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

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Numismatische Gesellschaft

Band: 83 (2004)

Rubrik: Kommentare zur Literatur über antike Münzen

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: 07.01.2026

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

KOMMENTARE ZUR LITERATUR ÜBER ANTIKE MÜNZEN

N.K. Rutter (Principal Editor)
A.M. Burnett – M.H. Crawford – A.E.M. Johnston – M. Jessop Price (Editors)

Historia Numorum
Italy

The British Museum Press, London 2001, XVI + 223 S., 4 Kart., 43 Taf.,
ISBN 0-7141-1801-X, £ 80.00

Wissenschaften wie die Numismatik, die von einem vergleichsweise engen Kreis von Spezialisten betrieben werden, drohen für Fernerstehende, die neben den anfallenden Monographien und den einschlägigen Zeitschriften unmöglich auch noch die Flut der Fundberichte, Kolloquien und Kataloge im Auge behalten können, stets rasch zu Geheimwissenschaften zu werden. Ein Historiker, der sich mit den Punischen Kriegen beschäftigt und die Verpflichtung fühlt, sich auf den Gebieten der römischen, der karthagischen und der grossgriechischen Numismatik einigermassen auf dem Laufenden zu halten, dürfte in den vergangenen Jahrzehnten mitunter verzweifelt sein. Winzige Münzstätten wie Cosa, obskure Hortfunde wie jene von Mesagne und Torchiarolo (von denen es jeweils mehrere desselben Namens gibt) oder die Schichtenfolge der Grabungen in Morgantina spielten plötzlich eine wesentliche Rolle. Da es aufgrund der anschwellenden Flut von Publikationen immer schwieriger wird, selbst eine begrenzte Debatte einer Nachbardisziplin zu verfolgen, darf man billigerweise erwarten, dass die Vertreter einer solchen Spezialdisziplin von Zeit zu Zeit die Summe ihrer Forschung ziehen.

Die Numismatik pflegt diesem Bedürfnis mit Handbüchern zu entsprechen, die das Material in einer stark verkürzten Form, nämlich nach typologischen Kriterien geordnet, darbieten. Solche Handbücher sind seit altersher eine Domäne der englischen Kollegen. Auf dem Gebiet der römischen Numismatik wendet man sich vertrauensvoll an das RIC, das zwar in Teilen ein wenig veraltet ist, aber nach dem hoffnungsvollen Auftakt des ersten Bandes nach und nach in einer überarbeiteten Neuauflage erscheinen soll. Auf dem lange Zeit vernachlässigten Feld der 'Greek Imperials' liegen seit einigen Jahren die ersten beiden Bände des RPC vor, die längst zu einem unentbehrlichen Hilfsmittel nicht nur der Numismatiker, sondern auch der Historiker und Archäologen geworden sind. Die besonders schwer zu überblickende vorkaiserzeitlich-griechische Numismatik hat dagegen schon lange keine Synthese mehr hervorgebracht. Für einzelne Epochen gibt es zwar bewährte Standardwerke wie Colin Kraays *ACGC* oder Otto Mørkholms *EHC*, doch ansonsten sieht sich der Aussenstehende entweder auf die grossen kommentierten Sammlungskataloge oder auf speziellere Monographien verwiesen. Wer das Pech hat, sich aus äusserem

Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau 83, 2004, S. 165-171.

Anlass plötzlich für Prägestätten wie Atrax, Issa oder Meliboia interessieren zu müssen, sucht seine Zuflucht immer noch bei Barclay Heads *Historia Numorum*, einem Klassiker, der 1887 in erster Auflage und 1911 in einer überarbeiteten Fassung erschien und seinem ehrwürdigen Alter entsprechend überholt ist, aber in manchen Fällen die einzige Adresse darstellt, unter der das Gesuchte mit Sicherheit zu finden ist.[1]

Stanley Robinson, Keeper of Coins des Britischen Museums und damit ein Nachfolger Heads, fasste in den 50er Jahren den Plan, die *Historia Numorum* neu zu bearbeiten. Nun liess sich das Vorgängerwerk schwerlich in einem einzigen Wurf ersetzen. Robinson wählte die Region, der er sich zuerst zuwenden wollte – Italien – , und stellte bald fest, dass auch diese begrenzte Arbeit von einem Einzelnen nicht mehr zu leisten war. So suchte er sich Mitarbeiter, denen er Teilaufgaben übertrug. Dass das Ziel erst jetzt, mehrere Jahrzehnte später, mit dem Erscheinen der *Historia Numorum Italy* erreicht wurde, beruht nicht etwa auf einer organisatorischen Schwäche, sondern vielmehr auf dem hohen Massstab, den sich die Verfasser gesetzt, und den vielfältigen Problemen, die sie im Vorfeld zu lösen hatten. Denn wenn man die Namen der Beitragenden, die der Herausgeber im Vorwort aufzählt, einmal Revue passieren lässt, kann man sich des Eindrucks nicht erwehren, dass die beträchtlichen Fortschritte, die gerade durch englische Numismatiker auf dem Gebiet der Numismatik Mittelitaliens und Grossgriechenlands nach dem Kriege erzielt wurden, der Vorbereitung dieses Buches zu verdanken sind. Viele der grundlegenden Studien erweisen sich jetzt als Vorarbeiten: Colin Kraays Untersuchungen zu Kaulonia, Poseidonia und Sybaris, Keith Rutters Behandlung der Prägungen von Neapolis und Cumae, Ann Johnstons Komplettierung von Sydney Noes Stempelstudie von Metapont, Roderick Williams' Monographie zu Velia und wohl auch Kenneth Jenkins' und Andrew Burnetts Forschungen zu Tarent. Dabei ging natürlich Zeit ins Land, und im Stab der engeren Mitarbeiter wechselten allmählich die Namen. Es ist den Herausgebern sehr dafür zu danken, dass man sich endlich doch entschloss, einen Schlussstrich zu ziehen und sich bei den vorläufig noch nicht ganz so gründlich erschlossenen Prägungen mit einem unbefriedigenden Kenntnisstand zu begnügen.

Aufgrund der langen Entstehungsdauer sind nicht alle Beitragenden auf dem Titelblatt vermerkt. Stattdessen zeichnet ein kleines Gremium von Verfassern als Herausgeber verantwortlich, wobei die Hauptaufgabe Keith Rutter oblag. Die einzelnen Beiträge sind denn auch nicht im Einzelnen gekennzeichnet, aber für den Kenner zeichnen sich in Zugriff und Diktion doch gewisse Unterschiede ab. Insbesondere die Abschnitte Etrurien und Zentralitalien, die Michael Crawford übernommen haben dürfte, stechen durch einen hohen Aktualitätsgrad und typologische Akribie, allerdings auch durch einen etwas apo-

[1] Das jüngere und ungleich umfangreichere Konkurrenzwerk von E. Babelon, Traité des monnaies grecques et romaines (Paris 1910-1932), blieb nach dem Tod seines Verfassers 1924 unvollendet.

diktischen Stil hervor. In den anderen Partien des Buches ist der Ton gelassener.

Im Gegensatz zu der altgewohnten Manier ist das Material nicht nach den strabonischen Provinzen geordnet. Die Verfasser versuchen den geographischen Bedingungen Rechnung zu tragen, indem sie den historischen und sich häufig auch numismatisch auswirkenden Beziehungen zwischen den Prägestätten einer Landschaftskammer den Vorrang gegenüber den traditionellen Provinzgrenzen einräumen. Sie stossen dabei in mehreren Fällen zu sinnvollen neuen Einheiten vor; gleichwohl ist zu bezweifeln, dass sich dieses neue Arrangement durchsetzen wird. Einige Beispiele: Die Städte von Picenum und Umbrien sind auf zwei Rubriken verteilt, die als *North-Eastern Italy* und als *Umbria* überschrieben sind. Unter der ersten Rubrik findet man drei picenische Münzstätten (Ancona, Firmum, Hatria) sowie das in der Aemilia gelegene Ariminum vor, das in der Antike als umbrische Gründung galt und darum von den Numismatikern etwas kavaliersmässig Umbrien zugeschlagen zu werden pflegt. Die neue Zuordnung ist auf jeden Fall konsequenter.

Ganz neu orientieren muss man sich in Mittelitalien. Das nördliche Latium inklusive Rom firmiert unter *Central Italy*, während das südliche Latium mit dem westlichen Samnium und dem nördlichen Kampanien zu einer eigenen Landschaft zusammengezogen wird. Etrurien ist in *Central* bzw. *Coastal Etruria* aufgeteilt, wobei der einzige Gewinn dieser Anordnung darin zu liegen scheint, dass das anonyme Aes Grave von den Silberprägungen der Küstenregion getrennt wird. Dadurch entsteht allerdings der falsche Eindruck, dass Etrurien in zwei numismatisch gänzlich wesensverschiedene Regionen auseinanderfällt; indessen liegen weder Volaterrae noch das in der Rubrik *Uncertain Umbria or Etruria* versteckte Volsinii an der Küste. In Süditalien, wo die Prägestätten bedeutender sind, aber weniger dicht beieinanderliegen, finden die althergebrachten Provinzgrenzen stärkere Beachtung. Allerdings lassen die Verfasser den Namen Kalabrien zugunsten eines Gross-Apuliens fallen; es bleibt unklar, ob sie damit auf die augusteische Regio II zurückgreifen oder einem Italizismus huldigen. Etwas verwirrend für jeden, der die Provinzgrenzen im Kopf hat, ist die Aufteilung in *Northern* und *Southern Apulia*, denn nach dieser Definition schliesst *Southern Apulia* nicht nur das antike Kalabrien, sondern auch das südliche Drittel Apuliens ein. Ob es wirklich sinnvoll ist, zwischen Venusia und Rubi eine Grenze zu ziehen? Nördliche Städte wie Ausculum oder Teate zeigen deutliche Einflüsse aus dem Süden, zumal seitens der Metropole Tarent, während das zum Süden gehörende Brentesion schon frühzeitig zur latinischen Kolonie wurde. Eine historisch gewachsene Grenze zeichnet sich hier in meinen Augen nicht ab.

Wenn man sich an die eigenwillige Disposition einmal gewöhnt hat, ist das Buch leicht zu benutzen. Dazu trägt vor allem die grosszügige Bebilderung bei. Von den 2682 numerierten Typen (in Wahrheit sind es mehr, weil einige in Subtypen untergliedert sind) sind 955 abgebildet, also mehr als ein Drittel. Zwei Glasgower Exemplare ausgenommen, handelt es sich durchweg um Photos von Gipsabgüssen. Das ist sehr zu begrüssen, denn das Tafelbild ist deutlich

ruhiger als in vielen anderen Katalogwerken, wo die dunklen Bronzen die hellen Gold- und Silbermünzen optisch förmlich erdrücken. Zugleich kommen die Details besser zur Geltung. Bei der Auswahl der abzubildenden Typen spielte natürlich vor allem die Knappheit des zur Verfügung stehenden Raumes eine Rolle; daher ist gar kein Aes Signatum und nur sehr wenig Aes Grave abgebildet, ein Umstand, der beispielsweise die Münzstätte Meles auf den Tafeln völlig undokumentiert lässt. Der Anfänger, der das Buch anfangs weniger lesend als blätternd in sich aufnehmen wird, mag dadurch ein wenig in die Irre geführt werden, aber man kann den Standpunkt der Herausgeber teilen.

Weniger Verständnis bringe ich auf, wenn persönliche Vorlieben durchschlagen. So werden uns nicht weniger als fünf Varianten der Eidschwurszene auf Denaren des *Bellum Sociale* dargeboten (die Nrn. 408, 415b, 415c, 425, 428), die, gemessen an dem darüber abgebildeten Vorläufer aus dem 2. Punischen Krieg, eher langweilig wirken, während die einzige ikonographisch neuartige Münze dieser Zeit, jener Denar, auf dem der italische Stier die römische Wölfin niederstreckt (Nr. 420), fehlt. Dasselbe gilt für den rehabilitierten Goldstater (Nr. 406 = SNG Paris 6, 2285). Auf dieser Tafel war schwerlich Platzmangel die Ursache. Ganz überwiegend ist aber ein repräsentativer Querschnitt angestrebt und auch erreicht; ein paar Perlen wie den jüngeren Stater von Pandosia (Nr. 2450) muss man eben missen. Abb. 1791 c fehlt.

Der Katalog ist überaus informativ. Zu jeder Prägestätte findet man einen historischen Abriss, eine ausführliche Bibliographie und einen kommentierten Typenkatalog. In ihrer Knappheit, Nüchternheit und Präzision sind die Texte kaum zu übertreffen. Hinsichtlich der Chronologie wird der im Winter 1995/96 erreichte Forschungsstand vertreten; später erschienene Titel wurden ausnahmsweise noch vermerkt, aber nicht mehr eingearbeitet.[2] Das ist schade, weil sich während der langen Mundierungsfrist noch manches getan hat, aber so etwas lässt sich nicht ändern. Eine Konkordanzliste (S. 40-42) und zahlreiche Tabellen erleichtern dem Leser die Arbeit, zudem sind in den Katalog laufend Hinweise auf chronologische oder metrologische Probleme eingestreut. Mitunter stösst man auch auf nebensächliche Meldungen, etwa dass die abgebildete Londoner Bronze der Paeligni Nr. 632 aus Millingens Besitz gestohlen worden sei, bevor sie in der Sammlung Lloyd wieder auftauchte. Bei Fragen der Typologie wird man den Verfassern zugestehen, dass sie bei all'jenen Prägungen, die bereits Gegenstand von Stempelstudien waren, grosszügig verfahren konnten. Das gilt vor allem für die typenreichen griechischen Prägungen. Es ergibt sich freilich kein angemessenes Bild, wenn die Prägungen des zweijährigen *Bellum Sociale* bis in alle Feinheiten aufgegliedert sind (Nr. 406-428, inklusive Subtypen), die tarentinische Oikistes-Prägung indes, die ein halbes

[2] Der wichtige Aufsatz von P. Visonà - S. Frey-Kupper, The Romanization of the *ager Bruttius*, SNR 75, 1996, S. 77 ff., wurde schon nicht mehr zur Kenntnis genommen. Als jüngste Schrift ist *sub loco* Skylletion ein Aufsatz J. Morcoms aus dem Jahr 2000 erwähnt, während die im selben Band publizierte Miscelle H. Cahns zu Kroton keinen Platz mehr fand.

Jahrhundert in Anspruch nahm und dabei einem beachtlichen Wandel unterlag, in lediglich vier Typen untergebracht wird (Nr. 843-846). Verschwommene Formulierungen wie «usually holding object», «holding various objects» oder «sometimes bearded» werden den Sammler, der genaue Referenzen sucht, nicht eben freuen. Und worin liegt der Sinn, unterschiedliche Bildtypen unter einer Nummer und einer dementsprechend vagen Beschreibung zu versammeln, wenn man sie dann auf den Tafeln abbildet und so die typologische Unschärfe enthüllt (Nrn. 528, 546, 844, 847, 870, 886, 934)? Nicht recht durchdacht scheint mir die Anordnung der Bronzen in der Sektion *Inland Etruria* zu sein, die die Gewichte des jeweils zugrundeliegenden Asses irrlichternd steigen und fallen lässt (S. 26).

Schwer zu handhaben ist der Katalog ausgerechnet im Bereich der römischen Prägung, deren Abfolge im Vorspann luzide abgehandelt wird; der zugehörige Katalog schwankt indes höchst unglücklich zwischen diachronen und synchronen Kategorien, und so muss man sich die Interdependenzen der verschiedenen Währungsklassen, die auf einer Tabelle (S. 45) übersichtlich dargestellt sind, mühsam von Neuem zusammensuchen. Bei Populonia fehlt im Katalog der Hinweis auf die Datierung der zweiten und dritten XX-Serie (S. 33). Michael Crawford verweist mehrmals auf seinen Artikel in Coin Hoards IX , der zur Zeit der Drucklegung noch nicht erschienen war; das Versprechen, sich dort zu Akudunniad zu äussern (S. 74 zu Nr. 620), hat er leider nicht eingelöst. Das ist zu verschmerzen, nicht aber, dass er *sub loco* Irnthií die einschlägige Literatur verschweigt und den Leser auf den genannten Artikel vertröstet (S. 68). Die letzte ausführliche Behandlung des Problems[3] ist auch dort nur en passant als Fundpublikation notiert. Aber all'das sind einsame Schnitzer, die angesichts der grossen Leistung des Katalogwerkes kaum ins Gewicht fallen.

