

Zeitschrift: Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau = Revue suisse de numismatique = Rivista svizzera di numismatica
Herausgeber: Schweizerische Numismatische Gesellschaft
Band: 85 (2006)
Rubrik: Kommentare zur Literatur über antike und orientalische Numismatik

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: 28.03.2026

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

KOMMENTARE ZUR LITERATUR
ÜBER ANTIKE UND ORIENTALISCHE NUMISMATIK

Robert C. Knapp/John D. Mac Isaac

Excavations at Nemea III. The Coins

Berkeley 2005. xxxii + 290 pp., 20 figs., 32 Pls. Cloth bound. \$ 135.–
ISBN 0-520-23169-4(v.3)

This elegant volume marks a milestone in the publication of excavation coins. The detailed presentation of both the coins and the archaeological contexts in which they were found, and the history of the site, rather than simply listing the coins in a purely numismatic way, makes the understanding of the material much easier. The extensive commentaries on the circulation and use of the coins, as well as on some of their dates, is both welcome and thought provoking. A number of very useful plans showing the findspots of certain types of coins sets a standard for the future and would have been more than useful in many earlier final report volumes; such as those, to mention only a few, from the Athenian Agora, Corinth, Dura, Morgantina, Sardes and Troy. In short, this volume stands as a challenge to those responsible for the future publication of excavation coins from any other major Greek site.

Nemea's history is fairly straightforward. The major buildings at the site are the early Hellenistic temple (the Archaic temple was destroyed when the sanctuary was sacked *c.* 415/410), a heroön for the cult of Opheltes (initially from the first half of the 6th century), and an early Hellenistic stadium (replacing an Archaic one on the other side of the sanctuary). In addition there were a series of 'treasuries' or *oikoi* (initially built in the 5th century), a *xenon* or hotel building (later 4th century), and some houses (initially from the 5th century). For numismatic purposes it is important to note that after the sanctuary was destroyed in *c.* 415-410 it was apparently abandoned until the mid-4th century when a great deal of reconstruction work was carried out. This was completed by *c.* 300 BC, but by *c.* 275 the site was clearly in disrepair and in *c.* 271 the Games were permanently moved to Argos. In the third quarter of the century there are some further building works but by the end of the century many of the houses seem to have gone out of use; one, however, continued to be inhabited until the late 2nd century; Mummius may have helped with some construction in the *xenon* *c.* 146 and Mithradates VI apparently made a dedication in the sanctuary *c.* 100. There are traces of activities throughout the Roman period until the early 3rd century; but the site really seems to pick up again beginning in the second quarter of the 5th century when the sanctuary area was used by a community of Christian farmers (their basilica was built over the *xenon*). This community came to an end in the late 6th century (possibly in the early 7th) due to the Slavic invasions. The site seems to have once again been occupied during the 12th century but was again in decline and deserted from the late 12th until the

early 1260s when there is a very modest revival that lasted up to the 14th century. After that the site seems to have been definitively abandoned until the 19th century.

It is important to emphasize that since the modern excavations have up to now concentrated on the sanctuary area and the stadium, little is known about the ancient village of Nemea so that evidence for continuing human activity during periods when the sanctuary area was abandoned perhaps remains to be found (I bring up this point here specifically because some of the numismatic evidence for the Greek period points in that direction).

The book is divided into five sections. The first contains useful prefatory material on terminology and the site grid system. The second (pp. 1-180), ably written by RCK, contains the extensive commentary and catalogue for the 2124 Greek and Roman coins found at Nemea, ranging in date from the 5th century BC to the time of Constantine I. JDM was responsible for the third section (pp. 183-237), which consists of a concise and meticulous commentary on the catalogue of 1058 (plus 566 totally illegible) Late Roman/Early Byzantine, later Byzantine, Frankish and Venetian coins from Nemea. This is followed by a number of indices, including a subject index to the text and notes, a very extensive catalogue index and a complete concordance between the excavation coin numbers and their final catalogue numbers (note that missing coin numbers refer to coins that disintegrated or to items initially thought to be coins but which proved not to be). The catalogue index, which must have been done by computer, provides a few amusing entries, like those under horse, “bridled and frothing” and, rather astoundingly, “drawn by Helios in quadriga” (could this be an ancient rite during which, once a year perhaps, the four horses of the sun pile in the quadriga while Helios pulled *them?*).

Finally we have 32 plates of generally disappointing quality. The plates themselves are very nicely, even luxuriantly arranged, with convenient titles giving all minting authorities. Each coin is identified with its catalogue number (which is what one would expect), but also with its excavation coin number (also found in the catalogue) and with a completely superfluous plate number (which also appears in the catalogue text, rather than simply having an asterisk next to the catalogue number to indicate that the coin was illustrated). Thus, on pl. 18, we have an illustration of a coin of Pellene identified as Cat. 1555, C 3889 and w (= pl. 18, w); unfortunately, despite all those three numbers, the coin is 98% illegible. The whole point of illustrating coins from casts is that the uniform plaster surfaces can, when proper care is taken, be lit to ensure that all visible details on the coin are legible; and that the plates themselves are uniform. A good example of such plates, among many possible, are those in the Greek coin volume from the Agora, Agora XXVI, where there are 31 plates of coins illustrated from casts; all well-lit and clear, despite the often poor quality of the coins themselves.

The Nemea plates, in contrast, have illustrations that are often muddy and poorly lit (a few coins, primarily Byzantine and later, were photographed directly – they would have been greatly improved had they been taken from casts). Even worse; while it is true that illustrating excavation coins helps other excavators

identify what they find elsewhere, illustrating coins that are extremely worn, nearly worn flat or corroded into amorphous blobs serves no useful purpose whatsoever (unless, of course, the coin comes from a significant deposit – most of these poorly preserved coins do not). Returning to plate 18, I fail to see the point of illustrating coins a, c, v, w, x and z (with the eye of faith one can see the ram's head on the reverse of w, but, alas, it is illustrated upside-down). Coins like that appear on every plate. The exception that proves the rule is pl. 12 o (cat. 1001), which is nearly worn flat but is clearly of Hadrian (as BCD Corinth 608) rather than of Claudius as identified by RCK. If all such coins had been omitted, the space saved could have been used to print a full-sized map of the entire site (including the stadium area and the modern village) to replace the much too small and wholly inadequate plan given as fig. 1 on p. 12.

