e., a *hemiassarion*).<sup>5</sup> While a reasonable assumption, since «S» can be used as an abbreviation for Semis, it becomes less so when one considers that similar countermarks are only found on Latin language issues from Corinth and Cephallenia,<sup>6</sup> and why they should appear on coins of Germe alone, and from no other city in Asia Minor, is a mystery. RPC II has rejected Howgego's interpretation as well,<sup>7</sup> but KE has embraced it and has decided that all three of these Flavian coins, despite their marked differences in size and weight, were all originally struck as *hemiassaria*. He then uses the size of the largest piece

<sup>2</sup> A. JOHNSTON, Greek Imperial Denominations in the Province of Asia, Numismata 1, Internationales Kolloquium zur kaiserzeitlichen Münzprägung Kleinasien. April 1994, München. Edited by J. NOLLÉ, B. OVERBECK and P. WEISS (Milan 1997), pp. 205-221.

<sup>3</sup> RPC II, p. 145.

<sup>4</sup> The RPC considered the two Apollo reverse types to be the same, but this is certainly incorrect. While there is some overlap in flan diameters between the two types, the weights are clearly different and the dies themselves show a significant difference in size – see the illustrations of RPC 925 and 926, and compare the illustrations of KE 34.1 with 38.1 and 44.1.

<sup>5</sup> C.J. HOWGEGO, Greek Imperial Countermarks (GIC). Studies in the Provincial Coinage of the Roman Empire. RNSSP 17 (London 1985), p. 258, 742.

<sup>6</sup> Corinth, RPC I, 1118; Cephallenia RPC I259-1260 = GIC 743, 745.

<sup>7</sup> RPC II, p. 145: no suggestion is made as to what the «S» stands for.

(for KE a *hemiassarion*) as a sure indication for the denomination of all similarly sized pieces struck in Germe over the next 160 years. This is a serious error because when these three types of Titus from Germe are compared with Johnston's figures for 1st-century issues from Smyrna and Sardes their real values are as follows: 1½ *assaria* (Titus/Seated Apollo), *assarion* (Titus/Standing Apollo) and *hemiassarion* (Titus/Domitian).<sup>8</sup>

After this KE moves on and makes a survey of all the remaining issues from Germe. He divides the coins into groups by size and identifies them, from the smallest to the largest, as Kleinstbronze (*Einer*-1), Kleinbronze (*Eineinhalber*-1½, *Zweier*-2 or *Zweieinhalber*-2½), Mittelbronze (*Dreier*-3 or *Vierer*-4), Grossbronze (*Fünfer*-5 or *Sechser*-6), and Medaillon (*Siebener*-7). He then attempts to give these differently sized coins their proper equivalents in *assaria* and makes the following equivalents: 1 = ¼ *assarion*; 2 = *hemiassarion*; 3 = *assarion*; 4 = *diassarion*; 5 = *tetrassarion*; 6 = *oktassarion*. He seems unwilling to hazard a guess at what the 1½s and the 2½s might be, and rather hesitantly suggests that the Medallions are 16 *assaria* pieces (p. 32).

I believe the term 'medallion' ought to be removed from the vocabulary of every serious scholar working on Roman Provincial coins. Unlike Roman Imperial medallions, which do have a special character, the often very large bronzes (40-50 mm or larger) from the Greek cities of the East are no different from smaller coins, except, of course, that they have more room for more extensive legends and for more elaborate types and portraits. They should, as KE rightly states (p. 32, n. 225), be viewed as high value, prestige coins of a recognized denomination. These large bronzes could easily be the equivalents of quinarii (8 *assaria*), cistophoric drachms (12 *assaria*), denarii (16 *assaria*), or even higher denominations. Only when future RPC volumes provide us with a sufficiently broad overview of the Provincial coinage as a whole will some of these relationships become clear.