Bezüglich der Chronologie der süditalischen Prägungen stützen sich die Verfasser auf jene Daten, auf die man sich bei einem Treffen in Cambridge 1981 geeinigt hatte.[4] Ich habe seitdem selbst in einigen Bereichen Änderungen vorgeschlagen, die sich nicht mehr berücksichtigen liessen; es ist nicht nötig, sie in diesem Rahmen nochmals auszubreiten.[5] Ich greife ein paar andere Punkte heraus: *a)* Wenn die italischen Pegasoi wirklich erst im 3. Jh. entstanden sein sollten, wie es uns auf S. 7 nahegelegt wird, muss man sich fragen, welche Absicht mit ihrer Prägung eigentlich verbunden war. Die korinthische Vorbildprägung läuft gegen Ende des 4. Jhs. aus, und der mächtige Zustrom mutterländischer Pegasoi, der seit Timoleons Erfolgen in Sizilien zu verzeichnen ist, kommt dort unter Agathokles zum Erliegen. *b)* Die reichlich erratischen *rationes* in Populonia, die einen extrem hochbewerteten Silberkurs verraten (AV:AR 1:7½, AR:AE 1:172), sind schwer zu verstehen, wenn andernorts

3 M. Russo - A. Stazio - P. Zancani Montuoro, Monumenti Antichi 52, 1984-90, S. 246f., Nr. 1-13, S. 267-274, Taf. 51-54.

4 A. Johnston, Coin Hoards VII (London 1985), S. 45-53.

5 Rez., Chronologie der Didrachmenprägung von Tarent 510-280 v. Chr., AMuGS XIV (Berlin-New York 1999).

Etrurien als Silberexporteur für Unteritalien zur Erwägung steht (S. 31, S. 5). *c)* Die Chronologie von Thurioi S. 147 ff., die über Kraays Anordnung in der SNG Oxford nicht hinauskommt, hätte sich durch ein Abgleichen mit einigen Hortfunden durchaus noch verfeinern lassen. Ein paar Notizen: Der Nr. 1767 entspricht das aus dem Oikistes-Hort (IGCH 1900) stammende Stück Gulbenkian 86, das folglich vor 420/15 geprägt sein muss. Gulbenkian 87 aus demselben Hort kann ich in diese Typologie nicht einfügen, Nr. 1783 ist es nicht. Das jüngste Exemplar von Thurioi im Hort aus den Corti Vecchie in Tarent (IGCH 1924) entspricht Nr. 1784 (vor 355), und das jüngste Exemplar im Sala Consilina-Hort (IGCH 1936) entspricht Nr. 1799 (vor 360?).[6] Ein Exemplar von Nr. 1805 (Noe F 22) ist im Paestum-Hort (IGCH 1925) bezeugt, während der Altamura-Hort (IGCH 1923) ungefähr bis Nr. 1813 hinunterreicht;[7] beide Hortfunde ergeben den *terminus ante quem* 340. *d)* Michael Crawford besteht auf seiner hohen Datierung der frühesten Silberprägung Roms (Nr. 266) in das letzte Jahrzehnt des 4. Jhs. Da er früher den Bau der Via Appia als mutmasslichen Anlass dieser Prägung genannt hat und die Art, wie er das Datum der ältesten Bronzemünzen Roms (Nr. 251, vgl. den Text zu Nr. 568) begründet, ebenfalls auf historischen Erwägungen beruht, möchte ich darauf hinweisen, dass die ältesten Hortfunde, die erstere Prägung vergesellschaften, in die Zeit des Pyrrhoskrieges fallen.[8] In dieser Zeit setzen auch bereits die ersten Nachprägungen (Nr. 210) ein. Neuere Grabungsfunde tragen zu der Frage vorläufig nichts bei.[9] *e)* Bei Nareton könnte ein Typus fehlen (S. 90). Kürzlich ist eine unedierte Kleinsilbermünze aufgetaucht, die aufgrund gewisser Ähnlichkeiten, vielleicht auch aufgrund des nicht mitgeteilten Fundortes, dem sizilischen Nakona zugewiesen wurde.[10] In der Tat spricht der Stil des Nymphenkopfes auf dem Avers für eine solche Lokalisierung. Indes scheint ein typengleiches Münzchen 1814 auf Ithaka gefunden worden zu sein,[11] und so ist eine kalabrische Provenienz zumindest zu erwägen. *f)* Die Verfasser lassen nur eine Sorte von Stateren von Temesa als echt gelten (Nr. 2566). Damit fallen berühmte Stücke der Verdammung anheim, Werke des berüchtigten Becker zu sein. Alan Walker hat die Dinge bereits zurechtgerückt;[12] ein Stück verzeichnete Carelli 1812, 15 Jahre bevor Becker seinen Stempel schnitt.

Mehrere gründliche Indices, eine Abbildungsliste und vier Karten runden das Buch ab. Die Karten sind bis auf die im Text sicher verorteten Münzstätten

6 T. Giove, AIIN 37, 1990, S. 18, Nr. 53.

7 G. Guzzetta, Bollettino di Numismatica 8, 1987, S. 129-132, Nr. 95-113.

8 Rez. a. O. (Anm. 5) S. 347. Neben der von Crawford genannten Literatur ist jetzt auf R. Vitale, AIIN 48, 2001, S. 97-118, und auf H.B. Mattingly, NC 161, 2001, S. 387, hinzuweisen.

9 G. Ciampoltrini, Studi Etruschi 62, 1996, S. 209f., Taf. 28, 14 (Ponte Gini III); H.P. Isler, Antike Kunst 47, 2004, S. 78, Taf. 11, 7-8 (Monte Iato).

10 Numismatica Ars Classica (Zürich) 21, 17. Mai 2001, Nr. 100.

11 M. Steinhart - E. Wirbelauer, Aus der Heimat des Odysseus (Mainz 2002), S. 247, Nr. 153.

12 Leu (Zürich) 86, 5. Mai 2003, Nr. 263.

stumm. Städte, denen irrtümlich eine Prägung zugewiesen wurde (Ameria und Telamon), sind nicht verzeichnet, dafür Volsinii und Aquilonia, obwohl Prägungen nur unter Vorbehalt dort lokalisiert werden. Das kampanische Nuceria (Alfaterna) ist eingetragen, nicht aber das brettische Nuceria (ital. Nocera Terinese) bei Temesa.

Doch damit genug der Quisquilien! Die Historia Numorum Italy stellt eine bewundernswerte Leistung dar und wird die Forschung, zumal seitens der eingangs genannten Aussenseiter, mit Sicherheit beflügeln. Das Buch gehört nicht nur in jede numismatische, sondern auch in jede althistorische und archäologische Bibliothek.

Dr. Wolfgang Fischer-Bossert
Nohlstr. 21,
DE-16548 Glienicke

Werner Tietz

Der Golf von Fethiye.

Politische, ethnische und kulturelle Strukturen einer Grenzregion vom Beginn der nachweisbaren Besiedlung bis in die römische Kaiserzeit

Antiquitas Reihe 1, Abhandlungen zur alten Geschichte, Band 50.
Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn 2003
394 pp., 1 carta geografica allegata. ISBN 3-7749-3146-1

In questo volume, che nasce come rielaborazione di una tesi di dottorato discussa nel 2001, Werner Tietz offre un'ampia ed esauriente trattazione della storia politica e culturale del golfo di Fethiye (l'antico *Telmessicus sinus*) e dei suoi insediamenti dal II millennio a.C. fino all'età romana. Situato nell'estremità occidentale della Licia, il golfo rappresentava una zona di confine con il mondo cario e costituiva una tappa obbligata nei percorsi marittimi e terrestri tra la valle dello Xanthos e i centri della Caria meridionale (in particolare Kaunos) nonché il naturale sbocco al mare per molti insediamenti dell'entroterra. Nonostante siano presenti influssi carii, visibili per esempio nella diffusione a partire dal IV sec. a.C. delle tombe rupestri a prospetto ionico, W. Tietz sottolinea come la regione del golfo (con l'esclusione di Kalynda orientata piuttosto verso Kaunos) abbia sempre gravitato, dal punto di vista culturale, prevalentemente a est, cioè verso la Licia e la valle dello Xanthos.

Dopo l'introduzione, in cui vengono trattati alcuni aspetti geografici della regione e vengono passati in rassegna i principali monumenti archeologici utili per la datazione degli insediamenti, l'autore affronta sinteticamente nel secondo capitolo il periodo del Tardo Bronzo al quale risalgono i primi documenti conosciuti. Come si ricava dalle scarse attestazioni presenti nelle fonti storiografiche di età ittita, il golfo di Fethiye era allora controllato dai bellicosi popoli Lukka il cui territorio si estendeva nell'Anatolia sud-occidentale, nella zona coincidente in età classica con la Caria meridionale, la Licia, la Pisidia e parte della Panfilia.

Il terzo capitolo è dedicato alla storia del golfo di Fethiye in età arcaica e classica. L'appartenenza della regione alla Lega delio-attica (collocabile cronologicamente tra la battaglia dell'Eurimedonte e gli anni tra il 425/4 e il 412/11 a.C.) non determinò un cambiamento delle strutture politiche preesistenti, in genere basate sul sistema dinastico. Il primo sovrano licio, secondo W. Tietz, che impose il controllo di Xanthos sulla regione del golfo (con l'eccezione di Kalynda), almeno nella prima fase del suo regno, fu Kuprlli (ca. 485-440 a.C.) di cui rimane una moneta con legenda caria attribuita, sempre dallo studioso, alla zecca di Krya (attuale Taşyaka). Dopo Kuprlli le serie monetali ci danno informazioni, se pure scarse e frammentarie, soltanto per i decenni a cavallo tra il V e il IV sec. a.C.: una sequenza di dinasti (M)egesetu-Kherẽi-Erbbina-

Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau 83, 2004, S. 172-179.

Aruwãntijesi-Arttuñpara che coniarono monete a Telmessos; alcune emissioni battute con legenda *ddenewele* considerata da W. Tietz non un nome di dinasta, come invece è stata finora interpretata dagli studiosi, bensì un toponimo identificabile con Daidala (attuale İnlice Asarı). Sempre secondo la ricostruzione di W. Tietz, la città, la cui zecca fu attiva nella seconda metà del V sec. a.C., passò intorno al 420/10 a.C. sotto la signoria dei sovrani di Xanthos (Kherẽi e Erbbina). Dopo il regno di Erbbina e di Arttuñpara, gli ultimi dinasti di Xanthos appartenenti alla dinastia arpagide, la regione del golfo venne conquistata da Perikle, signore di Limyra, probabilmente nel terzo decennio del IV sec. a.C., con una campagna militare ricordata sia dalle fonti greche sia da quelle indigene licie (cfr. TL 104, 2-4) e culminata con la presa di Telmessos. Con la fine della rivolta dei satrapi terminò in Licia il sistema dinastico. La regione venne inserita nella satrapia di Caria e rimase sotto il controllo dei dinasti ecatomnidi fino alla conquista di Alessandro.

Il capitolo quarto, strutturato topograficamente, affronta la storia degli insediamenti del golfo di Telmessos durante l'età ellenistica e romana. I centri esaminati sono Lydai, Lissai, Krya, Kalynda, Daidala, Hippukome, Oktapolis, Symbra, Telandros e Telmessos. Oltre alla storia politica e amministrativa, ricostruita sapientemente con particolare attenzione alle vicende all'interno della Lega licia, di ogni centro vengono discussi anche altri aspetti, quali l'esatta localizzazione, i confini del territorio, i ritrovamenti archeologici, la rete viaria, l'individuazione dei porti e le principali risorse economiche.

A conclusione del volume un sintetico catalogo delle monete di Ddenewele divise in due gruppi, il primo comprendente le serie con i tipi *testa maschile con tiara persiana/Atena* e il secondo comprendente le emissioni con i tipi *Atena/Eracle*. Il catalogo non è provvisto di fotografie.

La storia del golfo di Telmessos e dei suoi insediamenti è stata trattata nel complesso da W. Tietz con grande cura e perizia sia per la completezza delle fonti elencate, da quelle archeologiche e numismatiche fino a quelle storiografiche ed epigrafiche, sia per la capacità dell'autore di utilizzarle in maniera prudente e critica sia infine per le ricostruzioni storiche proposte che, con l'eccezione di alcune parti che non mi trovano pienamente d'accordo e che tra breve discuterò più dettagliatamente, sono in genere ben fondate e condivisibili. Nonostante il suo carattere di storia microregionale, l'opera di W. Tietz costituisce senza dubbio un valido strumento di lavoro per chi si interessa di storia e cultura licia considerato che, dopo il lavoro pionieristico di O. Treuber alla fine dell'Ottocento e le monografie più recenti di P.H.J. Houwink ten Cate e di T. Bryce,[1] solo negli ultimi anni sono state pubblicate opere di carattere generale relative alla storia dell'antica Licia.[2]

1 Cfr. O. Treuber, Geschichte der Lykier (Stuttgart 1887); P.H.J. Houwink Ten Cate, The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period (Leiden 1961); T. Bryce, The Lycians. Literary and Epigraphical Sources (Copenhagen 1986).

2 Mi riferisco in particolare ai lavori di M. Zimmermann, Untersuchungen zur historischen Landeskunde Zentrallykiens (Bonn 1992); A.G. Keen, Dynastic Lycia. A Political His-

Vorrei adesso soffermarmi in maniera più approfondita su quegli aspetti della trattazione di W. Tietz che, come già anticipato, appaiono poco convincenti in quanto, a mio parere, non sufficientemente giustificati dalle fonti in nostro possesso. L'ipotesi sostenuta dallo studioso del controllo da parte dei dinasti di Xanthos della regione del golfo ad ovest di Telmessos si basa essenzialmente su tre documenti:

- 1. emissione monetale di Kuprlli con legenda caria e licia attribuibile alla zecca di Krya;
- 2. interpretazione di *ddenewele* come toponimo (da identificare con il centro di Daidala);
- 3. serie monetale di Erbbina con legenda caria e licia battuta in una zecca al momento non identificabile con precisione, ma sicuramente da localizzare a ovest di Telmessos e di Daidala («Dieser Ort muß in einem Teil des Machtbereichs des Erbbina gelegen haben, wo zumindest vornehmlich karisch gesprochen wurde, also westlich von Telmessos und Daidala. Eine genauere Lokalisierung ist nach derzeitigem Kenntnisstand nicht möglich» pp. 98-99).

La serie monetale di Kuprlli è rappresentata da due stateri, coniati secondo il piede ponderale cosiddetto persiano (ca. 11 gr.), che presentano i tipi D/ *cinghiale che cammina a s.; in cerchio perlinato*; R/ *triskeles con bracci che terminano con teste di cigno, ornamento floreale che spunta dall'anello centrale; in quadrato incuso perlinato*. La moneta mostra al rovescio la legenda sicuramente licia *kuprlli* e al diritto cinque segni che sono stati interpretati diversamente dagli studiosi. O. Mørkholm e G. Neumann, nel loro fondamentale lavoro sulle legende monetali licie, hanno proposto la lettura sinistrorsa *θ-a-?-r-a* (M 301a) lasciando insoluto il problema rappresentato dal valore fonetico del segno centrale.[3] La lettura licia della legenda è stata tentata anche da O. Carruba che ha traslitterato *arnnaθ* (*arñna*/Xanthos) oppure *arssaθ* (Arsada) considerando il terzo segno una legatura per indicare un raddoppiamento consonantico di due lettere diverse (*nn* o *ss*).[4] S. Durnford ha per primo proposto un'interpretazione caria della legen-

tory of the Lycians and Their Relations with Foreign Powers, c. 545-362 B.C. (Leiden 1998); R. Behrwald, Der lykische Bund: Untersuchungen zu Geschichte und Verfassung (Bonn 2000); M. Domingo Gygax, Untersuchungen zu den lykischen Gemeinwesen in klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit (Bonn 2001). Cfr. anche per gli aspetti sociali della civiltà licia A.-V. Schweyer, Les Lyciens et la mort: une étude d'histoire sociale (Paris 2002).

3 Cfr. O. Mørkholm/G. Neumann, Die lykischen Münzlegenden, Nachrichten der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse n.1, 1978, p. 31 «Mehrere dieser fünf Zeichen lassen sich schwer mit solchen des lyk. Alphabets identifizieren. Doch wird man eher an lokale Sonderformen als an fremde (etwa karische?) Zeichen denken mögen. Wenn ausnahmsweise linksläufige Schreibweise vorläge, könnte man eine Lesung *θ-a-?-r-a* erwägen. (Freundlicher Hinweis von Michael Meier-Brügger.)».