JDM's chapter is somewhat unexpectedly entitled "The Early Christian and Later Coin Finds from Nemea." 'Early Christian' stands in for what is usually termed elsewhere as 'Late Roman' and 'Early Byzantine' because, (p. xxx), "such usage is confusing and, at least at Nemea, counterproductive <why?>. Early Christian, designating the period from Constantine the Great to Phocas, is a chronologically, historically, and politically correct term." Politically correct? In any case, since this is the only jargon to be found in the catalogue, and has no affect on the text, we can ignore it. Its use does, however, result in a few oddities in the index of kings and rulers (pp. 249-250), which lists 'Roman Emperors' (Domitian – Licinius II; Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius and Galba, all of whom appear on coins of Corinth, have been omitted in error), 'Early Christian Emperors' (Flavia Helena - Phocas) and, finally, 'Byzantine Emperors' (Leo VI – Isaac II). Luckily, JDM's analysis of the material does not share this semantic eccentricity! He uses the numismatic evidence to delineate the final period of relative prosperity at Nemea in the early Byzantine period just prior to the Slavic invasion (though a few coins of Phocas may indicate that either the site was only abandoned in the early 7th century or that it had a very short-lived partial reoccupation at that time). The remaining discussion is primarily devoted to the imitative issues of Manuel I; this will be of great help to anyone working with excavation material from this period elsewhere in Greece. One can only admire the care JDM has taken to catalogue the coins in his section because they are, as usual, among the most unprepossessing, ill-preserved and ugly coins to be found in a Greek excavation (only 34 were worth illustrating, and at least 5 of those are nearly or completely illegible; Cat. 3089 is illustrated on pl. 32 about 1 ½ times natural size).

Before turning to RCK's extensive chapter on the Greek coins, a word needs to be said on how the coins have been catalogued (while the description given here concerns the Greek coins, JDM's coins are listed in a very similar fashion). The Greek coins are, as usual, geographically arranged. Each group of coins is described by type, with its metal (and denomination for some of the silver), its date (usually taken from one of the standard references) and a citation to one or more reference works. Then each coin appears with its catalogue number; its excavation coin number; a site-grid reference to where it was found; the die axis, diameter and

weight; a plate reference (if illustrated); the date of whatever pottery was found with it; and, sometimes, notes indicating whether it was previously published in an excavation report or if there are legend or minor type variants. The inclusion of the contextual material is very useful, though since the sanctuary was heavily disturbed by farming in late antiquity the unfortunate result is that many of the coins are found in mixed levels; but there are some apparently meaningful deposits (in an unexpected lapse, there is no deposit list included in this book; rather, well groups or groups from intact strata are simply included, *or not*, in footnotes, making them very difficult to find or use).

RCK begins with a very careful summary of both the archaeological history of the site and its buildings and what is known about Nemea from ancient literary sources and inscriptions. He also emphasizes the havoc late antique farming caused to much of the site's stratigraphy, mixing 5th century BC coins with 5th century AD pottery; another good point he makes (p. 18) is that in its heyday, the sanctuary was regularly cleaned, thus precluding the build-up of useful stratified levels. RCK then embarks on a discussion of the kinds of coins found at Nemea. There are only two possible hoards; a group of small silver coins that seem to be offerings that were ritually buried in the late 5th century (a *Wappenmünzen* obol of Athens, a Aeginetan stater, an obol of Phlious, and two hemiobols and a tetartemorion of Sicyon – discussed on p. 19, but only identified when again mentioned on p. 34 in fn. 133) and a group of mid 2nd and early 3rd century Roman bronzes from Corinth and Argos apparently hidden in the roof of the bath building and dispersed when it collapsed (once again, discussed on p. 19, but only listed in fn. 243 on p. 61). RCK quite rightly concludes that the coins found in Nemea provide a true random sample of the coins then in circulation, free from any distortion caused by the presence of large numbers of similar pieces from hoards, and thus can be used for general conclusions about chronology (though Nemea is remarkable for the large number of silver coins found there).

Since to be lost coins have to be available, RCK makes the cogent observation that the vast majority of coins at Nemea come from mints no further than 75 km away (this pattern seems to be true for virtually every excavated ancient Greek site); at Nemea they are primarily from mints such as Corinth, Sicyon, Argos and Phlious that produced extensive coinages. He then goes on to highlight the importance of coins for dating at Nemea; the few pieces that came to light in wells and pits (five well groups are listed, by catalogue number only, in fn. 75, pp. 21-22; for the well in L 17, see below), as well as a coin of Philip II that was deliberately placed in the wall of the xenon, thus supposedly dating its construction to the third quarter of the 4th century (p. 22 and fn. 76; curiously, the coin in question, Cat. 56, is said to have been found in a 'modern' context! Could this be a misprint?). Despite the lack of relevant stratigraphy for so many coins at Nemea, their findspots do show patterns that illustrate the way the site was used at different periods. As RCK emphasizes, while later farming did mix up the vertical stratigraphy, it probably did not move the coins very far horizontally (i.e. we may not have stratigraphic evidence for when the coin was dropped, but we can be fairly confident its findspot is very near where it was originally lost).

Findspots are illustrated on four excellent plans of the sanctuary (*figs. 5-8*) and on one of the stadium (*fig. 9*, unfortunately without the grid overlay), and some of the conclusions drawn are fascinating. This is especially true for the stadium where the concentrations of coins from Corinth, Sicyon, Argos, Phlious and Kleonai seem to indicate where people from those cities sat as spectators! The stadium must have only been used during the Games, unlike the main sanctuary area, which would have had visitors year round, and RCK makes a convincing case for a primarily local audience since far fewer ‘foreign’ coins (i.e. those from places further than 75 km away) were found there than in the sanctuary as a whole. As for why coins should be found in the stadium, RCK reminds us that the Games took place in full summer and that the sellers of snacks and liquid refreshment would have been active in the stands. Mysteriously, four chalkoi of Polyrrenion in Crete turned up on the east side of the stadium in the ‘Argive section’ around the judges’ stand; these are, presumably, the record of a Cretan visitor who attended the games with his Argive hosts. Equally curious is the fact that five silver coins were found in the stadium – unfortunately RCK does not tell us which ones they are. Finally, the numismatic evidence seems conclusive that the stadium was abandoned *c.* 275/270 and not reused.

A very welcome survey of the use of coined money in sanctuaries appears on pp. 32-36. Officials had to meet expenses, charge fees and collect offerings, while visitors would need to pay for accommodations, buy food and souvenirs, and pay for sacrifices or votive offerings.

On pp. 36 through 49 RCK gives us a long but not altogether convincing discussion on how bronze coins circulated. Ancient travellers needed to carry low value bronzes to pay for daily needs as well as a store of higher value silver or gold coins, which were a convenient way of carrying large sums that could be exchanged for smaller denominations as the need arose (in an unfortunate misprint on p. 37, the bronze chalkous is valued at “...one-eighth or one-twelfth of a *drachma*, depending on the coinage system in use”, for *drachma* read *obol* – or for one-eighth read one-forty-eighth and for one-twelfth read one-seventy-second!!).

RCK suggests that there were two types of travellers in ancient days, those who were going to a specific place («destination travel») and those going from place to place over a long term, perhaps as merchants or as visitors to a number of religious sites («peripatetic travel»), and that their use of bronzes would be different. The first group might go directly to Nemea to attend the Games, stopping relatively infrequently and spending little of the money they had brought with them; they would be more likely to have retained the ‘foreign’ bronzes they had brought from home, which might then be spent at Nemea. The peripatetics, however, would spend the low value bronzes brought from home during their trip, replenishing them by exchanging high value silver for local bronzes in the cities they came to. For example, if two travellers set out for Nemea from Boeotia, one going as directly as possible and the other taking side trips to Euboia, Athens, Corinth and Argos, the first might leave a few central Greek coins as traces of his visit to Nemea, but the second might come to the site with a money bag filled mostly with Argive bronzes he had gotten on his last stop.