Returning to KE's scheme of denominations, he uses a number of mid-3rd-century countermarks, found on eight coins from Germe, as a linchpin for his arrangement: they are B = 2 (3 coins), Γ = 3 (3 coins), and Δ = 4 (2 coins). He assumes that all these countermarks were used to increase the values of the coins on which they were struck (p. 30-31) and tells us that the coins struck with B were originally *assaria*, those with Γ *diassarion*, and those with Δ *triassarion*. Unfortunately for KE, Johnston has made a very good case that the countermarks involved were actually used to reaffirm existing values, rather than to raise or lower them.<sup>9</sup> She has been able to prove this by comparing the weights and diameters of a number of extremely worn coins countermarked at Sardes with the value B ca. 200 (GIC 162: these coins were countermarked to allow them to continue circulating despite being worn virtually flat), with relatively new coins (as Germe KE 270.2 = GIC 559) countermarked there ca. 260 with the same value. The diameters and weights are the same.

In other words, coins, which were 2 *assaria* in the late 2nd century, were still 2 *assaria* in the mid-third. There are later countermarks, dating to the later 260s

<sup>8</sup> JOHNSTON, op. cit., n. 2, p. 218, tables 10-11.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 208ff.

when inflation had become rampant, that clearly do raise values, but only one of those countermarks is found on a coin of Germe (KE 417a = GIC 791a; KE 289.5 is also cited as being GIC 791 but it is actually GIC 561), and it is certainly later than the others since the coin's diameter is unusually small for the value. If we follow Johnston's arrangement for coins from 3rd-century Sardes and Smyrna<sup>10</sup> a number of KE's values have to be revised, and these revisions must, in fact, be valid for the entire coinage of Germe.

For example, Gordian III's coinage at Germe was quite extensive (KE 203-305, 325-329, 413-424) and is representative of earlier issues as well. KE divides the coins into 7 denominations, and in the following chart we can compare his values with Johnston's (the upper values are those of KE, the lower, *italicized*, are Johnston's). Johnston does not discuss the two highest values, and at present I would tentatively suggest that the 8 *assaria* be reduced in value to 6, and that the 'medallion' be rated at 12 *assaria* (I have included two coins within the 8 *assaria* that KE identifies as medallions, KE 308, but their diameters, 38-39 mm, and weights, 21 g, preclude them from being so).

Medallion	8 Assaria	4 Assaria	2 Assaria	Assarion	$\frac{3}{4}$ Assarion	$\frac{1}{2}$ Assarion
[12 <i>Assaria</i> ]	[6 <i>Assaria</i> ]	4 <i>Assaria</i>	3 <i>Assaria</i>	2 <i>Assaria</i>	1½ <i>Assaria</i>	<i>Assarion</i>
41-44 mm	36-40 mm	33-36 mm	27-34 mm	23-27 mm	21-23 mm	17-21 mm
36-48 g	17-27 g	17-20 g	8-16 g	6-10 g	2.7-7.5 g	2.5-4.9 g

Surprisingly, KE has no synoptic charts;<sup>11</sup> thus, anyone wishing to compare the coinages of different periods will have to read through his text and make charts for him or herself. This definitely makes the book harder to use.

KE also has a problem with what may be the most extraordinary issue of Germe's; a unique silver coin of Faustina II (KE 115) struck c. 155 from the dies of what is probably a *hemiassarion* (KE 116 – the illustrations on pl. 2 are not to scale and this makes it difficult to confirm the die link). The coin, which only appeared in 1998, is clearly genuine, but KE sees it as being an unofficial, irregular piece and more or less dismisses it from consideration. This is a major mistake: while the coin surely never formed part of Germe's regular issues, it was certainly officially struck, and the weight tells us precisely what it was. At 2.49 g the coin agrees exactly with the silver 12 *assaria* pieces struck under Nero at Caesarea approximately 100 years earlier,<sup>12</sup> and this is, surely, exactly what the coin of Germe was meant to be as well. This was obviously a very special issue (and probably a very small one as well), but if the very large bronzes, which began to be issued at Germe under the Severans, are, in fact, 12 *assaria* pieces, this small silver coin can be seen as their precursor. It too would have been viewed as a prestige issue, to be used for presentation to visiting dignitaries or for distribution to prominent local citizens.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 210-212.