4 Cfr. O. Carruba, Dynasten und Städte. Sprachliche und sonstige Bemerkungen zu den Namen auf den lykischen Münzen, in: J. Borchhardt-G. Dobesch (Hg.), Akten des II. Internationalen Lykien-Symposions, Wien, 6.-12. Mai 1990, I (Wien 1993), p. 15.

da monetale e ha suggerito la lettura destrorsa *arnnaθ* (Xanthos).[5] Tale lettura, tuttavia, non è più sostenibile grazie al ritrovamento della bilingue di Kaunos che ha assicurato il valore fonetico di alcuni segni dell'alfabeto cario (nella legenda di Kuprlli il secondo segno deve essere letto t_2 e non più *r*, mentre la terza lettera dovrebbe essere interpretata *mm*, ammettendo la presenza di una legatura per esprimere il doppio segno n. 11 come propone S. Durnford).[6] L'interpretazione caria rimane, a mio avviso, la soluzione più convincente e io stesso ho tentato di spiegare l'epigrafe monetale M 301a suggerendo la lettura retrograda *χ-a-w-*t_2*-a* da intendersi come abbreviazione di **χa(da)w(a)ta-*, forma caria del licio *χadawãti-* «Kadyanda».[7] Anche W. Tietz accetta l'ipotesi della legenda caria ma inspiegabilmente traslittera i segni *S-ś-r-s-*[.] o [.]*-s-r-ś-s* («Die karische Legende M 301a ergibt nicht, wie Durnford will, ein linksläufiges a-r-n-n-a-θ, sondern ein rechtsläufiges S-š-r-s-[.] bzw. ein linksläufiges [.]-s-r-š-s» p. 60). Tralasciando il problema del primo e del terzo segno (leggendo da destra), la seconda e la quinta lettera indicano con sicurezza il fonema /a/ (e non /s/), mentre il segno in quarta posizione rappresenta una dentale, come ci conferma la bilingue di Kaunos.[8] L'ipotesi quindi sostenuta da W. Tietz di individuare la legenda M 301a (più precisamente i segni *r-ś-s* ritenuti la forma indigena del toponimo Krya) nell'iscrizione caria TL 151, rinvenuta a Krya (attuale Taşyaka), non può essere più sostenuta e di conseguenza cade anche l'ipotesi di attribuire la moneta di Kuprlli alla zecca cittadina. Va inoltre aggiunto che i segni di TL 151, 2-3 *r-ś-s* (traslitterati però da W. Tietz *r-ś-s*, p. 61), che dovrebbero indicare un toponimo, non possono essere isolati e interpretati come un sostantivo: il grafema *s*, infatti, unito al segno successivo *b* forma la congiunzione copulativa *sb* = «e» (cfr. anche in licio B o miliaco *sebe* = «e»); i segni *r- ś* fanno invece parte di una sequenza di lettere che costituiscono quasi sicuramente un antroponimo. Lo prova l'elemento *δ-u-b-r-ś* che si può confrontare con il greco -δυβερος o -δυβερις presente in vari nomi composti attestati nelle iscrizioni greche della Licia (es. Ξανδυβερις, Περπενδυβερις, Ερμανδυβερις).[9]

5 S. Durnford, An Instance of the Lycian Name for Xanthos in Carian Script, Kadmos 30, 1991, pp. 90-92.

6 Sulla bilingue di Kaunos cfr. P. Frei/C. Marek, Die karisch-griechische Bilingue von Kaunos, Kadmos 36, 1997, pp. 1-89; ID., Die karisch-griechische Bilingue von Kaunos. Ein neues Textfragment, Kadmos 37, 1998, pp. 1-18.

7 Cfr. N. Cau, La legenda caria su una serie monetale del dinasta Kuprlli, in: B. Virgilio (Ed.), Studi Ellenistici 12, 1999, pp. 9-17; «la leggenda si spiegherebbe come abbreviazione di **χa(da)w(a)ta-* forma caria del licio *χadawãti-* «Kadyanda», nome attestato dalle serie monetali sempre senza nasalizzazione *χadawatihe* «di Kadyanda» e nella variante *χadaitihe* (da **χadaiti-*, dove probabilmente la *i* è un errore dell'incisore per *w*, data la somiglianza fra i due segni in licio). Proprio la variante **χadawti-*, con la caduta della vocale nasalizzata, sembra la forma più vicina a quella della leggenda caria» pp. 13-14.

8 Cfr. P. Frei/C. Marek, Die karisch-griechische Bilingue von Kaunos, cit. n. 6, p. 34 «Die Gleichungen *o*P*onosn* = Ἀθηναῖον sowie *lùsikra*P*as* = Λυσικράτους machen deutlich, daß das Zeichen P einer griechischen dentalen Tenuis, durch Tau oder Theta wiedergegeben, entspricht».

9 Sui nomi in cario composti con l'elemento *twbr-*/-δυβερος cfr. I.-J. Adiego, Les identifi-

Affrontiamo adesso il problema della legenda monetale *ddenewele* che è stata ritenuta finora dagli studiosi il nome di un dinasta, attivo tra la fine del V e gli inizi del IV sec. a.C. in Licia occidentale. Questo antroponimo compare in emissioni che presentano come tipi monetali Atena e una testa maschile con tiara persiana, raffigurante probabilmente il dinasta che firma l'emissione stessa, e in serie con i tipi Atena ed Eracle. W. Tietz propone, se pure a livello di ipotesi, di riconoscere nella legenda *ddenewele* non più un nome personale ma un toponimo identificabile con Daidala (attuale İnlice Asarı), un insediamento del golfo di Telmessos che conserva alcune sepolture di tipo licio tra cui anche una tomba a pilastro. L'ipotesi del toponimo è suggerita allo studioso da alcune considerazioni: «Ab Serie IV beginnt eine neue Gruppe, die zwar noch den Schriftzug Ddênewele (oder Varianten), nicht aber das "Porträt" zeigt. Ferner ist einzuwenden, daß die Legende bei den Ddênewele-Münzen der älteren Serien keineswegs eine Beischrift zu dem "Porträt" ist, sondern sich im Revers, also als Umschrift um den Athenakopf, befindet. Schließlich - das wohl stärkste Argument - liegt ein klares Gegenbeispiel vor: Eine in oder für Tlos geprägte Münze trägt lediglich auf der Rückseite die Legende *tlawi* (=Tlos), obwohl sie auf der Vorderseite einen Tiaraträger zeigt» (p. 64). Come prove a difesa della sua ipotesi W. Tietz cita anche le abbreviazioni nella parte centrale o all'inizio delle legende (cfr. *ddenele*)[10] che riguarderebbero soltanto i nomi di luogo e non i nomi di dinasti e la somiglianza linguistica di *ddenewele* con il toponimo *pinale* («eine ähnliche Endung finden wir auch in *pinale* (=Pinara)» p. 77).

Le argomentazioni portate da W. Tietz a sostegno dell'ipotesi del toponimo, a mio avviso, non sono decisive e possono facilmente essere confutate. La legenda *ddenewele* nelle emissioni con i tipi *testa maschile con tiara persiana/Atena* compare per lo più al rovescio a lato della testa di Atena, tuttavia è presente anche una serie in cui la legenda è posta accanto al ritratto del dinasta con tiara persiana;[11] il nome del dinasta abbinato alla testa di una divinità non costituisce un'eccezione nella monetazione licia come dimostra uno statere di Kherẽi (abbreviato *χe*) battuto probabilmente a Tlos (D/ *testa di Atena con elmo attico*; R/ *Linear device n. 25 in quadrato incuso* con legenda *χe* al diritto).[12] Nelle serie monetali licie sono attestate abbreviazioni (che non possono essere tutte attribuibili a errori dell'incisore) anche all'interno di nomi di dinasti come dimostrano

cations onomastiques dans le déchiffrement du carien, in: M.E. Giannotta-R. Gusmani-L. Innocente-D. Marcozzi-M. Salvini-M. Sinatra-P. Vannicelli (Edd.), La decifrazione del cario. Atti del 1° Simposio Internazionale, Roma, 3-4 maggio 1993 (Roma 1994), pp. 34, 43.

10 W. Tietz nota giustamente che la legenda potrebbe essere integrata *ddene*[*we*]*le* in quanto «rechts unten befinden sich im Feld Prägespuren, die zu zwei Buchstaben gehören könnten» (nota 338 di p. 77).

11 Cfr. N.Vismara, Monetazione arcaica della Lycia. II. La collezione Winsemann Falghera, Glaux 3 (Milano 1989), pp. 247-249, n. 178.

12 Cfr. O. Mørkholm/J. Zahle, The Coinages of the Lycian Dynasts Kheriga, Kherẽi, and Erbbina, AArch 47, 1976, p. 52, n. 47.

le legende *teθθweibi= teθθ(i)weibi;*[13] *kuplli = kup(r)lli;*[14] *wes = we(χ)s(sere)*[15]. Quanto alla somiglianza tra *ddenewele* e *pinale* si può affermare soltanto che si tratta in entrambi i casi di temi in vocale (*-e*) e che nei due nomi non è riconoscibile alcun tipo di suffisso. Ddenewele potrebbe essere accostato con analogo ragionamento all'antroponimo **pubiele*, presente in una iscrizione bilingue da Limyra nella forma *pubieleje*/Πυβιάληι (dat.; TL 117, 4-5). Che *ddenewele* inoltre non sia mai attestato sotto forma di etnico (in *-zi*/*-ze*) o declinato al caso genitivo come in genere avviene per gli altri toponimi presenti nelle legende monetali, non viene ritenuto da W. Tietz una prova valida per sostenere la teoria dell'antroponimo in quanto questo si verificherebbe anche con i toponimi Limyra = *zemuri*, Rhodiapolis = *wedrẽi* e Tlos = *tlawa* (pp. 77-78). Lo studioso non tiene conto tuttavia delle legende *zẽmuh*◊ (M 142 e M 145b), chiaramente un'abbreviazione del genitivo (*zẽmu(ri)h*◊), e *wedrewi* (M 146c), una forma probabilmente riconducibile a *wedrẽi*, nonché delle forme aggettivali del nome Tlos (anche se attestate solo epigraficamente e non dalle legende) *tlahñ* (TL 44a, 47), *tlãñna* (TL 25, 4).

Infine alcune osservazioni sulla relazione tra *ddenewele* e Δαιδαλα, toponimo noto soltanto dalle fonti di età ellenistica e romana: «Einerseits existierte am Golf von Fethiye bzw. in nicht allzu weiter Entfernung von *Telebehi*/Telmessos eine numismatisch bezeugte Siedlung oder ein Dynast namens Ddênewele, anderseits liegt mit der Ruinenstätte von İnlice Asarı die einzige bisher nicht mit Münzprägungen in Verbindung gebrachte lykische Dynastensiedlung in jener Gegend vor. Den klassisch lykischen Namen dieser Siedlung kennt man nicht, in hellenistischer und späterer Zeit hieß sie Daidala. Eine Verbindung beider Sachverhalte ist m.E. durchaus naheliegend: Eine Homophonie der Namen liegt auf der Hand, und noch heute heißt der Hafenplatz, der in der Antike zu Daidala gehörte, bei den Einheimischen Velidada - möglicherweise ein entfernter Namensanklang» (p. 79). Tra Ddenewele e Daidala non esiste alcun legame linguistico né, a mio giudizio, si può parlare di omofonia in quanto Daidala non costituisce la resa greca del toponimo epicorico. Se si considerasse *ddenewele* un nome di luogo, avremmo il caso di un toponimo indigeno diverso da quello greco (un fenomeno attestato nella regione cfr. *kbide* e Καῦνος, *arñna* e Ξάνθος, *wahñti* e Φέλλος), dal momento che Daidala a differenza di Ddenewele ha sicuramente un'origine greca (da Δαίδαλος oppure, come preferisce W. Tietz, da δαιδάλεος, p. 232). La versione greca di Ddenewele potrebbe essere *Δενευελης o *Δαναυαλης. La possibilità che Daidala derivi da Ddenewele non è a mio avviso proponibile neppure a livello di semplice ipotesi («Es wäre mithin in Anlehnung an Umar a.O. auf die Möglichkeit der luwischen Ergän-

[13] Cfr. O. Mørkholm/G. Neumann, Die lykischen Münzlegenden, cit. n. 3, p. 15 (M 127b).

[14] Cfr. O. Mørkholm/J. Zahle, The Coinage of Kuprlli, AArch 43, 1972, p. 62, nn. 25-26.

[15] Cfr. N. Vismara, Monetazione arcaica della Lycia.I. Il dinasta Wekhssere I, Glaux 2 (Milano 1989), pp. 51-53, n. 6.

zung des Namens, dessen Doppelkonsonant im Anlaut Aphairese von Vokalen andeutet, Bezug zu nehmen. Dies ergäbe - freilich unbelegbar - ***Da-ide**-ne-we(?)-**le**, woraus leicht auf "Daidala" zu kommen wäre», nota 9 di p. 232). Dovremmo infatti ricostruire una forma *Δαιδαναυαλα > Δαιδαλα e giustificare la caduta dell'elemento *-newe-*/-ναυα-, senza tener conto che in licio la doppia consonante iniziale non presuppone necessariamente la caduta di vocale interconsonantica (cfr. *zzala* = Σαλας TL 32*b*, 1-2; *ddedi* = *tedi* «padre» TL 103, 2, dal luvio *tati*-).

L'emissione di Erbbina con legenda licia e caria, che W. Tietz ritiene coniata in una zecca localizzabile a ovest di Telmessos e Daidala, è costituita da due esemplari, battuti secondo lo standard ponderale leggero, della serie D/ *testa di Atena con elmo attico*; *cerchio perlinato*; R/ *Eracle stante con leonté, piede s. su roccia, clava nella mano d. e arco nella s.*; *quadrato incuso perlinato*. La legenda sul rovescio è rappresentata dal nome *erbbina*, scritto con lettere licie, e da due segni dell'alfabeto cario che oggi, grazie al rinvenimento della Bilingue di Kaunos, possono con sicurezza essere trascritti t_2 *i* (ammettendo una direzione di scrittura retrograda) e non I-Š come invece sostiene W. Tietz (p. 98). La legenda t_2 *i* può essere interpretata plausibilmente come l'abbreviazione del nome cario di *telebehi*/Τελ(ε)μεσσός, la zecca dove Erbbina sembra aver coniato tutte le sue emissioni.[16]

Vorrẽi concludere questa discussione sulle fonti con un'ultima osservazione su quanto sostenuto da W. Tietz. Che i sovrani di Xanthos, in particolare Kherẽi ed Erbbina, abbiano controllato (anche per brevi periodi) la regione del golfo di Fethiye a ovest di Telmessos è un evento possibile e verosimile, vista l'importanza del golfo nelle rotte costiere e nei percorsi terrestri tra Caria e Licia. Rimane comunque innegabile, a mio parere, che questa proposta, stando alla documentazione in nostro possesso, non sia ancora sostenuta da prove convincenti e di conseguenza non possa valere che come semplice ipotesi di lavoro che nuove fonti dovranno convalidare. Nell'affrontare la storia del golfo di Fethiye ritengo che non si possa prescindere per il momento da tre dati la cui evidenza è indiscutibile: i documenti epigrafici in lingua licia non sono più attestati a ovest di Telmessos né in questa regione sono state finora individuate con sicurezza zecche utilizzate dai dinasti di Xanthos; nelle iscrizioni di Erbbina (sia in licio sia in greco) non si fa mai allusione a centri posti così a occidente, con l'eccezione naturalmente di Telmessos.

[16] Cfr. M. Meier-Brügger, Zu den Münzlegenden von Kaunos, Kadmos 37, 1998, p. 45; N. Cau, Una nuova lettura di alcune leggende monetali carie, Kadmos 38, 1999, pp. 45-48. Cfr. anche I.-J. Adiego, Die neue Bilingue von Kaunos und das Problem des karischen Alphabets, Kadmos 37, 1998, pp. 58-59 «Dann wäre *t* einfach der Anfangsbuchstabe des karischen Namens für Telmessos (lykisch *Telebehi*), während *i* der Anfangsbuchstabe der karischen Form von *Erbbina* sein könnte».

Le critiche mosse ad alcuni punti della trattazione di W. Tietz non inficiano naturalmente il valore generale dell'opera che, come già evidenziato, costituisce un valido studio d'insieme, approfondito e sempre ben documentato, di un'area dell'antica Licia, quale il golfo di Telmessos, di grande interesse dal punto di vista storico e culturale per la sua posizione al confine con il mondo cario.