RCK expands his discussion by suggesting that coins from certain towns that had a special relationship with Nemea would be more likely to appear there. These were the towns that had *theorodokoi*, the men who accommodated the heralds, *theoroi*, who were sent out from Nemea to announce the Nemean Games: people from these towns were perhaps more likely to go the sanctuary than those from other places. RCK tells us that «...in 19 of 32 cases in which a town known to mint bronze during the 4th century BC is represented in the *theorodokoi* lists, a coin turns up at Nemea (Fig. 15 and Table 2).» I think this may be pushing the evidence, especially for the coins of the nearby Arkadian towns of Pheneos, Kleitor and Stymphalos, which one might anyway expect to find at Nemea. Another problem is that while he speaks of «19 of 32 cases», according to the map and the table it seems actually to be at most only 14 of 27 (and 3 of the 14 are represented by coins minted later than the 4th century).

In a short section RCK discusses the coins of Argos and Kleonai that bear reference to Nemea (note that Olympia/Elis *did not* have a coinage prior to 471 as stated by RCK on p. 49, and that Delphi *did* produce Roman provincial issues with types referring to the Pythian Games, as BMC 24, 32, 35-40). There are quite a few pieces from Argos celebrating the myths surrounding the origin of the Games as well as many carrying symbols of Nemea, such as the wild celery wreath that crowned the victors or the club of Herakles. For Kleonai, a whole series of coins issued in the later 4th century must, as RCK shows (p. 51 and, more exhaustively, on p. 53), have been issued while Kleonai controlled the Games (AE chalkoi with Head of Herakles/KΛΕΩ in celery wreath, BMC 9-10 and Cat. 1857-1887; curiously, none of the larger bronzes of the same series or any of Kleonai's 5th century silver obols has been found at Nemea).

The only real problems I have come in RCK's last section (pp. 57-61). First, on the basis of the L 17 well deposit, he tries to push back the start of the Corinthian Pegasos/Trident and the Sicyonian Dove/*san* chalkoi into the last quarter of the 5th century. On p. 22 he writes that, «the debris in the well in Section L 17 shows a layer with materials of the late 5th century directly beneath a layer with coins of the late 4th century BC.», and identifies the coins (in fn. 75 on p. 21) as being Cat. 772 (a badly preserved P/T), Cat. 1263 (a Sicyonian dove/*san* in quite good condition) and Cat. 1592 (a rather nice Argive obol of the late 5th century). In the catalogue, the context pottery found with all three coins is described as being «4c BC.» However, on p. 57 the description of this well has changed:

«...material discovered near the top of the well makes <the> closing date in all likelihood the late 4th or early 3rd century BC. Proceeding down, the excavators found a distinct change in the fill; in that fill was found a saltcellar of the late 5th century BC. In that same fill were three coins: Cat 1263 (C 908, Sikyon, bronze, dove/*san*, 365-330 BC. [Warren Group 2]), Cat. 1592 (C, 1020, Argos, silver, before 421 BC), and Cat. 772 (C 1097, a bronze Pegasos/Trident of Corinth, ca. 248 [Price dating]). The excavators tentatively, but reasonably, assigned this level to the time of the destruction of the Sanctuary during the Peloponnesian War.»

How did three coins that are described as being found with 4th century pottery on p. 22 and in the catalogue suddenly get into a late 5th century level on p. 57? In fact, what we really have is that a 5th century silver coin and two 4th century bronzes were swept up with some miscellaneous 5th and 4th century sherds and were dumped into a well during the clean-up operations in the sanctuary during the 3rd quarter of the 4th century. This well simply can not be used for re-dating the bronzes of Sicyon or Corinth into the late 5th century.

On p. 60, and elsewhere, RCK suggests that the history of the site, specifically the period of renewal between the rebuilding of the sanctuary in the 330s and the transfer of the Games to Argos c. 271 (with the subsequent partial abandonment of the site) requires that a number of coins hitherto dated in the late 3rd or 2nd centuries be re-dated to the 4th or very early 3rd. He believes this because he feels that since they have been found at Nemea they must have been dropped during the late 4th and early 3rd century when the Games were held there. This is totally unconvincing, especially since plenty of coins that unquestionably date to the later 3rd -1st century have been found at Nemea (see p. 24, Fig. 6, which shows the find spots of no less than 94 coins dating between c. 271 and 44 B.C.)! The coins whose dates he wants to change to the late 4th or early 3rd century on p. 60 are:

1) Pholegandros (*cat. 1979*)

Normally dated to the 2nd-1st century BC but found with late 4th – early 3rd century pottery. For a more legible specimen, see *Monnaies et Médailles* 76, 1991, 794 (there dated to the 3rd century, which seems more likely than 4th century).

2) «Ainianes» (*cat. 118*)

Cited on p. 60 as being «traditionally dated 168-146 BC » and being BMC 17 (with a head of Athena); in the catalogue, however, it is described as having a head of Zeus to right and given a reference to Rogers 137 (since that has a head to left and is too big, it must really be Rogers 136). That coin has the traditional date of c. 302-286, perfect for Nemea. However, the coin from Nemea is actually *Late Roman*: a typical laureate, draped and cuirassed bust can be made out on the obverse, combined with a Victory left on the reverse and a mintmark beneath the exergual line!

3) Oiniadai (*cat. 155*)

BMC 6-14 usually dated c. 230-168. This coin is worn almost completely flat so that it must have circulated for a very long time before it was dropped (it is reminiscent of late Hellenistic bronzes found in 2nd or 3rd AD century contexts in the Athenian Agora). If it arrived in its present state in Nemea in the 4th, or even the early 3rd century, it would have had to have been struck generations earlier! Or are we to think that it arrived, brand new in the late 4th century and continued to circulate *in Nemea* for one hundred years or more before being dropped? In fact, the actual date of these coins is c. 219-211.¹

¹ See H. BLOESCH, *Griechische Münzen in Winterthur I* (1987), p. 173 and CRAWFORD, *RRC* p. 32, who discusses coins of this type that were overstruck by Canusium in c. 210.