<sup>11</sup> As, for example, D.O.A. KLOSE, *Die Münzprägung von Smyrna in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, AMuGS X (Berlin 1987), pp. 106ff.

<sup>12</sup> RPC I, 3643.

Turning to chronology, KE believes that military movements were the prime reason for the issuance of coins by Germe. Armies marching to or from the eastern frontier would have had to be provided with change so that they could purchase their daily necessities at markets set up by the cities through which they passed. I think KE is right to emphasize the importance of troop movements and imperial visits for the issuance of provincial coinage, but, as we have seen at Nicopolis ad Mestum, reliance on a single theory for the issues of a city's coinage is misplaced. For example, on p. 35, note 237, he states that festivals and games could not have given rise to issues of coinage at Germe because there are no specifically agonistic types on the coins. True, but there are also very few specifically military types, and I wonder whether events of local importance did play far more of a role in inspiring coinage at Germe than KE believes. As KE says (p. 13ff.), Germe possessed important thermal springs, which attracted visitors from all over Asia and which inspired several of the city's coin types (as those showing Artemis Thermaia, pp. 82-83). Was there no need for Germe to provide an adequate supply of change for the stream of visitors who used those baths?

In addition, when I counted the number of dies used for each issue, I began to wonder how KE could be so sure that such relatively small issues had to be caused by the arrival of military forces. For example, under Hadrian we have a total of 8 obverse and 10 reverse dies in his and Sabina's names, as well as a maximum of 14 obverse and 19 reverse dies used for 'pseudo-autonomous' coins that may be attributed to Hadrian (they could, however, also be either Trajanic or early Antonine). All those coins are small denominations. Do we really need an army for such a small group? At Nicopolis we had 18 obverse and 71 reverse dies used in less than a year with no sign of any military activity whatsoever.

I would think that forthcoming RPC volumes covering the Provincial coinages of the 2nd and 3rd centuries will provide the essential overview that will allow us to see if the military connection really is as strong as KE suggests.

KE then discusses the magistrates who signed so many coins at Germe (he rightly points out that unsigned issues tend to be of smaller module, so that a lack of space is the primary cause for the lack of a name, rather than any administrative reason). One curious factor at Germe is the appearance of both the titles *strategos* and *archon* on the coins. This has led to no little discussion in the past, but KE's interpretation, that the first term was used to identify the chief magistrate, while the second had become a term indicative of the magistracy in general, is surely correct. KE's discussion of prosopography is useful and informative as well. Table 5, p. 63, provides what initially appears to be a complete list of all the magistrates' names, in all their variants as they appear on the coinage. In fact this list is incomplete, and several of the legends given here are not the same as those recorded in the catalogue. For example, in the list Hermolaos appears as ΕΠΙ ΕΡΜΟΛΑΟΥ ΑΡΧ ΤΟ Β but in the catalogue, and as far as the illustration tells us, on the coins, solely as ΕΠΙ ΕΡΜΟΛΑΟΥ ΤΟ; in the list Glykon turns up on coins of Septimius Severus, Julia Domna and Caracalla as ΕΠΙ ΓΛΥΚΩΝΟC, ΕΠΙ CΤΡ ΓΛΥΚΩΝΟC Β and ΕΠΙ CΤΡΑ ΓΛΥΚΩΝΟC Β, but in the catalogue we also have ΕΠΙ CΤΡΑΘ-ΓΟΥ ΓΛΥΚΩΝΟC Β recorded for 157, and not recorded, but fully visible in the photograph, for 145; and we also have the unlisted CΤΡ ΓΛΥΚΩΝΟC under Julia

Domna (and is the ΕΠΙ ΙΟΥΛ ΓΛΥΚΩ ΤΡΑΡΑ ΤΟ Β who appears on 338 someone else?). The proposed dates for all the magistrates are given in table 6, p. 64: Capito's second magistracy (c. 200) has been left out.