Dott. Nicola Cau
via Montanelli 44
I-56121 Pisa
nicola.cau@tin.it

Georges Le Rider

Alexandre Le Grand. Monnaie, finances et politique

Presses Universitaires de France, Paris 2003
ISBN 2 13 053940 2. ISSN 0 246-6120, pp. I-XI, 1-363.

Georges Le Rider's (GLR) interest in Alexander the Great originated in the period long before the time when this learned and prolific Frenchman, of great repute among numismatists, wrote his first articles dealing with particular issues minted by Alexander. This interest in fact dates back to the years when he published and commented, either on his own or with others, on various hoards from the east or from the Greek peninsula.

- *Un trésor de tétradraches d'Alexandre trouvé à Ackakale en 1958,* RN 30, 1989, pp. 42-54, pl.V-X (in conjunction with N. Olçay)
- *Un trésor de statères d'or trouvés à Potidée en 1984 et à Scioné en 1985,* RN 33, 1991, pp. 89-96, pl. VII

Nor did Le Rider sit idly by, waiting for the appearance, in 1991, of the monumental work by M.J. Price, *The Coinage in the Name of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaeus*. Instead, he undertook a detailed study of the principles of Alexander's coinage.

- La date des premières monnaies d'Alexandre, Bull. Cercle d'Études Numismatiques 8-4, 1971, pp. 65-66.
- *Les alexandres d'argent en Asie Mineure et dans l'Orient séleucides au IIIe siècle av. J.-C. (c. 275-225): Remarques sur le système monétaire des Séleucides et des Ptolémées,* JS janvier-septembre 1989, pp. 3-51, pl. I-VI
- *Sur le frai de certaines monnaies anciennes et contemporaines*, in: Mélanges de la Bibliothèque de La Sorbonne offerts à André Tuilier (Paris 1988), pp. 70-83

GLR wrote a monumental work on the coinage of Philip II, together with many articles and a whole book in reply to Price. Alexander, of course, has always been a subject of interest on the part of the broader public. This interest intensified during the 1990s and it was this interest, together with GLR's own interest in Alexander that led him to deal passionately and repeatedly with the production of coinage and the economic policy of the great Macedonian. GLR thus made an extremely valuable and personal contribution to the study of Alexander's coinage and of his general policy, economic and otherwise that Alexander followed during his short and troubled life. Even if some of his articles and review-articles were published in response to essays written by others, GLR's contribution is to be regarded as highly original.

- *Histoire économique et monétaire de l'Orient hellénistique*, Annuaire du Collège de France 1995-1996 (Paris 1996) pp. 829-860
- *Le monnayage perse en Cilicie au IVe siècle*, NACQT 26, 1997, pp. 151-167
- *Cléomène de Naucratis*, BCH 121, 1997, pp. 71-93
- *Les tétradrachmes macédoniens d'Alexandre: réflexions sur leur classement, le nombre des ateliers et les lieux de frappe*, in: R. Ashton, S. Hurter (eds.), Studies in Greek Numismatics in memory of Martin Jessop Price (London 1998) pp. 237-245, pl. 53

Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau 83, 2004, S. 180-192.

- *Alexander in Asia Minor*, in: A. Burnett, U.Wartenberg, R. Witschonke (eds.), Coins of Macedonia and Rome. Essays in Honour of Charles Hersh (London 1998) pp. 49-57
- *Antimène de Rhodes à Babylone*, in: Alexander's legacy in the East, in: O. Bopearachchi / C.A. Bromberg / F. Grenet (Hg.), Studies in Honor of Paul Bernard, Bulletin of the Asia Institute 12 (1997 [2001]), pp. 21-140
- *Le monnayage d'or et d'argent frapée en Égypte sous Alexandre: le rôle monétaire d'Alexandre,* in: Colloque Alexandrie: une mégapole cosmopolite, Actes (Paris 1999), pp. 11-23

Reviews

- M. Thompson, *Alexander's Drachm Mints. II: Lampsacus and Abydus* (New York 1991) in: RN 36, 1994, pp. 335-336
- M.J. Price, *The Coinage in the Name of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaeus*. A British Museum Catalogue (Zurich 1991), in: SNR 71, 1992, pp. 214-225
- H.A. Troxell, *Studies in the Macedonian Coinage of Alexander the Great,* ANSNS 21 (New York 1997), in: SNR 77, 1998, pp. 663-673

The form of GLR's book discussed here is something new in his work on Alexander. Although the book constitutes a compilation of views formulated in most of GLR's previous articles, with the exception, however, of the final chapter in which the author goes through the issues in a lucid, methodical and systematic manner and offers his views in the hope of provoking further thought, it offers, nevertheless, a complete synthesis of the economic and numismatic policy of Alexander, something that has hitherto been missing from the international bibliography on the topic.

The general approach of GLR's monograph will appeal to an audience wider than numismatists, who are already aware of the issues. GLR formulated his general idea and structure very clearly in a concisely written article which summarizes his lectures at the Collège de France over the period 1995-1996.[1] The most important points of GLR's position, together with personal comments by the reviewer on various matters, are as follows:

I Staters and Tetradrachms: Athena and Zeus

The gold staters with Athena/Nike with a stylis must have come into circulation for the first time in July 332 BC, in other words, immediately after the conquest of Tyre, whereby Alexander crushed the Persian fleet and thus became, among other things, master of the seas. On the other hand, the silver tetradrachms of Attic standard with Heracles/enthroned Zeus with eagle would have been circulated after November, 333 BC and the victory at Issos.

The iconography of the particular issues depicting Olympian Zeus, Athena and Nike with a stylis, and the choice of time of issue are of a piece with the panhellenic aspect that was lent to the expedition against the Achaemenid empire at the beginning of the operation. The somewhat manufactured moral pretext for the whole operation were the Trojan War and the Persian Wars. The real aims and intentions of Alexander became clear, however, in a series of acts

1 *Histoire économique et monétaire de l'Orient hellenistique*, in: Annuaire du Collège de France (Paris 1996), pp. 829-860.

of a symbolic and a propagandistic aspect. The list of these deeds is well-known, but will be briefly reviewed here: The sacrifices made at the grave of Protesilaos at Elaeus, the laying of a wreath on Achilles's tomb at Troy; the dispatch to Athens of 300 Persian panoplies on the day following the victory in the battle of the Granikos, the warm, encouraging speeches of Panhellenic interest and vivid historic background, made to the *ethnē* comprising the expedition forces before the battles of Issos and Gaugamela; and the dispatch of letters to the Greek cities, announcing the defeat of the Persian tyranny and heralding the autonomy of the Greeks following the successful outcome of these battles and the burning of the palace in Persepolis.[2]

However, this panhellenic aspect of the conflict between Greeks and Persians ceased to exist the moment the allied forces were dismissed at Ecbatana, in 330 BC.[3] Panhellenism was gradually replaced by a policy of idealism, unprecedented for contemporary Greek standards. This has been characterised by modern research as *Verschmelzungspolitik*,[4] and its principles probably originated long before the events at the river Opis took place in the summer of 324 BC.

It was originally generally believed that Alexander started his gold and silver coinage prior to the expedition, on the day, in fact, following his ascent to the throne (and it is this theory that Price enshrines in his great work). The widely accepted *terminus post quem* today, however, as proposed by, among others, GLR himself, owes a great deal to the views of H.A. Troxell.[5] Through close study of the tetradrachms in the name of Alexander she proved that it was the Macedonian mint that in fact followed the local mint at Tarsos, rather than the reverse. Furthermore, the imperial title (ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ) was used for the first time on coins struck after Alexander's death, evidently in reference to Alexander IV who was still a minor.

A lower date for the minting and circulation of Alexander's gold and silver issues is further suggested by the conclusions that arise from an examination of the ancient literature and the examination of monetary circulation. The sequence of arguments, elaborated in some detail, is to be found in articles of the present reviewer[6] and is as follows:

> «The evidence of the hoards suggests that tetradrachms in the name of Alexander made their appearance earlier than anywhere else in Thessaly (333-330 BC) and the Peloponnese (330-325 BC), followed by Macedonia (323 BC) and Central Greece (319 BC). Tetradrachms of the young Macedonian are completely unknown in hoards from Euboea.

2 See M. Flower, Alexander the Great and Panhellenism, in: A. Bosworth, E.J. Baynham (eds.), *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction* (Oxford 2000), pp. 96-135, esp.107ff.

3 Arr. 3.19, 5-6, Diod. 17.74.3. Curtius 6.2.15-17

4 See A.B. Bosworth, Alexander and the Iranians, JHS 100, 1980, pp. 2ff.

5 a) Alexander's Earliest Macedonian Silver, in: W.E. Metcalf (ed.), *Mnemata: Papers in Memory of Nancy Waggoner* (New York 1991), pp. 49-61;
b) Studies in the Macedonian Coinage of Alexander the Great, ANSNS 21, 1997.

6 I. Touratsoglou, Back to the Future. Alexander the Great's Silver and Gold in the Balkans: the Hoard Evidence, in: A. Burnett, U. Wartenberg, R.B. Witschonke (eds.), *Essays in Honour of Charles Hersh*, pp. 71-101 and *idem*, The Price of Power: Drachms in the Name of Alexander the Great in Greece (On the Thessaly/1993 Confiscation), *Eulimene* 1, 2000, pp. 91-118.

«The explanation for this phenomenon is undoubtedly to be sought in a large number of characteristic facts: In accordance with the general practice in the Macedonian kingdom, neither had the newly-married (*neogamoi*) Macedonians of the Asian army sent back to winter in their homeland in 334 BC, with the intention of returning to Gordion the following year,[7] nor the aged and sick veterans (*apomachoi*) who, it was decided early in the summer of 329, should return from the Oxos to their birthplace,[8] had received any financial supportśalary from Alexander, apart, of course from the *siteresion*;[9] the Greek allies, on the other hand, whether volunteers or not, were treated as mercenaries, and many of them received special treatment in terms of payment.

«In southern Greece, tetradrachms (in all probability) will have accompanied the Greek mercenaries who were dismissed by Alexander after the torching of the palace at Persepolis in summer 330 BC, and were paid a bonus totalling 2,000 talents in addition to their salary.[10] The early appearance of tetradrachms in hoards from Thessaly, indeed, is probably to be connected with the events at the river Oxus in 329 BC, when a number of Thessalian volunteers were sent home.[11]

7 Arr. I 29.4 (καὶ οἱ νεόγαμοι δὲ οἱ ἐπί Μακεδονίας σταλέντες ἐις Γόρδιον ἧκον καὶ ξὺν αὐτοῖς ἄλλη στρατειὰ καταλεχθεῖσα) - Cf. A.B. Bosworth, Macedonian Manpower under Alexander the Great, Ancient Macedonia IV, 1986, p. 118. J. Seibert, Demographische und wirtschaftliche Probleme Makedoniens in der frühen Diadochenzeit, in: Studien zur Alten Geschichte (Festschrift S. Lauffer), III, (Rome 1989), p. 843. See also R. Billows, Kings and Colonists. Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism (Leiden/New York/Köln 1995), pp. 184ff. for another viewpoint.

8 Arr. III 29.5: τῶν τε Μακεδόνων ἐπιλέξας τοὺς πρεσβυτάτους καὶ ἤδη ἀπολέμους ... ἐπ' οἴκου ἀπέστειλεν. Cf.. A.B. Bosworth, Macedonian Manpower (n. 7), pp. 120-121, and R.D. Milns, Army Pay and the Military Budget of Alexander the Great, in: W. Will (Hg.), Zu Alexander d. Gr., Festschrift G. Wirth zum 60. Geburtstag am 9.12.86 (Amsterdam 1987), p. 244. According to Curtius 7. 5,27, who is probably confusing his sources at this point, the Macedonian infantry (about four hundred according to N.G.L. Hammond, JHS 109, 1989, p. 64) were sent back *monitosque ut liberos generarent.* To these, Alexander *dedit terna denarium* (presumably tetradrachms) *milia.* Cf. J. Seibert, Demographische ... Probleme (see n. 7), p. 840 and pp. 843-844.

9 This conclusion is supported by the late appearance of tetradrachms in hoards from Macedonia. R.D. Milns, Army Pay (n. 8), p. 235, properly notes that «we have no positive evidence before the Indian campaign that specifically mentions *payment* being made to Macedonians. »

10 Arr. III 19.5-6; see also Diodorus 17. 74.3 τούς τε ὀφειλομένους μισθούς); Curtius 6. 2, 15-17; Plutarch, Alexander 42,3: τούς μεν Θετταλούς ἱππέας καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ξυμμάχους ἀποπέμπει ὀπίσω ἐπὶ θάλασσαν, τόν τε μισθόν ἀποδοὺς αὐτοῖς ἐντελῆ τὸν ξυντεταγμένον καὶ δισχίλια παρ' αὐτοῦ τάλαντα ἐπιδούς. - See also N.G.L. Hammond, Alexander's Veterans after his Death, GRBS 25, 1984, p. 53, and *idem*, The Macedonian State. The Origins, Institutions, and History, (Oxford 1992[2]), p. 212. *Idem*, Alexander the Great, King, Commander and Statesman (1994[3]), p. 170; R.D. Milns, Army Pay (*supra*, n. 10), p. 240. Cf. also R. Billows (*supra* n. 8), pp. 184ff. and A.B. Bosworth, The Legacy of Alexander. Politics, Warfare, and Propaganda under the Successors (Oxford 2002), pp. 64ff. (Macedonian Numbers at the Death of Alexander the Great).

11 Arr. III 29.5; see also Arr. V 27,5: καὶ τῶν Θεσσαλῶν τοὺς ἐθελοντὰς καταμείναντες, ἐπ ὀίκου ἀπέστειλεν. Curtius 7. 5,27 adds that Alexander gave *bina talenta equiti* (probably in tetradrachms). For these events, see Fr.L. Holt, Alexander the Great and Bactria (Leiden 1989), p. 49. According to Hammond, JHS 109, 1989, p. 64, the Thessalians sent home numbered about five hundred.

«The channelling of tetradrachms to the Peloponnese, too, especially the west, north and central areas, is undoubtedly to be connected with the confrontation in 331/330 BC between Agis, assisted by the Eleans, Arcadians, and Achaeans, and Antipater, who was supported by Alexander to the sum of at least 3,000 talents of silver.[12] The sources fail to make it clear how far this sum will have been spent on the enlisting of mercenaries (and not for the pay of Macedonians), though it seems fairly certain that this was the case.[13]

«Moreover, as early as 333 BC, in better financial condition than when he set out from Pella,[14] Alexander had sent 'an officer with money ... (probably tetradrachms) ... to recruit mercenaries'.[15]

«The fact that there is no express record in the sources of any payment of sums of money prior to 333 BC is not sufficient in itself (and from this point of view) to call into question the correctness of Price's theory, which would lead to the complete acceptance of the view of Zervos, Troxell and Le Rider.[16] The lack of any written testimony, however, does not argue in favour of Price.

«In any case, if the view advanced by H. Troxell is accepted,[17] Alexander's decision to issue coins in his name in 333/332 BC - immediately after the capture of Tarsus - is probably rather to be associated with the need for liquid funds to enlist mercenaries, than to constitute the «means to affirm his authority and ambition».[18] For it is known that «for his last years Alexander had not drawn any troops from Macedonia», and that «his needs were met not only by enlisting Balkan troops and Greek mercenaries but also by training and employing very great numbers of Asian troops in all branches of the army».[19]

II Drachms: the Price of Power

As regards the Alexander drachms and their dating towards the end of the reign and life of Alexander,[20] GLR's review of M. Thompson's main article *Paying the Mercenaries*[21], and a supplement to Fr. de Callataÿ's article, *Réflexions*

12 Arr. III 16.10: ἀργυρίου τάλαντα ἐς τρισχίλια. Cf. N.G.L. Hammond, Alexander the Great, (*supra*, n. 10), pp. 159ff. W.L.T. Adams, Antipater and Cassander. Generalship on Restricted Resources in the Fourth Century, AntWelt 10, nos. 3-4, 1984, pp. 79ff.

13 Cf. also A.B. Bosworth, Alexander the Great and the Decline of Macedonia, JHS 106, 1986, p. 8.

14 See F. Rebuffat, Alexandre le Grand et les problèmes financiers au début de son règne (été 336-printemps 335), RN 25, 1983, pp. 43-52.

15 See N.G.L. Hammond, Alexander the Great (*supra*, n. 10), 157 and J. Seibert (supra, n. 7), p. 839.

16 Cf. also F. de Callatay, RBN 128, 1982, pp. 5-25, on the late beginning of Alexander's coinage (333 BC on).

17 in: *Mnermata* (*supra*, n. 5).