4) Lebadeia (*cat.* 216)

«usually dated ca. 146-27 BC...BMC...1-2...this was found in Section E 19, where coins dating from as late as the 2nd to 1st century BC are not otherwise found.» This is no reason for re-dating such a rare coin of such late style.²

Another coin erroneously re-dated to the late 4th or early 3rd century in the catalogue is:

5) Thespiai (*cat.* 232)

«ca. 338-315»; and in fn. 276, «He³ identifies the female head as Arsinoe III, comparing her portrait on a Ptolemaic coin of 211 BC. Thus he suggests a date of ca. 210-208 BC for this coin. The Nemea evidence argues for the earlier date.» Alas, there is no evidence from Nemea; but see Agora XXVI, 607 for an example found in a deposit of the 80s and the citations to one found in Corinth in a pre-146 well deposit and for another overstruck at Sicyon c. 200 B.C. The fact that the female head is clearly modelled on Arsinoe III's portrait completely excludes RCK's revised date.⁴

Also on p. 60 RCK speculates that there are religious connections behind the discovery of 22 coins of Lokris at Nemea; he thinks that since the Zeus of Nemea was worshipped in a grove at Opeus people may have travelled between the two sites. This idea is supported by Professor S. Miller, the excavation director who thinks pilgrims from Lokris brought the coins to Nemea. Unfortunately, both RCK and Miller chose to disagree with JDM's comment, cited in fn. 238, that coins of Lokris are commonly found in Corinth, Central Greece and parts of the northern Peloponnesos, and that the widespread circulation of these coins has nothing to do with religious ties. Not only that, while RCK suggests Lokris was «not a prolific mint», it actually did strike a very considerable silver and bronze coinage – her stater issues were larger than those of any Peloponnesian mint save Olympia and Sicyon (and infinitely larger than those of Argos), and there is much anecdotal evidence that her bronzes circulated widely and, as JDM already mentioned, are frequently found in Thessaly, Central Greece and the Peloponnesos. The suggestion (again p. 60) that a single coin of Antioch found at Corinth might relate to religious travel should not have been made.

² For this coin type, see Triton IX, 1, Jan. 2006 (The BCD Collection of the Coinage of Boiotia), lot 175 and its accompanying notes.

³ A. SCHACHTER, A Note on the Reorganization of the Thespian Museia, NC 1961.

⁴ For good illustrations of a series of these coins, see Triton IX.1, (as n. 2), p. 112.

The catalogue itself is very clearly laid out and truly easy to use. I have a few comments and corrections:

- 54**, this looks like it might possibly be an early Celtic imitation;
127-128, for OITAΩN read OITAIΩN; **128bis** read Ω for ω;
147, rather Tegea than Argos Amphiloichicum;
160, hemidrachm, not drachm;
191, obol; **217-219**, all obols;
220, stater; **221**, obol; **227**, this apparently has a 5th century context;
239-240, both hemidrachms;
439, not Corinth – it shows a bust right and is probably a tremendously worn Ptolemy III, as 1999-2001;
1535, c. 90s-60s B.C.;
1562, a plated *hemidrachm*, not a drachm, and dated far too early – surely of the 2nd half of the 3rd century;
1563, plated hemidrachm of the 3rd quarter of the 1st century, not of the first half of the 2nd; **1573**, obol;
1582, a fascinating coin, apparently completely unknown – it is almost certainly not Lakonian, the obverse bust looks more like Hera than Apollo, but, unfortunately, I, and several other experts I have shown it to, are unable to suggest what it might be;
1590, there are no symbols on the reverse of this coin;
1639-1642, trihemiobols, not obols, c. 260s/250s not 350-228 and with Θ on the obverses, not a pellet;
1643, triobol, c. 260s/250s;
1759, read AI for AP;
1765-1776, for *tetartemorion* (¼ obol) read *tritartemorion* (¾ obol), but, in fact, they are more likely reduced weight obols! –
1769-1776 date to the 270s-250s;
1780, delete the top line of the reverse description note; **1780-1782**, of the early 1st century;
1783-1784, should follow 1785-1786 and all date to the late 3rd- early 2nd century;
1787-1800, all late 3rd – early 2nd century;
1801, triobol, c. 80s-50s BC; **1802-1810**, all late 3rd – early 2nd century;
1811, Hera not Zeus on the reverse; **1819**, Ares on the reverse, not a woman holding poppies;
1827, late 4th or early 3rd century; **1828-1834**, early to mid 3rd century;
1906, from Lokris rather than Troizen (see Cat. 161 ff.); **1910**, dates c. 480-470;
1911, astonishingly, this lovely coin lacks the expected reference to Williams' corpus – it is Williams 93 (O.62/R.55) and was struck in Tegea in the 460s – alas it comes from modern fill!;
1939, the appearance of this very rare coin of Antinoos at Nemea is fascinating, but its late context tells us nothing – similar pieces have apparently turned up as chance finds from Kleonai and Phlious;

1943, probably dates to the 360s/350s; **1944-1947**, all probably dated from the 320s-270s; **1947**, the monogram is rendered incorrectly; **1958** given the diameter of 18 mm this coin is probably a variant of BMC 8 rather than BMC 7;

1963, footnote 327, the reference to Agora XXVI p. 247 is correct but no coin of this type is described there, the SNG Cop reference is to a larger denomination and the date is the first half of the 4th century;

1965, delete the note about monograms on the reverse since they do not appear on this coin type (perhaps they were meant for 1966 but they do not appear on that coin either); **1966**, not c. 50-25 BC but 4th-3rd century (it appears to lack the monograms that characterize the later issue and surely belongs to the much more common early type, as BMC 15-16 rather than BMC 25).

A *gamma* has been used for a *pi* in either the notes or descriptions of **131, 231, 1642, 1643, 1765, 1769, 1771-1773, 1775 and 1834**.

Aside from those already noted there are a number of minor errors and misprints. On pp. xxx and 22, and in the captions of figs. 6 and 8, the foundation date of Roman Corinth is misprinted as 46 BC rather than 44; Oinoi is not in Galatia but on the island of Ikaria off Samos.

To summarize, I certainly have my disagreements with some of the theories and suggestions made in this book, but I do want to emphasize that none of them can take away the great value it has for archaeological numismatics. Both RCK and JDM should be congratulated for their efforts and for the immense amount of information they have provided in such concise and clear fashion. I am quite sure that the continuing excavations at Nemea will produce further evidence for the numismatic history of the site, especially for those periods when there was reduced activity after c. 271. The fact that numbers of coins from the 3rd through the 1st century BC. have been found scattered over the site might well indicate that markets were held: simple tables and tents would leave no archaeological traces, but the occasional dropped coin could hint of their presence. It would also be wonderful if this publication would serve as a model for the excavators of Corinth and Argos (among other places). A complete republication of ALL the coins from Corinth (they now can only be found in the long out-dated Corinth VI from 1933, covering the coins from 1896 to 1929, and in a multitude of scattered excavation reports for coins found since then) in the manner of the Nemea volume, complete with a site history and useful plans, would be enormously useful. The recent publication of the first volume of the Halieis excavation final reports, with a list of all the provenances for the coins found but not the commentary on them (that is reserved for a future volume) compares very unfavorably with what we have here. No archaeologist or numismatist working on coins from the Peloponnesos can afford to be without this book.