More seriously, KE has actually missed a magistrate of Commodus, one whose name has been known since the early 19th century. In Münsterberg's classic compendium of magistrates' names<sup>13</sup> we find, taken from Mionnet, a certain ΕΠΙ ΤΡΑΡΑ ΑΥΡΗ ΑΙΟΛΑ. I assumed that KE omitted him as simply being a misreading (though there is no note about it), but, unfortunately, it is not a misreading. While KE terms the reverse legend of his 132 (the Mionnet coin = Paris 336 = SNG Paris 979) «... nur teilweise lesbar», the reading is, in fact, quite clear in the plates of SNG Paris. There the legend is given as ΕΠΙ ΤΡΑΡΑ ΑΥΡΗ ΑΙΟΛΑ (presumably an L. Aurelius Iollas). In any event, he's not Hermolaos or Capito, the two other known magistrates of Commodus.

KE's very long section on the coin types of Germe is well done (his identification of the type of the three clothed nymphs as an indication of the city's Thracian origin is particularly convincing), but it is severely marred by the annoying fact that most of the coins he discusses are not illustrated. This is a pity because so much of what he has to say is quite intriguing. A perfect example of how his discussion is crippled by lack of illustrative material is his excursus on the Apollo Marsyas group (pp. 75-81). While a coin bearing the group is actually illustrated (156.3, fig. 6 on p. 27), none of the existing sculptural types is.<sup>14</sup> In any case, presenting a carefully thought out discussion on ancient sculpture in a book on a city's coinage is all very well, but I would certainly suggest that KE publish an expanded version, with illustrations, elsewhere in a publication, which the art historians whom it would interest most might see.

KE then provides a very good discussion about the 'pseudo-autonomous' coins of Germe, (i.e., those which do not bear imperial portraits – his lists of parallels are impressive and informative), and, finally, a short section on findspots (unfortunately, known findspots are few and tell us little). This is followed by a short summary in chapter three.

Chapter four is the heart of this study, the catalogue of all the coins of Germe known to KE. It begins with a list showing the sources of all the coins in KE's corpus: public and private collections, photo archives and commercial catalogues. I think he was very brave, and right, to identify the three public collections, which charge so much for photographs that their coins could not be included. He also notes that three museums did not answer his requests for information, and that nine were checked but had no coins of Germe.

<sup>13</sup> R. MÜNSTERBERG, *Die Beamtennamen auf den griechischen Münzen*. Four parts (originally ex NZ 1911, 1912, 1914 and 1927) reprinted in one (Hildesheim 1973). See p. 136 for Germe, listed under Lydia. The citation is taken from Mionnet II, 555 and the coin was then, and is now, in Paris.

<sup>14</sup> It should be noted that his theory of the propagandistic use of Pergamene sculpture will strike some readers as being highly speculative, based, as it is, on almost totally circular reasoning.

His collection bibliography is quite extensive but there are omissions. Not mentioned under private collections (those not in auction catalogues) is the collection of Sir Hermann Weber (though the coins appear in the catalogue and the publication turns up in his main bibliography) and he seems not to have known about Martini and Vismara's catalogue of the Winsemann Falghera collection.<sup>15</sup> That collection includes the following: Titus & Domitian, 605-606 (as KE 1ff.); Trajan, 686 (as KE 47), 682 (as KE 52) and 683-685 (as KE 57ff.); Crispina, 1167 (as KE 136ff.); and pseudo-autonomous, 2803-2807 (as KE 343ff.). KE lacks the most important of all sales of Roman Provincial coins from the USA, Waddell Auction 1, 9 Dec. 1982: the two pieces there, lots 130-131 are, respectively, as KE 331-334 and 142. In addition, Peus 366, containing the Burstein collection, unfortunately came out too late for KE to be able to include the pieces within it; they are: 574 (= KE 122.2?); 575 (as KE 180); 576 (as KE 240); and 577 (as KE 290).