18 G. Le Rider, Alexander in Asia Minor, in: Essays Charles Hersh (*supra*, n. 6), p. 55.

19 N.G.L. Hammond, Casualties and Reinforcements of Citizen Soldiers in Greece and Macedonia, JHS 109, 1989, p. 65.

20 See Ch. Hersh and H. Troxell, A 1993 Hoard of Alexander Drachms from the Near East, AJN 5-6, 1993-94.

21 in: A. Houghton *et al.*, (eds.), Festschrift für Leo Mildenberg (Wetteren 1984), pp. 241-247.

sur les ateliers d'Asie mineure d'Alexandre le Grand,[22] we may perhaps introduce another assumption, made by the present reviewer:[23]

«It was decided in 325/24 BC only to generalise the practice of making actual payments to soldiers (mercenaries) by extending payment (*misthophora*) to the veterans, although the Macedonian citizen army was, *par excellence*, an army based on the *ethnos*.[24]

«One question that needs to be investigated, however, is the reason for which it was decided to mint drachms (especially these) in addition to the tetradrachms and staters that had been in circulation for some time and were used mainly to pay the mercenaries, the production of which intensified at the newly opened mints in Asia Minor.[25]

The behaviour of the Alexander drachms as revealed by the hoards, both mixed and those containing only drachms, is in this case highly interesting. In contrast with the tetradrachms, the drachms occur in hoards from the Greek peninsula at later dates, and even in the final decade of the century (310 BC in Macedonia and Central Greece, 300 BC in Thessaly and the Peloponnese).[26]

In the overwhelming majority of cases, these issues came from the newly founded mints at Sardis, Miletos, Lampsakos, Magnesia, "Kolophon", "Teos", Mylasa (?), and Abydos (?), which scholarship dates to the period after 325/4 BC,[27] and were intended primarily for the 10,000 Macedonian veterans discharged by Alexander at the end of summer 324 BC,

22 Trésors et circulation monétaire en Anatolie antique (Paris 1994), pp. 19-35.

23 I. Touratsoglou, The Price of Power, *Eulimene* 1, 2000 (*supra*, n. 6), pp. 91-118.

24 For this, see Justinus, 11, 1, 10.

25 See the enlightening article by Fr. de Callataÿ, Des trésors royaux achéménides au monnayage d'Alexandre. Espèces immobilisées et espèces circulantes, Actes du colloque sur l'or dans l'empire achéménide, Bordeaux, mars 1989, Rev.d'Et.Anc. 91, 1989, pp. 259-273 and I.P. Touratsoglou, Στην αναζήτηση τοὺ ἑλληνιστικοῦ χρυσοὺ, μεγάλοι ἀντὶ μικρῶν καὶ πλούσιοι ἐκ πενήτων (Arr. V 27,6). in: ΜΝΕΙΑΣ ΧΑΡΙΝ, Τόμος στη μνήμη Μαίρης Σιγανίδου (Thessaloniki 1998), pp. 235-266.

26 Drachms appear in hoards from Thrace and the land of the Getai from the beginning of the last twenty years of the 4th c. BC (the proposed date of deposit of the Mahala find in IGCH is certainly too high).

27 M. Thompson, Paying the Mercenaries (*supra*, n. 21), pp. 241-247 (These men were, of course, mercenaries not veterans). Fr. de Callataÿ, Réflexions sur les ateliers d'Asie Mineure d'Alexandre le Grand (*supra*, n. 22), pp. 19-35. Y. Touratsoglou, Back to the Future (*supra*, n. 6). - M.J. Price, The Coinage in the Name of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaeus (Zurich/London 1991), who was followed by Fr. de Callataÿ, Réflexions, pp. 27-28, Ch. Hersh and H. Troxell, A 1993 Hoard (*supra*, n. 20), pp. 13-42. Ch. Hersh, Additions and Corrections to Martin J. Price's 'The Coinage in the Name of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaeus', in: R. Ashton, S. Hurter (eds.), Studies in Memory of Martin Jessop Price (London 1998), pp. 135-144, and G. Le Rider, Alexander in Asia Minor (*supra*, n. 18), pp. 49-57 (cf. also G. Le Rider, SNR 71, 1992, pp. 214-225) were the first to adduce arguments calling into question some of the attributions to specific mints proposed by M. Thompson, in: The Alexandrine Mint of Mylasa, NACQT 10, 1981, pp. 207-217, *eadem*, Alexander's Drachm Mints, I Sardis and Miletus, ANSNS 16 (New York 1983) and *eadem*, II, Lampsacus and Abydus, ANSNS 19 (New York 1991), and proceeded to check a number of dates assigned, particularly to the inaugural issues.

after the revolt at Opis,[28] and for those who at the end of 321 BC accompanied Antipater, with Philip III and the royal court on their return journey to Macedon.[29]

«These drachms (and perhaps also a sum in tetradrachms) were presumably intended for the 31,000 mercenaries from South Greece who, in the years following 323 BC, returned to their homes, leaving the newly founded cities of the East where they had been settled by the son of Philip II (about 23,000), or having been discharged by the local Macedonian satraps (8,000).[30]

Unlike the tetradrachms, the penetration of Macedonia and the rest of Greece by drachms issued in the name of Alexander tended to be somewhat later than their year of issue.

«It is significant for the numismatic policy of Alexander that drachms were preceded in hoards not only by tetradrachms but also by staters. Wherever and whenever the sources refer to the payment of Macedonian veterans or mercenaries, it is normally noted, or may be inferred, that they were paid in silver coins. We do not know how far the various bonuses - normally for discharged soldiers - were paid in gold, or whether certain currency despatches were made only in gold coins. Whatever the case, gold issues in the name of Philip II, Alexander, and Philip III (mainly staters, through more rarely multiples or subdivisions of staters) are found in the Balkans and Greece preeminently in hoards from Macedonia and Thrace. The gold staters discovered in Macedonia come from Chalkidike (Kassandreia) and East Macedonia (Amphipolis, Philippoi) and fall into two groups of hoards - one with burial dates in the interval from 325 BC to 323 BC (three hoards) and one from 315 BC to 275 BC (ten hoards), while in Thrace, hoards containing gold staters, which are undoubtedly more numerous than in Macedonia, come from the central and east areas of what is now Bulgaria (kingdom of the Odrysai) and from the east of modern Romania (Getai, Scyths). The Thracian staters fall into two groups, one with burial dates in the period 325-320/319 BC (ten hoards) and the other in the period 315-275 BC (sixteen hoards) [31].

«The late circulation of the drachms, which was a characteristic feature of the monetary history of the regions in which they have been discovered, is mainly a vivid reflection of the events in the last twenty-five years of the century; it is also a factor of the pronounced mobility that could be observable almost immediately after the death of the warrior-king, as some of the Epigoni attempted to realise their personal ambitions, with movements of

28 Arr. IV 18-19. VII 12,1-2: καὶ οὗτοι αὐτῶ ἐγένοντο ἐς μυρίους. τούτοις δὲ τὴν τε μισθοφορὰν οὐ τοῦ ἐξήκοντος ἤδη χρόνου ἔδωκεν Αλέξανδρος μόνον, ἀλλά καὶ τοῦ ἐς τὴν ἀπονόστησιν τὴν οἴκαδε ξυμβαίνοντος. ἐπέδωκεν δὲ καὶ τάλαντον ἑκάστω ὑπέρ τὴν μισθοφοράν; Diod. 17 109,2. Cf. N.G.L. Hammond, Alexander's Veterans, pp. 54-55; *idem*, the Macedonian State (*supra*, n. 10), p. 225. One of the reasons for the revolt at Opis was probably the strong discontent of the Macedonians that they had not so far been taken into account in payments - unlike, of course, the Greek and barbarian mercenaries.

29 Diod. 18 39,7: τοὺς βασιλεῖς ἀναλαβών (Antipater) καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν προῆγεν ἐπί Μακεδονίαν. Cf.. N.G.L. Hammond, Alexander's Veterans, p. 59; *idem*, The Macedonian State (*supra*, n. 10), p. 255.

30 Diod. 18 7,2 and 18 9,3. Cf. N.G.L. Hammond, Alexander's Veterans (*supra*, n. 10), p. 53. - Both Hammond, Alexander's Veterans, p. 60 and Bosworth, Macedonian Manpower (*supra*, n. 7), p. 121, mention the 3,000 revolted Macedonians of Antigonos Monophthalmos, who succeeded by violent methods in 321/320 or 320/319 in securing their dismissal and permission to return to Macedonia (see Polyain., 4, 6, 6).

31 See Y. Touratsoglou, Back to the Future (*supra*, n. 6) and *idem*, in: ΜΝΕΙΑΣ ΧΑΡΙΝ (*supra*, n. 25).

armies (mainly Macedonians, though also mercenaries) which went back and forth, as well as in circles. Movements that seem to have led to a tidal wave of money in the single direction of the Asia Minor coast. For events themselves involved a centrifugal tendency of interests in the direction of Asia.[32]

«One result of this uncertainty and fluid climate is the fact that for the period between the Lamian War and the battle of Krannon (322 BC) and the final domination by Antigonos Monophthalmos and his son Demetrios Poliorketes (302 BC) - primarily a period of realignments of power in the Balkans, with Kassander, Lysimachos and Demetrios Poliorketes taking turns as masters of the situation, and forming moving targets between East and West, North and South - the hoards from south and north Greece are rather few, the drachms they contain being confined to a limited number of issues from the early years of their circulation.

«After the decisive battle at Ipsos in Phrygia (301 BC), in contrast, and stabilisation of the situation and to some extent also the balance of forces in the multi-ethnic states wrested from the once mighty Achaemenid empire, the Balkan peninsula, and particularly Greece, was converted into a field of fierce military conflicts of a centripetal character.

One result of this intense conflict is that hoards containing drachms in the name of Alexander from south and north Greece are distinctly more numerous throughout the entire third century BC than those of the previous period, and have distinctly larger numbers of specimens. A characteristic feature is that despite their late concealment, the drachms contained in these hoards, which come almost exclusively from mints in Asia Minor, were issues both of the beginning of the last twenty five years of the 4th c. BC (the minority) and of the years 319-300 BC onwards (the majority).[33] This observation, taken together with what we have seen in the immediately preceding period, might possibly suggest that these "Alexander drachms" of the 3rd c. BC hoards - struck in the 4th c. BC - represent late imports of money from the Orient, primarily accompanying the mercenary bands that fought in Greece under the orders of the protagonists of the period, rather than already existing wealth already in the hands of locals, even in the form of the remains of pay.

«The study of a number of newly found hoards together with those analysed in the past, indicates the leading role played by drachms in the name of Alexander, preeminently as a means of exercising a policy of domination by fire and the sword, in the third century before Christ - the century of mercenaries and fortune-seekers, of the conflicting aspirations of reckless thrones, and of weary veterans of the campaign in Asia.»[34]

32 For example, the 6,000 Macedonians (part of the 10,000), transferred at Krateros's orders from Kilikia to European territory to reinforce Antipater in Thessaly before the battle of Krannon (322 BC), and later moved forwards to meet the Aetolians (322/321 BC) were ultimately obliged to return to Asia for further adventures (cf. N.G.L. Hammond, The Macedonian State, pp. 248ff.). Cf. also R. Billows (*supra*, n. 7), pp. 184ff.

33 GLR (JS 1986, pp. 27-28) arrives at a similar conclusion about the presence of Alexander tetradrachms and drachms struck in 301-294 BC in hoards from Asia Minor with burial dates in the decade 240-230 BC (cf. also G. Le Rider, Sur le frai de certaines monnaies anciennes et contemporaines, Mélanges offerts à André Tuilier, pp. 77ff.).

34 GLR 's comment (JS 1986, 27) on the circulation of Alexander drachms in Asia Minor «au IIIe siècle, en Asie Mineure et dans l'Orient séleucide, lorsque les transactions comportaient un paiement en drachmes, celles-ci étaient dans leur très grande majorité des monnaies aux types d'Alexandre» is not completely confirmed for Greece, with regard neither to the number of hoards, nor with the number of coins of this category they contain. In Greece at this period, not a few hoards also contain issues of the cities; see Y.

III Macedonia: the Motherland

It is reasonable to ask what kind and category of coins were minted in Macedonia in the period between Alexander's ascent to the throne (336 BC) and his departure for Asia Minor (334 BC). GLR correctly asserts that the young leader continued to produce silver and gold coins in the name of his father. To the beginning of his reign and prior to his adventure in Asia, must belong the apparently small issue of tetradrachms and of drachms with an eagle on the reverse.[35] It does not seem likely to the present reviewer that the 'Zeus/eagle' coins could have been minted «plus tard par les soins d'Antipatros, juste après la mort d'Alexandre».[36]

The evidence provided by hoards does not prove that the gold and silver of Philip circulated regularly in Asia Minor. It is thus reasonable to presume, as is asserted by GLR, that the various and many needs of the Macedonian army up until the issue of the first tetradrachms of Attic standard, after November 333 BC, had to be dealt with, obviously not without some risk, by the expected flow of money from the enemy or from the contributions of the liberated Greek cities in Asia Minor.

In fact, «the quantities of precious metals, in the form of coins, unminted gold and silver, or even in objects referred to in the sources as occupier's trophies of the advancing Macedonian army into the depths of the Persian land, were by no means insignificant. On the contrary, they came in unprecedented quantities. Even though the occupation of Sardis in the summer of 334 BC constituted Alexander's first gallant attempt at solving the acute economic problem he had been facing even before the landing in Asia Minor, what followed was beyond all expectation. In addition to the 50 talents that Aspendos was forced to pay as punishment and the 200 talents from Soli following the events in Damascus in November 333, 2,600 talents found their way to the royal treasury in the form of silver coins (approximately four million tetradrachms' worth) and 500 talents in silver. An influx of money was also achieved with the sale of 3,000 citizens of Tyre as slaves (332 BC). However, the really large quantities were to follow: after the events at Arbela, in October of 331 BC, 3,000 talents in silver coins; at Susa, in the fall of 331, 40,000 talents of unminted gold and silver, and 9,000 talents in Darics; after the events at Persepolis, in the winter of 331/330, 120,000 talents of unminted gold and silver, and, after Pasargades, in the same winter, 6,000 talents.»[37]

Touratsoglou, Back to the Future (*supra*, n. 6). Cf. also Fr. de Callataÿ, Un trésor de drachmes aux types d'Alexandre le Grand conservé au Cabinet des Médailles à Bruxelles, RBN 129, 1983, pp. 23-60.

35 See most recently U. Wartenberg, The Alexander-Eagle Hoard: Thessaly 1992, NC 157, 1997, pp. 179-188 who, however, makes no attempt at dating.

36 G. Le Rider, Histoire économique et monétaire de l'Orient hellénistique, Annuaire du Collège de France 1995-1996 (Paris 1996), p. 834.

37 I.P. Touratsoglou in: ΜΝΕΙΑΣ ΧΑΡΙΝ (*supra*, n. 25). Cf. also R. Knapowski, Die Finanzen Alexander's des Grossen, in: Fr. Altheim, R. Stiehl (eds.), Geschichte Mittelasiens im Altertum (Berlin 1970), pp. 235-247 and Fr. Holt, Alexander the Great and the Spoils of War, Ancient Macedonia VI/1 (Thessaloniki 1999), pp. 499-506.

Contrary to M. Price's assertions, most recently expressed in *The Coinage of Alexander*, it would seem that for a long time after 331/330 BC, when the town was seized by Alexander, the mint of Babylon, under the direction of Mazaeos, issued only silver tetradrachms (the so-called «lion coins») of Attic standard, and double and simple gold darics. While the minting of the lion tetradrachms and imitations thereof did not stop at Mazaeos's death in 328/327 BC, the gold coins were issued even after 323 BC. Harpalos, the γαζοφύλαξ, may have been responsible for producing them in Babylonia from 330 until 325 BC.[38] At the same time, imitations of Athenian tetradrachms were issued in some unknown area in Babylonia during Alexander's lifetime.

In any event, even though Alexander remained in the areas between the Euphrates and Tigris rivers for about six years, it does not appear that he set up new mints there for striking of staters and tetradrachms in his name. This may be explained by the fact that in these areas the concept of currency in the form of coinage was unknown to the local population, since coins that ended up there were used solely as amounts of precious metal.