Dr. Alan S. Walker
c/o LHS Numismatik
CH-8001 Zürich

Osmund Bopearachchi/Philippe Flandrin

Le Portrait d'Alexandre le Grand

Histoire d'une découverte pour l'humanité
Édition du Rocher (Paris 2005) € 18.90, ISBN 2-268-05476-4

From the day it came out this new book has caused a sensation in both numismatic and archaeological circles. Written like a film scenario with many flashbacks, it deals with the two main topics, the enormous hoard of coins and other objects from Mir Zakah and the new gold coin of Alexander the Great after which the book is named, but it does not treat them strictly separately. In a third part, with no connection with either the hoard or the new coin, the authors present two new and unique coins of the Bactrian ruler Sophytes.

*About the book**

The book is written by two authors, Philippe Flandrin (P.F.), a journalist who has spent much time in Afghanistan over the past years as a war correspondent, but one with a keen interest in lost, or dispersed treasures, and Osmund Bopearachchi (O.B.), who is a renowned specialist in Bactrian and Indo-Greek coinage. The first part, an introduction, is by P.F. while O.B. deals more specifically with the coins.

The book makes thrilling reading on account of P.F.'s knowledge of the country and its people. He seems particularly interested in the tribe, always unconquered, of the Pashtouns and their archaic-macho way of living. And it is deep in Pashtoun country that Mir Zakah, the find spot, is located.

But was it really necessary to retell in detail that old cloak-and-dagger story of the Oxus find of 1877, a find that, as it turns out, has problems of its own (see pp. 79-80)? After all, as recently as 2002 Frank Holt had once again dramatically recounted the tale.¹ Quoting the various publications on that treasure would have been sufficient.²

It is not easy to follow a sequence of events that is not clear at all, or to grasp what exactly became of the Mir Zakah material. P.F. never stays long with the same topic; in the introduction he speaks in the same breath of the *Eukratideion*, the Oxus find and present-day Afghanistan.

It was apparently in October 2004 that the two authors decided to travel to Afghanistan to pursue their investigations on the spot (p. 10). A few days later they

* For a map of the region see P.F. Mittag's article on p. 31 of this volume.

¹ F.L. HOLT, *Alexander the Great and the Mystery of the Elephant Medallions* (Berkeley 2003, with older literature).

² P. GARDNER, *New Coins from Bactria*, NC 1879; A. CUNNINGHAM, *Relics from Ancient Persia*, JASB 1881, S. 151; O.M. DALTON, *The Treasure of the Oxus*, BM 1905, and, most recently, J.E. CURTIS, *The Oxus Treasure in the British Museum*, *Ancient Civilisations from Scythia to Siberia* 10, 3/4, pp. 293-338.

met in London with their trusted contact person, *l'homme de Peshawar*, and in mid-February 2005 they left for Mir Zakah (p. 112). Within this short time, P.F. did his best to acquire some numismatic knowledge, but, alas, there was not much time. As the book was in print at the end of August of the same year, the authors must have written it more or less on the flight back to France. This great haste is surely the reason for the frequent numismatic inconsistencies like the confusion of gold stater and darics, or mistakes, such as the unfortunate Baaltras (pp. 43, 203 and index), or the British Museum's Martin Price becoming an American (p. 95) and a diobol a diobolo (p. 200 top). One also wonders whether either author has read the other's part. As for the plates, many readers would surely have preferred to see more photos of coins or of objects rather than of people.

About the Mir Zakah Hoard

The first news on the Mir Zakah hoard dates back to the spring of 1992 (p. 35). In fact the hoard came in two parts; a first, smaller group was unearthed in 1947 (p. 105 ff.).³ The 1992 lot consisted of an enormous quantity of coins in gold, silver and bronze ranging in date from the 5th century bc to the 3rd century ad. It suffered the fate of most hoards, i.e., it was divided and dispersed before notes of any kind could be made. What information there is comes from this mysterious *homme de Peshawar* who is apparently an Afghan *marchand-amateur* living in Pakistan, a man with an astonishing knowledge who played mentor to O.B. and who met with the two authors in London in late 2004 (p. 34 sq.).

L'homme de Peshawar relates

He first heard of the hoard in the bazaar of Peshawar in late January 2003; at the time the coins were still in Mir Zakah. He immediately travelled to the finding place and was shown the following material (pp. 42-43):

- Silver coins: large amounts of Bactrian tetradrachms of attic weight from Demetrius I to Lysias
- Gold coins: a shower (*une pluie*) of Achaemenid darics and double darics (probably the ordinary type with the archer); triple darics of Mazaios with seated Baaltars and the lion attacking a bull. However, this information seems rather confused since we know that no double darics were struck by the Achaemenid Great Kings, and we read on p. 171 that the hoard contained no Achaemenid darics or sigloi; as for the triple darics of Mazaios, see Miho Catalogue⁴ nos. 44 a and b and below, p. 191).
- Darics of Lampsakos (Miho Cat. 44d; according to the IGCH no Lampsakos gold coins have ever been found in eastern Asia Minor or further east) and

³ R. CURIEL/D. SCHLUMBERGER, Trésors monétaires d'Afghanistan. Mémoires de la Délégation archéologique française en Afghanistan, tome XIV, p. 4-5.

⁴ Treasures of Ancient Bactria, Catalogue of the Miho Museum in Shigaraki near Kyoto, Japan (2002).

of Chio (read Kios in Bithynia, see Miho Cat. 44c); gold staters of Diodotos, Eukratides and of Indo-Greek and Indo-Scythian kings.

- Gold jewelry, precious stones, gemstones, silver vessels, rhyta with animals.
- and, for a moment, he sees the gold coin of Alexander.

Mentioned later (p. 219), a gold double stater (?) of Agathokles for Alexander, with Alexander wearing the lion-skin headdress and a seated Zeus facing⁵ (*un document numismatique d'une extrême importance*).

Mentioned even later, and it is not clear whether *l'homme de P.* actually saw it, is a gold stater of Menander (p. 226). And there is the photograph of a gold stater of Andragoras that Michel Setboun – who took most of the photos in the book – set in the Internet as coming from Mir Zakah, yet another type of gold coin whose authenticity has often been questioned.

When *l'homme de P.* returned to Mir Zakah two months after his first visit, i.e. in late March 1993, bringing large amounts of cash, the treasure had already vanished abroad (p. 45). A part of the coins were sold to a buyer in New York while three tons of silver coins remained in the Freeport of Basel (p. 36; and again, p. 138 “dans la bonne ville de Bâle”). The most important coins went from Basel to London, from where the cream of the hoard was apparently sold to a Japanese buyer.⁶

What was not sold, however, *l'homme de P.* tells us, is the gold coin of Alexander. The finder kept it aside for a rainy day, and now, ten years later, he has decided to sell it. *L'homme de P.* presents it to our authors at their meeting in London (pp. 48-50).