The only Jacob Hirsch catalogue in KE's bibliography is one of the most important sales of the 20th century, XIII of 1905, which contained the collection of the Greek archaeologist A. Rhousopoulos, presented as «eines bekannten Archäologen». Unfortunately, KE ascribes it to *Consul Weber* (actually Hirsch XXI of 1908). This is not a mere typographical error: throughout the catalogue all the Rhousopoulos coins are ascribed to Consul Weber, while all the Consul Weber coins are correctly cited (though the catalogue is missing from his bibliography; it also should be noted that a number of coins are ascribed to 'a' Weber collection, but whether to Sir Hermann or Consul Eduard is unclear).

KE writes, pp. 117-118, that the coins are organized by emperor; then, if they have them, by magistrate's name (presumably in the chronological order he has developed for the magistrates in table 6, p. 64); then by denomination in descending order. In fact, this does not seem always to be the case: the catalogue of the coins of Antoninus Pius begins with issues of S. Iulius Faustus (c. 155) and ends with a magistrate who signs with a *delta* monogram (no date suggested for him but, on p. 63, he appears before Faustus in table 5). Under the coins ascribed to M. Aurelius Caesar, however, the *delta* monogramist comes first, before Aelius Marcianus (c. 139-155) and Faustus.

It is really a pity that KE did not take the RPC as his model for the organization of his catalogue. The fact that so many coins from Germe bear magistrates' names, and those without names can so often be related stylistically with those that do, would have allowed him to arrange the coins by issues rather than by ruler, had he so wished. We would thus have had an immediate and clear overview of each issue: for example, coins signed by Faustus c. 155 are not found in one place but, rather, as 86 for Pius; as 96-97 for M. Aurelius Caesar; as 111, 115-117 for Faustina II; and as 335-336, 339-340 and 342 ('pseudo-autonomous'). With a chart putting all the coins signed by each magistrate in order, along with those unsigned pieces, which could be attributed by style or fabric to the same group, we would easily be able to see how different members of the imperial family were used on different denomi-

<sup>15</sup> R. MARTINI and N. VISMARA, *Glaux 8. Monetazione provinciale romana II, Collezione Winsemann Falghera* (Milan 1992).

nations and we would also be able to easily compare the various issues. But then KE does not use charts and we have to do this for ourselves.

Admittedly putting the coinage in order by issues is very hard to do with the 'pseudo-autonomous' coins, which lack imperial portraits, and KE has divided them into a bewildering number of often very narrowly bordered chronological groups. For example, for the 2nd century we have the following rubrics (other than those signed by magistrates): Trajanic/Antonine, Antonine, Late Antonine, Late Antonine/Severan, 2nd century, late 2nd century, and 2nd/3rd century. Surely most of these could be placed as parts of various signed issues. Even if they were wrongly placed they would not be far wrong. Hopefully the writers of forthcoming RPC volumes will sort this out.

KE invested a great amount of work and time into this book, but the result is far short of what it could have been. The lack of illustrations is disastrous, though the blame for this should probably be laid at the door of the publishers of *Asia Minor Studien*, who are presumably unaware of the importance of full illustrations for a numismatic study (this is the first primarily numismatic study they have published, and it does not augur well for the future). The lack of any convenient synoptic charts to provide the reader with a clear picture of the progression of issues, their denominations, and the types depicted on them, is in no way 'user-friendly', and is highly unexpected. The lack of a map showing the location of the city is incomprehensible.

In short, despite a great deal of useful information on the city and coinage of Germe, this book is disappointing; even more so when compared to the other two books under review. I doubt that any members of its intended audience, whether numismatists, art historians or archaeologists, will find it particularly satisfying.

Dr. Alan S. Walker  
Leu Numismatics  
CH-8001 Zürich