Accordingly, the production of royal coins at Babylon must have begun after 326 BC, or even 325, as GLR correctly asserts. They were gold staters and silver tetradrachms with a few dekadrachms, all of the usual type. However, the so-called «Poros dekadrachms» of Poros and «tetradrachms of the Indian archers», of Attic weight, pose a problem both in terms of their date and in terms of their attribution to a specific mint in Babylonia or in the area east of the Tigris. In discussing the certainly problematic composition of the 1973 hoard from the surroundings of Babylon,[39] GLR considers the particular issues, probably the products of the Babylon mint, to be later than June 323 BC, thus opposing the view that they were minted during Alexander's lifetime, as Price had suggested. GLR accepts the theory of R.J. Lane Fox who thinks that the coins were produced at Susa.[40] In P. Bernard's opinion the Poros dekadrachms and the archer tetradrachms are the work of Eudamus,[41] satrap of the area of the Punjab (318/317 BC) and «leader of the elephants».[42] W. Hollstein, however, proposes that the prince Taxiles is responsible for minting these coins, a view supported by the poor technical quality of the coins and the absence of Alexander's name thereon.[43]

In an admittedly interesting book, whose contents, however, could easily have been condensed to the length of an article,[44] Fr. Holt goes extensively

38 Apparently Babylon was not the only mint which produced double darics. GLR suggests there were centres in Arachosia and Baktriana.

39 M. Price, Circulation at Babylon in 323 B.C., in: *Mnemata* (see note 5), pp. 69-72.

40 R.J. Lane Fox, Text and Image: Alexander the Great, coins and elephants, Bull.Inst.-Class.Studies 41, 1996, pp. 87-108.

41 P. Bernard, Le monnayage d'Eudamos, satrape grec du Pandjab et maître des éléphants, Orientalia Josephi Tucci Memoriae dicata (Rome 1985), pp. 65-94.

42 Plutarch, *Eumenes*, 16,3.

43 W. Hollstein, «Taxiles» Prägung für Alexander den Grossen, SNR 68, 1989, pp. 5-17.

44 Fr. Holt, Alexander the Great and the Mystery of the Elephant Medaillons (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 2003).

through, *inter alia*, the international bibliography on the subject and reaches the following conclusion after a detailed study of all the recommendations: the dekadrachms, unique in terms of illustration, and the accompanying tetradrachms must have been minted in small quantities and under less than ideal conditions from the point of minting as well as weight between 326 and 324 B.C., in other words, between the battle at the river Hydaspis and the return of the expedition army to Babylon.[45] In Holt's view (p. 147) these coins constitute special editions «for veterans of the Indian campaign, no doubt authorised by Alexander and produced as best as could be managed on the road in the East, then carried back to Mesopotamia. They were simply not intended to be circulating coins of the usual imperial varieties, but rather as rare commemorative medallions, or *aristeia*, valuable rewards for distinguished military service».[46] They would have been used, if not during the games that took place in the recently founded cities of Boucephala and Nikaia[47] in the area of the last battle, then at least during the festivities that followed in Babylon.

If Holt's radical approach is valid, and it would appear to be so for many reasons, then Bernard's view regarding posthumous minting with a thematic reference, in part anyway, to a «culte militaire» which (*apud* GLR, pp. 332-333) «aurait put être implanté, à des fins politiques, dans l'armée qui stationnait à ce moment-là sur les bords de l'Euphrate et du Tigre», does not make sense.

In fact, this argument raises the point that such a theory fails to provide a satisfactory explanation for the presence of the images on the sides of the dekadrachms. These images are related to the reason, which is a great earthly victory, and to the result, which is the deification of the victor.

> «... it was [namely] the silver issues corresponding with five [and two shekels] struck in Babylon or, more likely, Susa in the period 326-323 BC, or more precisely in 324-323 BC, that clearly proclaimed the new *ethos* through their obverse and reverse representations. Not only did these coins immortalize a historic moment in a manner preeminently that of narrative epic - in the scene of the confrontation between Poros and the Macedonian - but

45 O. Mørkholm, Early Hellenistic Coinage (Cambridge/New York 1991), pp. 52-54 as well as N.G.L. Hammond, Alexander the Great (*supra*, n. 10), p. 216, and A. Stewart, Faces of Power. Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics (Berkeley/Los Angeles/Oxford 1993), p. 48, W. Völker-Janssen, Kunst und Gesellschaft an den Höfen Alexanders d.Gr. und seiner Nachfolger (München 1993), p. 146 and Billows (*supra*, n. 7), p. 27 support the view that these coins were struck during Alexander's lifetime.

46 Although O. Mørkholm (see previous n.), p. 53 points out that the weights of these coins did not seem to follow the Attic standard («the weights of the tetradrachms are quite irregular and fall well behind the Attic standard»), he maintains that they could have been issued at the Susa mint, which probably began to operate around 323 BC. He thinks they were produced with a view to Alexander's intense interest «in celebrating his eastern campaign after his return to Persia and Mesopotamia in 324, when games and festivals were arranged in order to wipe out the memory of the appalling march through the Carmanian desert». A.B. Bosworth, The Indian Campaigns, 327-325 BC, in: J.Roisman (ed.), Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great (Leiden/London 2003), p. 165, attributes the dekadrachms and tetradrachms to the mint of Babylon during the king's lifetime.

47 Bosworth, The Indian Campaigns (n. 46), 165.

on the reverse they embodied the metaphysical ritual, conducted somewhere between reality and myth, of the triumphant deification of the victor outside space and time. Fully equipped with conventional human-scale arms (spear and sword) but also with a divine weapon (the thunderbolt), the victor was both the triumphant warrior and supreme political leader.»[48]

The background to this glorification and deification may be sought in the Egypt of 331 BC, at the oracle of Siwa, or in the Bactria of 327 BC, during the *proskynesis* episode. Nevertheless, its actual attested realization, accompanied by its reflection in the iconographic record, thanks to Alexander himself, could only have taken place in a favourable environment, such as India. Many examples of the new coins are overstruck, which indicates haste in production. However, the unprecedented triumphalistic iconography, whereby *hubris* is rendered as a quasi-divine ἔπαθλον at the end of a titanic effort on the fringes of the inhabited world show that the act was also deliberate.

V Mints: Certainty and Ambiguity

With regard to the intricate and complex question of the attribution of Alexander's Macedonian tetradrachms, these have in the past been grouped depending on the symbols on their reverse in three series (series 1-3: Head of Heracles/ Enthroned Zeus), whilst the so-called fourth series depicts an eagle. The three series can be attributed, with varying degrees of certainty, to two or even three mints at Pella, Amphipolis and Aegae.

A small sample from the coins was analysed by means of energy dispersive x-ray fluorescence and offered some interesting information.[49] «Bismuth appears to be one of the most important elements related with the original type of the ore, especially when correlated with the copper and silver content». Furthermore, «bismuth is a good parent ore indicator for silver coins and high bismuth content may be indicative of a bismuth rich ore». Thus the following conclusions arise.

(a) The analysis of the elements of some of the tetradrachms examined, regarding which Price's and Troxell's opinions differ as to whether they belonged to the mint of Pella (Price, *Alexander,* issue 243), showed that these coins most probably originated from the mint of Amphipolis.

(b) Price thinks that his issue *Alexander* 57 may not have originated at Amphipolis, whilst Troxell is sure it did. However, it should now probably be attributed to another mint.

48 I. Touratsoglou, The Alexander of the Coins, The Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation (Nicosia 2000), pp. 62-63.

49 See N. Kallithrakas-Kontos, A.A. Katsanos, J. Touratsoglou, Trace Elements Analysis of Alexander the Great's Silver Tetradrachms minted in Macedonia, NIM B 171, 2000, pp. 342-349. M. Kallithrakas-Kontos, A. Katsanos, G. Vlamaki, I. Touratsoglou, Composition and Origin of Alexander the Great's Tetradrachms, Obolos 4, 2000, pp. 39-345.

(c) Finally, a Babylon tetradrachm, included in this group, is rich in bismuth, a characteristic of the Amphipolis mint.

VI Conclusions: Beyond the Illusion; beyond Vanity?

> « Il semble bien qu'il faille renoncer à prêter à Alexandre l'ambition de créer une 'monnaie d'empire', car il n¿imposa pas l'usage de ses tetradrachmes d'argent ni de ses statères d'or dans les immenses territoires conquis. Les provinces orientales à l'est du Tigre restèrent dépourvues d¿atelier monétaire. En revanche, la tradition littéraire souligne qu'il utilisa au cours de ses dix ans de campagnes les espèces accumulées dans les trésors du dernier roi achéménide, en particulier les dariques d'or. Les statères d'argent frappés sous le reigne par Balacros en Cilicie (Tarse) ou par Mazdaï à Babylone n'ont guère de point commun avec la monnaie de type macédonien. Il est probable aussi qu'une quantité de tétradrachmes pseudo-athéniens continuèrent à circuler, en partie produits, peut-être, en Babylonie. Si l'aboutissement de cette politique tolérante - la frappe de deux monnayages distincts, l'un, macédonien, destiné aux régions occidentales du royaume, l'autre, constitué de nouvelles monnaies d'or et d'argent convenant mieux aux transactions dans la partie orientale - est postérieur à la mort prématurée d'Alexandre, l'idée était en germe dans ses initiatives monétaires toujours adaptées aux conditions locales, aux circonstances et aux imprévus de la conquête ».

This conclusion, by Hélène Nicolet-Pierre,[50] was also reached by GLR, although the argumentation is dated and the issue has been adequately analysed in the past. Such a confirmation, apart from the economic and numismatic dimensions that it possesses, is to be viewed in the general light of the policy of fusion. This characterized the later deeds of the young visionary Alexander. He was a young dreamer, completely alone in the midst of his universal ideals, in a dangerous no-man's land between the severe Olympian austerity of the Classical and the Dionysiac inspiration of approaching Hellenism.

* * *

GLR's recently published book is a major addition to his whole invaluable œuvre on Alexander, and it most certainly offers a complete exploration of the structure of Alexander's economic and numismatic policy, something hitherto missing from the international bibliography on the topic. Nevertheless, the book would have been even more complete and useful, had a bibliography, albeit only a select bibliography, been included.

Finally, there is the question of the illustration of the book cover, which depicts Alexander on the triumphant chariot as another Louis XIV from the later Baroque. Such a picture certainly makes clear the impact this earthly god has had throughout the course of history, thereby setting an example for later leaders. However, this dimension goes beyond the scope of the book and could easily mislead the unwary reader.

Dr. I.P. Touratsoglou
c/o Numismatic Museum
GR-106 82 Athens

[50] H. Nicolet-Pierre, Numismatique grèque (Paris 2002), p. 210.

Arthur Houghton and Catharine Lorber

Seleucid Coins, a comprehensive catalogue, with metrological tables by Brian Kritt

Part I, Seleucos I through Antiochus III
Vol. I: Introduction, maps and catalogue (488 p.);
Vol. II: Appendices, indices and plates
(300 p., 101 pl.)

American Numismatic Society - Classical Numismatic Group
(Lancaster/London 2002).

E.T. Newell avait publié sur le monnayage des premiers rois séleucides (de Séleucos I jusqu'à Antiochos III, mort en 187) deux ouvrages magistraux: *Eastern Seleucid Mints* (1938) [*ESM*] et *Western Seleucid Mints* (1941) [*WSM*]. Il est inutile de faire l'éloge de ces deux livres. Tous ceux qui, de près ou de loin, se sont intéressés aux monnaies des sept premiers rois de la dynastie (j'inclus dans la liste Antiochos Hiérax) ont mesuré l'énorme travail accompli par Newell et admiré le génie dont il avait fait preuve dans ses classements.

Soixante ans après la parution de *WSM*, chacun, cependant, sentait le besoin d'une mise à jour de l'œuvre du grand numismate américain. Les deux volumes de *Seleucid Coins* élaborés par Houghton et Lorber répondent à cette attente. Il était bon, en effet, d'ajouter aux données réunies par Newell la documentation considérable apparue depuis 1941: On sait combien d'informations nouvelles ont été fournies par les découvertes fortuites de trésors qui se sont multipliées depuis la fin de la deuxième guerre mondiale et par les trouvailles faites dans les chantiers de fouilles qui, eux aussi, sont devenus plus nombreux en Orient au cours des dernières décennies. Tous ces apports ont permis aux spécialistes de confirmer ou d'infirmer certaines attributions de Newell et d'affiner sa chronologie. Les publications étaient devenues si foisonnantes et si dispersées qu'il commençait à devenir difficile de maîtriser la bibliographie. *Seleucid Coins* rend sur ce point un signalé service. Les auteurs semblent avoir tout lu, tout enregistré. Ils ont passé en revue la multitude des catalogues de ventes publiques. Ils n'ont apparemment rien oublié et nous devons leur être reconnaissants de mettre à notre disposition un outil de travail bibliographiquement aussi parfait.

Seleucid Coins n'est cependant pas un simple complément de *ESM - WSM*. L'œuvre de Newell a été complètement refondue. Bien que le laps de temps étudié soit resté exactement le même (Séleucos I – Antiochos III) et bien que les principales séries monétaires demeurent attribuées aux même ateliers, *Seleucid Coins,* à beaucoup de points de vue, constitue un ouvrage original.

La différence la plus évidente par rapport à *ESM-WSM* est le classement des monnaies par règnes, et non, comme l'avait fait Newell, par ateliers. Newell, dans tous ses écrits, avait mis l'accent sur la notion d'atelier, comme en témoi-

Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau 83. 2004. S. 193-199.

gnent ses recherches si fructueuses sur le monnayage au nom et aux types d'Alexandre. Tout naturellement, il avait appliqué ce mode de classement dans sa présentation des émissions séleucides. Ainsi, le chapitre I d'*ESM*, est intitulé «Seleucia on the Tigris» et rassemble toutes les séries, de Séleucos I à Antiochos III, que Newell avait cru pouvoir attribuer à ce centre de production; le chapitre II s'intitule «Babylon», le chapitre III «Susa», etc. Un tel classement a des avantages: il permet de mieux apprécier les continuités et les évolutions au fil des règnes et, par conséquent, de mieux comprendre le bien-fondé de telle ou telle attribution. – Dans *ESM*, Newell était parti de la Babylonie (Séleucie du Tigre, Babylone) et avait terminé par les ateliers les plus orientaux (Bactres, Hécatompylos-Artacoana); dans *WSM*, il avait commencé par la Mésopotamie (Carrhae, Édesse, Nisibe), avait poursuivi par la Syrie (Antioche) et la Cilicie (Tarse) et avait fini par l'Asie Mineure occidentale. Cet ordre, en ce qui concerne Séleucos I, n'était pas sans logique: ce prince, dont les possessions se limitaient au départ à la Babylonie, s'était d'abord élancé vers l'Est à la conquête des Hautes Satrapies, puis, se tournant vers l'Ouest, avait annexé successivement la Syrie du Nord, la Cilicie et l'Asie Mineure.

Houghton et Lorber ont, à l'inverse de Newell, opté pour une présentation par règnes, estimant qu'un lecteur non spécialiste trouverait ainsi la consultation de leur recueil plus aisée. À l'intérieur de chacun des règnes, les ateliers sont classés d'Ouest en Est, pratiquement dans l'ordre que B.V. Head (en s'inspirant de la Géographie de Strabon) avait retenu pour son *Historia Numorum.* Cela crée une certaine gêne quand il s'agit de Séleucos I: le catalogue commence en effet par les ateliers de Pergame, de Sardes et de Magnésie du Méandre, cités que le souverain séleucide n'a conquises que dans les derniers mois de son règne et où il n'a donc pu frapper qu'un monnayage exigu. Cette gêne disparaît du reste quand on passe aux règnes suivants, sous lesquels l'Asie Mineure occidentale a joué monétairement un rôle important. On ne peut que donner raison aux auteurs d'avoir voulu faciliter l'utilisation de leur livre en l'ordonnant selon une présentation quelque peu artificielle, mais qui a le mérite de la simplicité et de la clarté. Notons que plusieurs cartes permettent de situer géographiquement les villes du royaume et les ateliers monétaires (p. xl, 10, 164, 170, 234, 290, 362); ces cartes, sur lesquelles sont portées des indications générales de relief, remplacent utilement les deux cartes blanches de *ESM* et *WSM*.

Une autre différence, cette fois de caractère méthodologique, frappe le lecteur qui, après avoir pratiqué *ESM* et *WSM,* se plonge dans *Seleucid Coins*: c'est l'abondance, dans ce dernier ouvrage, des ateliers incertains, des émissions non attribuées. Newell avait un remarquable esprit synthétique; l'objectif qu'il poursuivait était de répartir les monnaies séleucides entre des ateliers bien localisés, en laissant le moins possible de séries incertaines. Beaucoup de ses classements sont entièrement convaincants, et n'ont pas été contestés par Houghton et Lorber. Newell s'était fondé en effet sur des critères solides : lieux de trouvaille des monnaies de bronze (dont on sait que la circulation était limitée), communautés de coins entre les émissions, identités de monogrammes et de

symboles, ressemblances indiscutables de style, particularités de fabrique, témoignage de certains trésors. Parfois cependant, cédant à son intuition, Newell était allé trop loin : il avait classé à tel atelier une émission, ou un groupe d'émissions, avec comme seul argument une similitude «de style et de fabrique» qui ne frappait pas le lecteur et le laissait perplexe, - mais cependant disposé à suivre Newell, tant était grande la force persuasive de ce savant.