In order to be sure that the *Treasure of Ancient Bactria*⁷ really came from Mir Zakah, the authors travelled to Afghanistan in February 2005 to make inquiries on the spot and to interview villagers as well as civil and military officials. The main problem with Mir Zakah is, of course, that the hoard had not been properly recorded; circumstances did not allow it, and no one on the spot seems to have been knowledgeable enough to care. So, for the identification of hoard objects, the authors depended entirely on eyewitnesses among the local people who had been involved in the excavations. At no time do the authors question the good faith or the credibility of their informants. Some would remember a striking object such as the rhyta with the horse (Miho Cat. no. 116) or with the stag (Miho Cat. no. 117), no question about this. But how could a young Afghan remember well enough to positively identify some silver coins of which there were so many, after a lapse of ten years (p. 129)? Could not the villagers and the various officials have

⁵ For the obv. type see the tetradrachms M. MITCHINER, *Indo-Greek and Scythian Coinage* (London 1975/6), Type 146, for the rev. Type 137; this combination of types is not known for tetradrachms.

⁶ Above, n. 4.

⁷ *Ibid.*

tried to please the nice Mr. O.B., seeing how eager he was that they should recognize certain items? Unfortunately, these identifications, as those by *l'homme de Peshawar*, remain a matter of faith, a *Glaubensfrage*.

The new Alexander gold coin

The historical background is well known. In 327, after the conquest of Bactria, Alexander led his army towards India. In 326, on the Hydaspes river, he won his historical victory over the native king Poros and the Greek army continued its march down the Indus valley. Alexander had not struck any coins while in Bactria, but now, practically on the day after the battle, the authors tell us, he decided to celebrate his victory by a special commemorative issue of coins. Struck were the large silver 5-shekel pieces with the battle scene, i.e., the famous 'Poros' medallions, and 2-shekels with an archer and an elephant.⁸ Along with these silver coins a gold coin was produced, the new Alexander (*Pl. 16, 1*).

This gold coin is a complete *novum*. The engraver who cut the dies in a mint established *ad hoc* in the Indus valley (*atelier itinérant dans la vallée de l'Indus*, p. 191) was ahead of his time in creating two novelties:

- he produced the only known coin portrait of Alexander that was made during the conqueror's lifetime. In fact, it is apparently the earliest contemporary portrait of a Greek ruler. The Seleucid kings who succeeded Alexander all put their portraits on coins, but in Macedon the situation was different. In the early 3rd century we find portraits of Demetrios Poliorketes (306-284) but always with a divine attribute, a bull's horn, thus linking him with Poseidon whose son he proclaimed to be. The first portrait of a Macedonian king just wearing the diadem occurred on an exceptional issue of Philip V (221-179).⁹
- on this first portrait coin Alexander is wearing the elephant-scalp headdress (*exuviae*), which symbolizes the king's immortality; around his neck he wears the aegis of his father Zeus, thus emphasizing his divine descent (p. 49). The authors propose that this type was later copied on the early issues of Ptolemy I first struck in *c.* 319.¹⁰

It is at this point that the readers' readiness to accept the authors' theories and arguments starts to wear thin. They tell us that when Alexander marched from

⁸ The exact date and place of minting of these two coinages are still controversial; see HOLT, *supra*, n. 1. It must be added that Holt's new theory, in which both authors of this book seem firmly to believe, has not met with general acceptance; see e.g. the review by O. HOOVER, *ANS Magazine* vol. 3/2, 2004, pp. 58-61, or by C. ARNOLD BIUCCHI, *New Engl. Class. Journ.* 32/4, Nov. 2005, pp. 356-360.

⁹ See e.g. G.M.A. RICHTER, *The Portraits of the Greeks* vol. III (London 1963), 1744 (Demetrios) and 1746 (Philip V), or G.K. JENKINS, *Gulbenkian coll.* vol. II (Lisboa 1989), note to 879 (Demetrios) and note to 886 (Philip V).

¹⁰ See C.C. LORBER, *A Revised Chronology for the Coinage of Ptolemy I*, NC 165, 2005, pp. 61-62.

Bactria to the Indus valley he had a court artist travel with the army. Even more, they suggest it was Lysippos, one of the most accomplished and best-known artists of the later 4th century BC (later, p. 183, they also speak of the painter Apelles and the gem-cutter Pyrgoteles but without connecting them with the new gold coin). We know from ancient sources that Alexander refused to be portrayed by any artist other than Lysippos. That the most famous artist of his time should accompany Alexander on the strenuous march across the Hindukush is hard to believe. All the more as Lysippos was no longer a young man: he was born in the decade 400-390 BC and died toward the end of the 4th century; so in 326 he would have been at least 60 years old.¹¹

This coin portrait, the only lifetime likeness of the king, moreover, is said to be the model for the coinage of Ptolemy I with the portrait of Alexander. However, the Egyptian numismatic portraits of the recently deceased king¹² are of great sensitivity, with delicately modelled traits, with a vivid, open eye, a portrait that has at times be traced back to Lysippos' influence (*Pl. 16, 2*). They have little in common with the new gold coin which, compared to them, appears clumsily proportioned and rather devoid of artistic merit, though, of course, they do both bear a head with an elephant-skin headdress. The authors call the new coin the prototype (p. 188) for the Ptolemaic tetradrachms, but this just cannot be so.

One detail should be pointed out: the aegis. On the new gold coin it has a clearly scaly pattern; on the first issue of Ptolemy's Alexander-head tetradrachms, however, the aegis is plain. There the scaly pattern only appears on the later issues, not on those before *c.* 311 (*Pl. 16, 3*).¹³ If the gold coin really were the prototype of the Egyptian issues, should we not have expected a scaly aegis from the beginning on?

The elephant on the reverse of the gold coin is equally puzzling. Why is it seemingly standing on the tip of its toes, almost as if it were dancing? Elephants put their feet squarely on the ground when they walk or stand (*see Pl. 16, 6-9*).¹⁴ The clumsily rendered feet and manner of walking of the pachyderm is mentioned in connection with the 'Poros' 5-shekels (p. 192),¹⁵ yet with an ingenious explanation. The engraver, we read, was familiar with the elephants of the army, but he wished to reserve his mastery exclusively for the new gold coin that was intended for the King himself. The silver coins were just for gifts to officers of the army, and so the die-cutter bothered less. But, why then are the elephant's feet on the gold coin not rendered more realistically?

One question that has never been asked, at least by our authors: what about the authenticity of this new coin and of other novelties that appeared with it (see

¹¹ See P. MORENO, in: *Künstlerlexikon der Antike*, R. VOLLKOMMER, ed., vol. 2 (Munich/Leipzig 2004), *s.v.* Lysippos (I), pp. 27-39.

¹² G.K. JENKINS, *Ancient Greek Coins* (Fribourg 1972), p. 216 and fig. 502, or H.A. CAHN, *Frühhellenistische Münzkunst* (Basel 1949), p. 13-14 and fig. 10.

¹³ LORBER (*supra*, n. 10) pp. 62-63.

¹⁴ See *Grzimeks Tierleben*, vol. XII (1972), p. 464 and pp. 479-501 (*Pl. 16, 9*).