Dans mon corpus de l'atelier d'Antioche de Séleucos I à Antiochos V (publié en 1999), je me suis efforcé de mettre à part quelques émissions données dans *WSM* à cet atelier, mais qui, me semblait-il, ne s'intégraient pas de façon évidente dans la série qu'on pouvait considérer avec une quasi-certitude comme antiochéenne. Cela ne voulait pas dire que Newell avait eu tort dans tous les cas: il s'agissait simplement de souligner que certaines attributions n'allaient pas de soi. – J'ai essayé de montrer ailleurs (dans un article paru en 2000) que Newell avait conféré à l'atelier d'Apamée de Syrie une importance monétaire qu'il n'avait probablement pas eue.

Aussi ai-je été très satisfait de constater que Houghton et Lorber avaient fait preuve, dans ce domaine, d'une extrême prudence. Les utilisateurs de *Seleucid Coins* seront surpris, et peut-être même, au premier abord, déconcertés, de trouver dans ce recueil tant d'«uncertain mints», d'«uncertain issues», d'«unattributed issues». Ils se rendront rapidement compte que ce n'est pas une régression par rapport à Newell, mais au contraire un constat objectif de ce qui peut être regardé comme acquis et de ce qui n'est pas sûr: n'est-ce pas le plus grand service qui puisse être rendu à tous ceux qui veulent s'informer sur le monnayage séleucide et en particulier aux historiens de l'époque hellénistique? Je reviens sur le cas d'Apamée. Le territoire de cette cité abritait un camp militaire dont l'importance transparaît dans les récits des auteurs anciens: c'est là notamment qu'était regroupées la cavalerie et la redoutable arme de guerre que constituaient les éléphants. Faut-il, de ce fait, créditer Apamée du monnayage de tétradrachmes et de bronzes que lui ont attribué Newell et, à sa suite, d'autres spécialistes? Les arguments de Newell en faveur de cette attribution sont faibles et il est salutaire que *Seleucid Coins* ait préféré, pour ce groupe de pièces, parler d' «uncertain mint(s)».

Bien que le nombre des ateliers incertains ait considérablement augmenté, un correctif a été apporté. Houghton et Lorber, dans beaucoup de cas, ont pu indiquer dans quelle région du royaume il fallait probablement chercher la localisation de tel atelier incertain ou de tel ensemble d'ateliers incertains. Prenons par exemple le monnayage du premier souverain, Séleucos I. On commence (selon l'ordre géographique adopté) par l'atelier de Pergame. Vient ensuite la rubrique «Unattributed tetradrachm with Pergamene types»; puis nous passons aux ateliers de Sardes, de Magnésie et de Tarse; à cet endroit est placée une émission non attribuée originaire de Cilicie ou de Syrie du Nord; les ateliers syriens (Séleucie de Piérie, Antioche, etc.) sont décrits à leur tour; c'est alors qu'apparaît un groupe important d'ateliers incertains, qui semblent avoir fonctionné en Cappadoce, en Syrie du Nord ou en Mésopotamie: même si on eût aimé connaître le nom de ces ateliers, on a au moins la satisfaction de savoir

dans quelle partie de l'empire il convient probablement de les chercher. La suite du catalogue est organisée selon ce principe, que je juge pour ma part excellent.

On posera la question: pourquoi subsiste-t-il un aussi grand nombre d'incertitudes? L'une des raisons est à chercher dans les lacunes de notre documentation: il arrive qu'un nouveau trésor apporte une variété inédite qui, parfois, établit un lien entre une émission attribuée et une émission qui ne l'est pas. Certes, ces heureux hasards ne sont pas très fréquents, mais ils font prendre conscience de tout ce qui reste à découvrir.

Une autre raison peut être envisagée. Tous les règnes ont été marqués par des campagnes militaires. Ainsi Antiochos III, monté sur le trône en 223, a dû aussitôt réprimer la révolte de Molon; il a ensuite tenté, sans succès, de reprendre aux Ptolémées la Phénicie et la Syrie du sud; il s'est dirigé alors contre Achaios, en rébellion lui aussi; il a entrepris en 212 sa fameuse expédition en Orient, qui a duré plusieurs années; en 200, il a réussi à vaincre Ptolémée V et à s'emparer de la Phénicie et de la Syrie méridionale; la fin de son règne a été occupée par son action militaire en Asie Mineure, qui se termina par sa défaite devant les Romains en 189. On peut présumer que, au cours de ces diverses campagnes, le roi a eu de temps en temps besoin d'un supplément d'argent monnayé et qu'il a fait frapper monnaie là où il se trouvait, soit dans une ville qu'il traversait, soit à l'intérieur de son camp. S'il en a vraiment été ainsi, on comprend qu'il soit impossible de localiser exactement les lieux d'émission. Une indication de région, comme en donnent Houghton et Lorber, est ce qu'on peut attendre de plus précis.

L'esprit critique des deux auteurs se manifeste à tout instant, et le lecteur prend conscience de la complexité des problèmes que posent certaines attributions. J'en donnerai comme exemple leur analyse des monnaies au type de l'éléphant qui furent frappées par Antiochos III: l'exposé de la p. 377 remet en cause les classements antérieurs, en montrant que ces pièces proviennent probablement d'un plus grand nombre d'ateliers qu'on ne l'avait cru.

Dans un cas au moins, Houghton et Lorber semblent avoir été moins circonspects que d'ordinaire. Adoptant les conclusions de Kritt, il ont classé à Aï Khanoum, sur l'Oxus (Amou Daria) une importante série d'émissions (voir p. 203-207) que Newell avait placée à Bactres. Aï Khanoum (on en ignore encore le nom ancien) devient ainsi le principal atelier monétaire bactrien de Séleucos I et Antiochos I, reléguant au second plan Bactres, la capitale de la satrapie. Une telle classification surprend, car elle va contre la vraisemblance historique. P. Bernard, le meilleur connaisseur d'Aï Khanoum et de l'Asie centrale, éprouve une forte réticence à l'égard de ce bouleversement monétaire. Bactres (Zariaspa sous les Perses) occupait en effet une position clé en Bactriane, sur la grand-route qui arrivait d'Ecbatane et continuait vers Taxila. Aï Khanoum, au contraire, était située très à l'écart de cette voie de passage empruntée par tous les voyageurs anciens et modernes (c'est pourquoi le site n'a été découvert que très tardivement). La plaine intérieure dont la cité exploitait les ressources

était environnée de hauteurs et l'un des rôles d'Aï Khanoum était de surveiller les passes d'où pouvaient surgir à tout moment des tribus nomades: on a du mal à croire que cette ville relativement isolée ait supplanté Bactres monétairement.

Une idée reçue est que les vestiges d'époque hellénistique sont quasi inexistants à Bactres. Cette idée doit être révisée aujourd'hui. Des circonstances récentes ont provoqué la mise au jour de fragments d'architecture et de sculpture qui attestent une implantation des Grecs à cet endroit dès le début du IIIe siècle. Notons qu'Euthydème, après une première défaite devant Antiochos III, organisa à Bactres-Zariaspa la défense de son royaume: perdre Bactres eût été pour lui perdre l'essentiel de la Bactriane.

Houghton et Lorber nous ont donné la primeur d'une intéressante monnaie de bronze entrée dans la collection de Kritt, qui en prépare la publication détaillée (n°286 A). La pièce porte le monogramme caractéristique du groupe que Newell classait à Bactres et que Kritt donne à Aï Khanoum; on voit au droit un taureau cornupète à visage humain barbu (il s'agit donc d'un dieu-fleuve) et au revers une ancre encadrée des noms de Séleucos et d'Antiochos (voir vol. 2, pl. 68; on aimerait avoir un agrandissement du droit, pour mieux discerner les traits du dieu-fleuve). Selon Kritt, dont l'opinion est rapportée par Houghton et Lorber (cf. p. 103), cette monnaie confirmerait l'attribution à Aï Khanoum qu'il propose: elle ne peut pas, à son avis, avoir été frappée à Bactres, qui était loin de l'Oxus et de tout autre fleuve; elle convient au contraire à Aï Khanoum, située sur l'Oxus. On ne peut pas approuver ce propos: Zariaspa-Bactres était bâtie sur les bords d'un gros affluent de l'Oxus, qui avait donné son nom à Zariaspa (Strabon, XI, 2; Pline, VI, 18,48; Ptolémée, VI, 11, 2, nomme le fleuve Zariaspis):[1] un dieu-fleuve n'était donc en aucune façon déplacé à Bactres; la monnaie en question ne peut pas servir d'argument en faveur d'une attribution à Aï Khanoum.

Les types des monnaies séleucides sont de façon générale aisément identifiables, à de rares exceptions près, comme par exemple le personnage assis sur des rochers, tenant l'*ankh*[2] de la main droite (Séleucos I, Antioche, n°25). Un autre type a été souvent commenté: des tétradrachmes et des fractions frappés à Suse sous Séleucos I (n°s 173-176) sont ornés au droit d'une tête casquée; le casque est couvert d'une peau de panthère et on voit deux cornes et une oreille de taureau; une peau de panthère est nouée aussi autour du cou; on a reconnu dans cette représentation tantôt la tête d'Alexandre, tantôt celle de Séleucos; Houghton et Lorber ne se prononcent pas ou plutôt, ils décrivent cette tête comme celle d'un héros évoquant à la fois Alexandre, Séleucos et Dionysos.

1 Le cours inférieur du Zariaspis est asséché aujourd'hui par l'irrigation: telle semble avoir été la situation déjà dans l'Antiquité; quoi qu'il en soit, le fleuve était bien connu: Ptolémée en parle avec des détails; remarquons que nous ignorons quelle était l'étendue du territoire de Bactres; il allait peut-être jusqu'à l'Oxus; mais de toute façon l'existence du Zariaspis était plus que suffisante pour susciter le type d'un dieu-fleuve.

2 L'*ankh*, décrit parfois comme une croix ansée (*crux ansata*), se composait d'une croix surmontée d'un cercle; il symbolisait la force vitale.

Le catalogue comprend 1295 numéros et 44 additions (Ad1-Ad44). L'existence d'une numérotation continue (présente aussi dans *ESM* et *WSM*), facilite la consultation de l'ouvrage. De façon générale, les auteurs ont eu le souci d'être clairs et ils y sont parvenus: on leur en sait gré. Comme ils l'ont bien indiqué dans leur introduction, *Seleucid Coins* n'est pas un corpus. Cependant, les mentions de coins sont fréquentes: soit que Houghton et Lorber, pour tel atelier, aient eu sous la main un corpus déjà existant et ils ont alors mentionné le nombre de coins répertoriés dans ce corpus; soit qu'ils aient souligné une communauté de coin permettant de régler un problème d'attribution ou de chronologie. Newell, dans beaucoup de cas avait fait une véritable étude de coins et les informations qu'il a fournies demeurent précieuses.

Le volume I de *Seleucid Coins* est consacré au catalogue, qui pour chaque règne, est précédé d'un exposé portant sur des événements historiques, sur la répartition du monnayage, sur l'iconographie; à l'intérieur du catalogue lui même, chaque atelier a droit à une brève notice explicative. Le volume s'ouvre par des considérations générales et un guide du lecteur; il se termine par trois annexes (pièces omises dans le catalogue; monnayage de Séleucos I en Babylonie entre 320 et 315; trésor trouvé près de Quetta, Pakistan occidental, ancienne Arachosie).

Le volume II est très riche lui aussi. Il commence par des considérations sur les monnaies de bronze. C. Lorber, auteur de cet exposé, explique pourquoi les diverses dénominations ont été désignées d'une façon neutre, par des lettres, ce qui me paraît très sage. Le problème en effet est de savoir quelle a été la dénomination ayant eu la valeur du chalque. Les marques de valeur qui apparaissent, dans certains ateliers, sous Antiochos IV, Timarque, Démétrios I, Alexandre Balas (et Mithridate I) suscitent de nombreuses interrogations et n'autorisent pas à dire quel était le chalque de Séleucos I. Cet exposé de C. Lorber est suivi de tables métrologiques établies par Kritt: elles sont parlantes et suggestives: on peut suivre (jusqu'à la fin du règne d'Antiochos III) les vicissitudes métrologiques de ce qu'on peut regarder comme la même dénomination, par exemple la dénomination B ou la dénomination C, que Newell appelait respectivement «double» et «unité». Indiquons que, dans leur catalogue, les auteurs ont pris soin de noter, pour chaque module de bronze, le poids maximum et le poids minimum des exemplaires connus, ainsi que le poids modal; ils ont en outre, ce dont il faut les louer, spécifié le plus grand et le plus petit diamètre des pièces de chacun des modules décrits.

La suite du volume II se compose de plusieurs rubriques: classement et interprétation des contremarques apposées sur les monnaies de bronze; liste des trésors; tableau synoptique de la production monétaire par règnes, puis par ateliers; bibliographie; table de concordance entre *ESM-WSM* et *Seleucid Coins*; index des types; index des marques de contrôle; index des légendes remarquables; index des contremarques relevées sur les monnaies de bronze; liste des illustrations celles-ci couvrent 101 planches, qui sont aussi bonnes que les techniques actuelles de reproduction le permettent. – En ce qui concerne les contremarques, les deux auteurs se sont demandé dans quelles circonstances les

autorités monétaires ont décidé de recouvrir à cette pratique (p. 41-45) : leurs réflexions sont pertinentes, mais il ne faut pas perdre de vue que la fonction fondamentale des contremarques sur les monnaies de bronze était de donner cours à des pièces qui, sans la contremarque, n'auraient pas été acceptées.

Seleucid Coins est un grand livre, agréablement présenté, facile à consulter, d'une érudition irréprochable et doté d'index multiples et bien faits. Les spécialistes de l'histoire séleucide utiliseront avec bonheur un instrument de travail d'une telle qualité.

Je terminerai par une mise en garde, que j'avais formulée déjà à propos de *ESM* et *WSM*. Un ouvrage comme *Seleucid Coins* peut donner l'impression que le monnayage Séleucide en argent et en or a été produit en amples quantités, répondant aux besoins de l'immense empire créé par Séleucos. La réalité est autre. L'étude de la circulation monétaire à l'intérieur du royaume, rendue possible grâce au témoignage des trésors, révèle que, pendant la période couverte par *Seleucid Coins*, et encore plus tard, les espèces royales en métal précieux n'ont occupé que le second rang par rapport à l'ensemble des pièces étrangères, parmi lesquelles les alexandres se sont distingués tout particulièrement. Les drachmes alexandrines, notamment, ont envahi au IIIe siècle le marché séleucide, ce qui explique le très petit nombre de drachmes frappées à cette époque par les rois. Le monnayage d'argent et d'or des Séleucides ne doit pas être isolé des autres numéraires qui l'ont complété.

Georges Le Rider
Collège de France
F-75004 Paris

Roland Baldus (Hrsg.)

Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum Deutschland. Staatliche Münzsammlung München

28. Heft. Syrien: Nicht-Königliche Prägungen, Nr. 1-1066
München, Hirmer Verlag, 2001.

A rarity among SNG volumes, this: a catalogue of coins of Syria. Asia Minor is increasingly well-served by the SNG series, but regions further east and south have received less attention. All the more reason to welcome the present volume. The scholar responsible, Hans Roland Baldus, is a well-known expert on these coins who has been able to bring many years of experience to bear on the material. The result is a well-ordered and carefully structured catalogue without the frequent misattributions which often dog lists of Syrian issues.

Particularly sensible is the arrangement which places the majority of Roman imperial tetradrachms at the beginning rather than under individual cities, thus circumventing unresolved debates about the place of minting for various issues (e.g. the 'Zeus' tetradrachms of Caligula and Claudius, nos. 7-10, which may belong to Cilicia or Syria; or the Trajanic issues assigned to Antioch or Tyre, nos. 37-47). The reader is thus spared the task of hunting in two or more places to find the coins (although tetradrachms with ethnics have been placed elsewhere, e.g. nos. 704, 717-718). The list of silver issues includes some great rarities, such as the Caligula 'Zeus' tetradrachm (no. 7); two tetradrachms of Claudius and Nero (nos. 11-12); and the coin of Caracalla with the seated Zeus reverse, attributable to Cyrrhus (no. 61).

After the tetradrachms come the SC bronzes, normally assigned to Antioch (nos. 108-351). Included among these are a group of coins with the letters *delta-epsilon* rather than SC in a wreath as the reverse type (nos. 319-327) which, as Baldus notes, have been assigned to Laodicea as well as Antioch. The portraits on the SC bronzes are not always easily identifiable, but the author's familiarity with these issues means that he is able to assign coins to emperors, or confirm earlier identifications, even where the obverse legends are illegible, and to distinguish those bronzes probably struck at Rome (nos. 155-157, 164, 167, 174) from those probably produced at Antioch. The SC coins of Otho include several forgeries, tooled from coins of other emperors (nos. 152-3), all of which are duly noted by Baldus. No. 152, as he states, is a coin of Domitian. This fact presumably has some bearing on the *terminus post quem* for its unique countermark, GIC 580. Another coin, no. 148, is undoubtedly Otho but looks as if it has been tooled, which may explain its rather strange style.

The SC bronzes are followed by coins of the koinon of Syria (nos. 352-357), and the rest of the catalogue concerns the civic coinages of Syria, listed in BMC order, with one notable exception: 'Leucas on the Chrysorhoas' is correctly reconciled with Balanea on the coast and not an imaginary city somewhere on the Barada river west of Damascus, as in BMC. Most of the coins are of the Ro-

Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau 83, 2004, S. 200-204.

man period, and it is perhaps regrettable that geographical terms like 'Cyrrhestice' and the misleading 'Seleucis and Pieria' have been retained and cities assigned to them, although their use here could be justified because they are familiar to numismatists. However, it would be a good idea if numismatists abandoned them, because they give the impression of a geographical structure which in reality never existed.

The evidence for any entity called Cyrrhestice extending beyond the *polis* of Cyrrhus to include the cities of Beroea and Hierapolis during the Roman period is speculative at best; 'Seleucis' was used by the Seleucids, and may have survived as a popular name in Roman times, but was not an administrative entity; 'Pieria' seems to be nothing more than a term for the mountain range behind the port of Seleucia. 'Coele Syria' is highly slippery: it seems to have been used by the Seleucids to describe southern Syria and may have survived in the Roman period as a term for an eparchy of the imperial cult probably based at Damascus (which included many cities of the 'Decapolis'), but from the time of Septimius Severus northern Syria (excluding Damascus and the south) became the province of 'Syria Coele'. 'Decapolis' may have been a word employed to describe an enclave of city states which in the late first century BC were surrounded by the Herodian, Ituraean and Nabataean realms, but it seems fairly certain that it was never an official entity or league of cities. By the second century the identifiable cities of the 'Decapolis' were divided among the provinces of Syria, Arabia and Syria Palaestina. 'Trachonitis' was a popular term used in the Roman period to describe the modern Leja, a rough lava flow south of Damascus, but, with the exception of Philippopolis, which lay on its easternmost edge, no cities are known there in the period when cities were issuing coins (large parts of it may have been an imperial estate). Consequently Gaba (no. 147) should be located in Syria Palaestina, not in Trachonitis (see SNG ANS 904 for the same type), and Caesarea Panias is also wrongly assigned to this region. Baldus notes the relocation of Gaba, so it is all the more curious to see the traditional arrangement retained in this case. Over the period covered by this volume, the names for regions changed and provincial boundaries altered, making it hard to construct any rigid geographical terminology; but there is nothing to be gained by persisting in employing terms that we know to be misleading or wrong.

The civic coins include some very rare types, such as the issue of Philip I at Samosata with a seated city goddess, Pegasus and a river god (no. 400); the issue of Antioch under Claudius naming the Syrian governor Cassius (no. 719); and the coin of Claudius from Laodicea (no. 883). The letters E-E on an issue of Elagabalus of Emisa (no. 822) are interesting; this type commonly bears a single letter E, and one wonders whether this new inscription (if it is not simply an error) bears any relation to the letters *delta* or *delta-epsilon* found on coins of Antioch and Laodicea. *Delta-epsilon* has plausibly been interpreted as an abbreviation for 'of the four eparchies' of the provincial imperial cult in Syria.[1] The Emisa coins of Elagabalus accord the city the title of metropolis, a status not recorded on earlier or later issues, and one often connected with cities that were

meeting-places for celebrations of the provincial imperial cult. Was Emisa briefly the chief city of a fifth eparchy under Elagabalus? We know that in later times the city was a rival of the metropolis of Damascus, which is a likely candidate for the chief city of the eparchy of Coele Syria. As so often, the terse nature of these coin inscriptions leaves too much to the imagination and too little to build on.

Baldus is aware of the phenomenon of die-sharing between Antioch and other cities between the reigns of Elagabalus and Trebonianus Gallus, but does not always mention which coins belong to the die-sharing groups. It is highly likely that those sharing dies were struck at Antioch, regardless of the city in which they were issued. He does not separate third-century coins of Samosata struck locally from those probably produced at Antioch (nos. 392-6 of Elagabalus are local; nos. 397-9 are Antioch; nos. 400-403, 405-6, 408 and 411 of Philip I and II are local; nos. 404, 407, 409-410 are Antioch). Some links are noted, but not all (e.g. nos. 782 (Trebonianus Gallus, Antioch) and 952 (Laodicea) are from the same obverse die). Surprisingly, early types for Philip I at Antioch (nos. 761-763) are listed after later ones (750-760). But the author has done a good job in distinguishing portraits of Philip I from those of his son (especially difficult with worn or corroded specimens).

This reviewer has recently completed a catalogue of coins of northern Syria without the benefit of seeing the entire Munich collection. It is therefore worth listing 'new' material here:

- No. 373 (Samosata, Hadrian). The type is known with various dates, but this is the first specimen I have noted with the date year 59 (although the picture is insufficiently clear to confirm this reading of the date).
- No. 386 (Samosata, Lucius Verus). The coin is almost illegible. The reverse type (caduceus) is certainly known for Samosata (see, for example, no. 379), but the type is not otherwise known for Aurelius or Verus. The tentative attribution is possible, but a clearer specimen is necessary to confirm an attribution to Samosata.
- No. 390 (Samosata, Caracalla). The obverse bust type seems to be unique, although the coin is probably of Elagabalus rather than Caracalla (as is no. 391).
- No. 420 (Samosata, Philip I). The obverse bust variant seems to be otherwise unrecorded.
- No. 617 (Antioch, autonomous Zeus/Zeus seated type). I have no record of a caduceus symbol on the reverse for Caesarean year 25, but the date is unclear from the illustration. The symbol is common on coins of year 21.

[1] E. Meyer, Die Bronzeprägung von Laodikeia in Syrien 194/217, JNG 37/38, 1987/8 (1991), pp. 56-92.

- No. 619 (Antioch, as previous). I have no record of a cornucopiae symbol on the reverse for Caesarean year 15, but again the date is unclear. The symbol is certainly known for years 11, 13, and 16.

The following comments and minor corrections should be noted:

- Nos. 308, 314-318 (Antioch, Elagabalus). These coins should probably be assigned to Caracalla.
- No. 367 (Germanicia, Commodus). The obverse legend is illegible and it might also be Aurelius or Verus.
- No. 380 (Samosata, Antoninus Pius). The coin could well be of Aurelius or Verus rather than Antoninus Pius.
- No. 385 (Samosata, Aurelius Caesar). This is a coin of Flaviopolis in Cilicia (SNG Levante 1539).
- No. 392 (Samosata, Elagabalus). As Baldus notes, the attribution of this coin with its Latin legends is dubious. It is not a coin of Samosata.
- No. 516 (Chalcis ad Belum, Aurelius). This is a coin of Chalcis in Euboea.[2]
- No. 1003 (Chalcis sub Libano). This is also a coin of Chalcis in Euboea, as confirmed by find spots.[3]

These minor points do not detract from the value of this SNG volume. One can only hope that other major collections will make an effort to publish their Syrian coins, and to the same high standard.

Prof. Kevin Butcher
American University of Beirut, Lebanon

[2] O. Picard, Chalcis et la Confédération Eubéenne (Paris 1979), p. 130, no. 100, 'semis'.
[3] *ibid.*, no. 97, 'semis'.

Haim Gitler and Matthew Ponting

The Silver Coinage of Septimius Severus and his Family (193-211 AD)

A Study of the Chemical Composition of the Roman and Eastern Issues

Glaux 16. Milan: Edizioni ennere S.r.l., 2003. 157pp. 17 plates
ISBN 88-87235-33-3, ISSN 1121-7472

This monograph centers on the analysis of 173 pieces of ancient silver. These include denarii of Rome and elsewhere, «Syrian» tetradrachms, and drachms of Caesarea in Cappadocia, as well as cast imitations and offal from an assemblage published by the same authors some time ago.

The focus on analysis is welcome. Soon after David Walker's huge series of analyses began to appear, it was evident that his methods produced peculiar results: high standard deviations within samples and what proved to be very high values for silver content. Both of these phenomena could be attributed to surface enrichment. Walker's streaks had permitted examination of only the surface of the coin, which was subject to leeching of baser metals and thus enhanced apparent silver content. There is a useful account of this recognition, along with the phenomenon of depletion silvering recognized by Cope, on pp. 11-13.

While the problem was recognized, little was done about it until Ponting himself, first in collaboration with Butcher and then with Gitler, used microdrilling to penetrate to the core of coins; the samples thus retrieved were then analyzed by atomic absorption photospectrometry (AAS). Here the method is further advanced to include optical microscopy and scanning electron microscopy with energy dispersive analysis.

Ch. III («Analysis») presents the technical details, which will be of interest to anyone attempting to replicate the work. The principal conclusion here is the remarkable degree of consistency between results achieved by inductively-coupled plasma atomic emission spectrometry (ICP-AES) and and those achieved by AAS, which are noted in Figs. 11 and 12. This is not only comforting in itself, but satisfies the authors that the techniques can be amalgamated and used together, which I take to mean that results obtained by one method are directly comparable with those obtained by the other. This in itself is a great advance, since heretofore data obtained by different methods could only be compared intuitively. Here data obtained by both methods are interdigitated: the results seem directly comparable with the exception that AAS data do not include results for arsenic and ICP-AES data do not include results for bismuth.

As the method of distinguishing coins from the various mints is not succinctly summarized here, it may be useful to tabulate it as follows:

Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau 83, 2004, S. 204-208.

	Lead	Tin	Nickel	Bismuth	Antimony	Arsenic
Rome	1.08%	< 1%	0.07%	higher	0.16% (AAS), > 0.15% (ICP-AES)	< 0.2%
"Emesa"	1,40%	> 1%	not given	spread	0.27% (AAS), < 0.1% (ICP-AES)	> 0.1%
"Laodicea"	0.66%	> 1%	0.23%	lower	0.03% (AAS), < 0.1% (ICP-AES)	> 0.1%

In Ch. IV («The material analysed») the authors acknowledge that the impetus for the study was the group of cast Severan denarii obtained by the Israel Museum in 1993 and later published. This acquisition made it desirable to obtain a basis for comparison, which was done on the basis of available material. Herein lies a problem, specifically that a surprisingly small number of Severan denarii come from appropriate archaeological contexts.

The authors offer a historical rationale for this as it applies to Middle Eastern hoards, but in fact the phenomenon can be observed elsewhere - though admittedly «elsewhere» includes a great number of hoards from outside the *limes*. Still, it is broadly true that hoards with heavy representation of second-century coins have very thin representation of Severan and later coins, while those of the Severan and later periods tend to exclude earlier denarii. If relative fineness is arguably at issue here, it would have been useful to have analyses of some coins of Commodus, so that there would be a reliable basis of comparison of the fineness of his coins against those of Septimius.

The authors recognize that their data can be used to help sort out the morass of early Severan denarii, and propose the following reattributions on the basis of their analyses (p. 24): cat. nos. 39, 41, 48, 51, 61, 62, 67, 77 from Rome to Laodicea; and of coins whose obverse/reverse type combinations were struck at both Rome and Laodicea, cat. nos. 21, 34, 44, 45, 58, 71-74, 80 and 81 to Rome, 35 47, 66, and 82 to Laodicea. The argument applies, of course, only to these specimens, but if correct it would confirm what has long been suspected, that the conventional attributions enshrined in BMC and RIC are not wholly authoritative.

The conclusion that certain coins attributed to Rome belong in the east, and vice-versa, is more significant than, perhaps, the authors realize. The early Severan period was the first manifestation of long-term, substantial denarius production in the east, and our (apparent) ability to assign varieties to western or eastern origin has been the basis of considerable argument regarding mobility of coin: the appearance of eastern denarii in the west, and vice-versa, is good evidence for velocity of movement.[1] The questions raised here undercut the ground on which such arguments stand.

Whether the Ponting-Gitler reattributions will withstand scrutiny is not yet determinable. It would be desirable to use the results obtained here as a kind of

[1] See most recently C. Howgego, The Denarii of Septimius Severus and the Mobility of Roman Coin: a reply, NC 162, 2002, pp. 339-345, commenting on R.P. Duncan-Jones, The Denarii of Septimius Severus and the Mobility of Roman Coin, NC 161, 2001, pp. 75-89 with earlier bibliography.

survey, pinpointing those emissions that deserve further analyses, in an effort to establish whether results from single coins can be generalized to larger samples.

* * *

The book has certain problems as a presentation. The illustrative figures are jumbled: they are not presented consecutively, apparently because it was deemed desirable to group black-and-white figures in one place and color ones in another; as the pages on which they appear are numbered, page references might have been included. There are occasional anomalies in the English, and the number of typographical errors in the text is not liable to inspire confidence in the tables of data. On the other hand the plates are remarkably clear and useful.

More substantially, the authors have used the terms «Laodicea» and «Emesa» throughout to identify Septimius' eastern mints. It is time to admit that, convenient as these labels may be, there is no more evidence for «Laodicea» and «Emesa» than for the Man in the Moon. The intellectual genesis of these attributions is the famous «demotion» of Antioch after it supported Pescennius Niger, but there is no implication in the surviving texts that this included loss of minting privileges; and Emesa is just another large city. The best purely numismatic evidence is, of course, for Antioch (a successor mint to that of Pescennius Niger) and Caesarea in Cappadocia. At the one, stylistic and epigraphic similarities, as well as sharing of types, point to a direct continuation of striking, employing the same engravers, after Septimius seized the city from Pescennius.[2] At the other, the Greek-Latin die links reported by various scholars and summarized by Buttrey seem decisive, at least for Pescennius. This accounts for the beginnings; where the mints may have gone after that, if indeed they moved at all, is anybody's guess, but it ought to be recognized as no more than a guess.

The question may seem only tangentially relevant to the authors' purpose, but it is soluble by the methods they use. Surely the continuity between groups of Pescennian and Severan denarii ought to be measurable analytically; given the relative rarity of Niger's denarii, the accumulation of a sample may pose problems, but in the abstract this is exactly the kind of application to which the authors' methods lend themselves.

I want to close with what may seem a semantic quibble: this has to do with the authors' distinction between attributions made on analytical grounds and those made on «numismatic» grounds. They have a clear preference for the former. Now the authors do not define what they mean by the latter; it seems to

2 *Pace* R. Bickford-Smith, The Imperial Mints in the East for Septimius Severus: it is time to begin a thorough reconsideration, RIN 96, 1994/5, pp. 53-71 at p. 59: «Some scholars see identity of style between Pescennius Niger's Antioch denarii and Severan coins [with COS III] and hope to find die-links between them, but I find this expectation unpersuasive.» But by limiting the case to die links he understates it, even though he cites (n. 21) T.V. Buttrey, The Denarii of Pescennius Niger, NC 152, 1992, pp. iv-xxii.

refer to those criteria of type and style, or sometimes just style, that distinguish eastern coins from those that emanated from the capital.

But the verbiage is flawed, if not the thinking. There is no independent «analytical» classification of the coins: it would be impossible to take any single coin, even against this background of new, (presumably) precise and accurate analyses, and attribute it to one mint or another solely on the basis of metal content. As the authors have here demonstrated, this fundamental constituent of a coin's identity and provenance has been inadequately considered in the past; but we are now in a position to employ it, *in the context of all other aspects*, in securing a coin's attribution. Ideally the term «numismatic» should be taken to embrace analysis as well, and we may hope that this work has advanced that principle. Would it be too much to ask that others attempt to apply it?

Prof. William E. Metcalf
Yale University Department of Classics *and*
Yale University Art Gallery
New Haven, CT 06520-8266 USA
william.metcalf@yale.edu