¹⁵ Already observed by B.V. HEAD, *NC* 1906, p. 8 sq. and by G.F. HILL, *BMQuart.* 1, 1926, p. 36.

below, pp. 192)? As already stated, it is all a matter of faith: as far as the provenance and the circumstances of finding go, we depend on *l'homme de Peshawar* – there is no way we can verify anything. And this man's recollections that O.B. accepted and repeats form the basis for the conclusions of this book. We can assume that O.B. held the coins in his hand, but how were they examined, where were they recorded, and, most important, where are they now? Possibly in some mysterious Japanese collection? All this does not make sense and we have to conclude that at least some of these wonderful novelties are forgeries.

After all, Northern India of the colonial age, present-day Pakistan and Afghanistan, has a tradition of producing forgeries that goes back to the late 19th century. The officers of the British army that were stationed there, mostly without family, found little to occupy them in their free time besides hunting or drinking too much. But quite a few became collectors and were fascinated by the ancient coins of which the local bazaars, real Aladdin's caves, abounded. The market flourished and before long the local dealers started mixing forgeries in with the real coins.¹⁶ These forgeries can still be found in old English collections whose owners were once stationed in India, e.g. Major-General Haughton's.¹⁷

Postscriptum to Alexander

A few months after the book had come out, O.B. let it be known that the Alexander coin had been on exhibit at the Montpellier museum for three months, but without any kind of announcement, however. Now Montpellier is a beautiful and pleasant town, worth a visit any day, but it is not exactly the hub of the numismatic world, and who would look for a new, sensational coin there without knowing about the exhibit? There was no need for such secrecy, and many questions could have been asked, and perhaps answered, on the spot if it had not been handled in such a furtive way.

Numismatic questions about Mir Zakah

For the few coins from the Mir Zakah find that are published we depend on the catalogue of the Miho Museum (see note 4) where (part of?) the coins sold to this institution are illustrated. It is a strange selection, and some items confirm the uneasy feelings one already got from reading about them in the book. This is the general situation:

¹⁶ Peshawar was apparently a center, see MITCHINER (*supra*, n. 5) vol. 4, p. 381.

¹⁷ See the catalogue Sotheby London, 30 Apr. 1958, lots 280, 290, 292, 333, 334, 395-397.

A) *surely not authentic*

- 44 a and b 'Mazaïos', AV Triple daric. 2 specimens from the same pair of dies. Unfortunately a fantasy, copying (the reverse badly so) silver staters of Mazaïos struck at Tarsos. On the silver staters there are Aramaic legends and letters on both sides and the lion/bull scene is turned to left, cf. esp. SNG von Aulock 5957, also SNG Paris Cilicie 330-353 and SNG Levante I, 100-107.
- 44 k and l Seleukos I, Gold stater. 2 specimens from the same pair of dies. Three genuine staters of this type are known so far: a) Berlin (= ESM 329); b) London, NC 1959, pl. VI, 22 ('purchased in Kabul'); c) coll. Houghton, CSE 1034 = NFA XVIII, 1987, 279.

B) *should be examined*

- 44 c Kios, Bithynia. Gold stater. Very suspicious, see the genuine specimen BMC 3 = R.Gén. II pl. XLIX, 3: same magistrate's name but differently arranged; no club above the prow. The coin from Mir Zakah is of the style and fabric of a silver drachm, not of a gold stater.
- 44 i and j Seleukos I, Gold stater. 2 specimens from the same pair of dies. For references see 44 k and l above. Die duplicates do of course occur in hoards, but why are there always two of the same here?
- 45 c Diodotos, Gold stater. This third specimen is possibly a copy of a silver drachm, cf. Mitchiner Type 65. On the stater both ends of the diadem fall on the neck, as on the silver, while on the gold staters one end is normally turned upward.
- 46 a Menander, Gold stater. Very suspicious, see Mitchiner vol. 4, p. 382. It is not sure whether this king struck gold coins at all.
- to be examined if and when they surface – Agathokles. Double gold stater, with head of Alexander wearing elephant-scalp headdress and with a seated Zeus facing on the rev. (see p. 219 and note 5).
– Andragoras, AV Stater

O.B.'s main argument in favor of the authenticity of the Menander gold stater (p. 226), a coin type that has long been questioned, is the claim that it came from the Mir Zakah hoard. What's more, he goes on to argue that this hoard provenance not only proves beyond any doubt the authenticity of the Miho specimen, but also disproves and silences definitely all the doubts that had been formerly voiced.¹⁸ This, however, is a typical circular reasoning, and we are back to our old problem: the provenance from the Mir Zakah hoard is not proven and cannot be proved. We might just as well turn the tables and argue that the fact that this extremely

¹⁸ But see MITCHINER (*supra*, n. 5), vol. 4, p. 381-383, Appendix three: Forgeries, esp. p. 382 with n. 515: the 3 specimens of the General Haughton coll.

questionable coin was from Mir Zakah is an indication that other rarities of this “hoard” could be equally dubious.

King Sophytes

When *l'homme de Peshawar* met with the two authors in Paris in February 2005, just before they left for Afghanistan, he had another surprise in store for them; apart from some fabulous jewelry coming from Aï Khanoum, he produced two coins (p. 112), both unknown and unique (both illustrated), a gold stater (*Pl. 17, 1*) and a new silver tetradrachm (*Pl. 17, 7*) of king Sophytes. Basically there is no connection between these two coins and the Mir Zakah hoard, and one wonders why their publication is included, a little furtively, perhaps, in this book.

O.B. had already treated this mysterious ruler in 1996.¹⁹ On rereading this article one finds it, unfortunately, somewhat disappointing. It mainly deals with the historical background, and the tetradrachm of this king, of the types of the smaller denominations, is not mentioned even once in the text though it was unique at the time and the first specimen of this large denomination known. Nor is there any comment on the letters MNA²⁰ – which occur again on the new gold stater – and the coin's illustration is both too dark and too out of focus to allow the reader to study it closely.

On this new gold stater we see a portrait of the king and, on the reverse, a kerykeion. Sophytes wears a helmet adorned with an olive wreath and with a large cheek-piece decorated with a bird's wing; on the neck are the letters MNA. The new tetradrachm bears a rather masculine looking head of Athena and, like Sophytes' smaller denominations, a cock on the reverse. Both coins are said to be from a hoard of 48 coins found at Aqtacha, near Bactra, in 2002, about which nothing is known except what *l'homme de Peshawar* told the authors.

In any event, until now Sophytes was generally thought to be a local ruler in Bactria toward the end of the 4th century, of whom little is known except that he struck coins with his name, coins that are normally found north of the Hindukush. Now his history is about to be retold.

The gold stater shows several peculiarities of which the helmet with its pronounced visor and cheek-piece is the most striking. It is reminiscent of the helmet Seleukos I wears on his tetradrachms from Susa, a victory coinage struck after 305, but with the difference that Seuleukos I's helmet is also adorned with the horn and ear of a bull (*Pl. 17, 3*).²¹ Until now the Seleucid helmet was always considered to have been the model for Sophytes, whose reign, consequently, came after that of Seleukos I. O.B. now offers a completely different interpretation of Sophytes' helmet that rather baffles the reader.

¹⁹ O. BOPEARACHCHI, Sophytes, The Enigmatic Ruler of Central Asia, *Nom. Khron* 15, 1996, pp. 19-32, with older literature.

²⁰ See H. NICOLET-PIERRE/M. AMANDRY, Un nouveau trésor de monnaies pseudo-athéniennes venu d'Afghanistan (1990), *RN* 1994, pp. 34 f., esp. 48-51.

²¹ *SC* 173-174.

On p. 200 we learn that the model for Sophytes' helmet is not to be found in the Seleucid coinage, but much farther to the West. O.B. compares it with the helmet Athena wears on the didrachms struck by Thurioi in Southern Italy of the years *c.* 440-420 (*Pl. 17, 2*).²² However, a mere quick glance at the cited specimens in ACGC shows that Athena's helmet at Thurioi is without a visor, that the olive wreath there is slightly curved as is the helmet's rim, that the leaves of the wreath do not stick out at an almost right angle from the twig, and that the pronounced helmet-crest – it is ultimately taken from Athenian tetradrachms – has, on the Bactrian coin, been transformed into a kind of handle with a volute pattern.

Moreover, the helmet on Seuleukos I's tetradrachms – the more likely models – is covered with a panther skin with its characteristic pattern of spots. On the cheek-piece of Sophytes' helmet this pattern is simply rendered as a bird's wing (which gives him a rather unshaved appearance).

There are also questions about the kerykeion on the reverse. If Sophytes was looking for a Western model for his helmet, one might almost expect a kerykeion in the manner of the reverse of the first Ainos tetradrachms (*Pl. 17, 5*). But there is a world of difference between the simple, unadorned staff at Ainos and the over-elaborate one of the gold stater. The best comparison for the latter is found on the large bronzes of Demetrios I of the early 2nd century (Bop. série 5E, *Pl. 17, 6*), but these are less over-elaborate despite the space the large planchet offers, and they look more like the staffs next to the cock on Sophytes' silver coins than the one on the new gold stater does.

The case of the new tetradrachm is somewhat different. It is less the coin itself, which may well be genuine, than the stylistic comparisons and their conclusions that astonish the reader. As said above, the head of Athena is rather coarse and masculine in appearance. But can we really recognize the king himself who usurped the traits of the goddess and thus committed an outrage (*un sacrilège*), as O.B. wishes us to believe? And, assuming that Sophytes did strike gold coins, would this have been tantamount to usurpation? Anyhow, whoever is on the coin seems to wear a round earring, and that points more to Athena.

Here again, O.B. was looking for a Western model, this time for the reverse, and once more the comparison does not work. The cock does not in the least resemble any of the cocks on the late archaic drachms and didrachms of Himera in Sicily of the years *c.* 520-480 that O.B. cites (*Pl. 17, 8 and 9*).²³ One might argue that a cock is a cock, but the proportions of the Bactrian bird with its larger crest are quite different from the Sicilian types, not to mention the chronological and geographical distances.

According to IGCH, silver coins of Thurioi have never been found outside Italy. The case of Himera is similar: early silver coins of this mint occurred outside Sicily only in the Asyut hoard (IGCH 1644) which contained 3 or 4 worn archaic drachms, and then the Nile valley is, of course, much more easily accessible for coins travelling

²² ACGC 728-729.

²³ ACGC 760-763.

east from Italy than the Oxus valley. So where did the Bactrian engravers get their models from?

Alas, this is all fantasy. The comparisons don't stand up to the most superficial examination. They are only put forward to rewrite Sophytes' history. If Seleukos I copied Sophytes' helmet, not the other way round, it follows that Sophytes' reign is earlier. This would situate him within the political vacuum in Bactria during the years 316-305, between Alexander's last satrap and the recapture of the province by Seleukos, and it would have been Sophytes against whom Seleukos waged war. It would also mean that the engravers at Susa were familiar with Sophytes' coins, which are, however, only known to have been found north of the Hindukush (see pp. 196-197).

In short, this proposed new dating of Sophytes' reign is an interesting speculation, but one that rests on unprovable assumptions which themselves are based on a gold coin whose claim to authenticity is unlikely in the extreme.

Silvia Mani Hurter
Brandschenkestrasse 82
CH-8002 Zürich
s.m.hurter@bluewin.ch

KEY TO PLATES 16–17

Alexander (Pl. 16)

Portrait of Alexander

- 1 Alexander III. Double daric (c.2.5:1)
- 2 Ptolemaios I, Tetradrachm, Alexandria Leu 36, 1985, 202
- 3 Ptolemaios I, Tetradrachm, Alexandria Leu 30, 1982, 217
- 4 Seleukos I, Double daric, Ekbatana. ESM 460; BMC Arabia etc., pl. XXIII, 1
- 5 Gold ring with silver intaglio by the engraver Kallippos, late 3rd cent. Ant.Kunst 45, 1/2, 2002, Pl. 18, 1

Elephant

- 6 Seleukos I, Tetradrachm, Pergamon c.281/280. CSE 1302; NFA XVIII, 1987, 287 ex "Kunstfreund" 249
- 7 Antiochos III, Tetradrachm, Nisibis. CSE 1183; NFA XVIII, 1987, 320
- 8 Seleukos I, Tetradrachm, Susa, c.295-285. CSE 1030; NFA XVIII, 1987, 278
- 9 Elephant advancing to left; see *Grzimeks Tierleben*, vol. XII (1972), p. 464

Sophytes (Pl. 17)

Helmet

- 1 Sophytes, Gold stater (c.3:1)
- 1A Sophytes, Gold stater (c.1.5:1; exact size not indicated)
- 2 Thurioi, Didrachm c.420. Leu 15, 1976, 25
- 3 Seleukos I, Tetradrachm, Susa, c.305. MM 76, 1991, 828
- 4 Sophytes, Didrachm, early 4th c. From *Nom.Khron.* 15, 1996, p. 31, 2

Kerykeion

- 5 Ainos, Tetradrachm c.470. *Ars Classica* XIII, 1926, 575
- 6 Bactria, Demetrios I, AE Triple Unit early 2nd c. Triton IX, 2006, 1115

Cock

- 7 Sophytes, *rev.* of new Tetradrachm (exact size not indicated)
- 8 Himera, Drachm c.520. Leu 28, 1981, 24
- 9 Himera, Didrachm, c.480. *Ars Classica* XVI, 1933, 529



1



2



3



5



4




6



7



8



9



1
Sophytes



1 A



2



3



4



5



6



7



8



9

Editors' Note

This entry is an addendum to the review which had appeared in SNR 82, 2003, pp. 147-157. While the points expressed there basically still stand, a hoard partly recorded since brought new evidence that called for some rearrangements.

Stella Lavva

Die Münzprägung von Pharsalos

Saarbrücker Studien zur Archäologie und alten Geschichte (Saarbrücken 2001)

ADDENDUM: REMNANTS OF A HOARD OF PHARSALIAN HEMIDRACHMS

In 1999 a hoard of Pharsalian hemidrachms was dispersed on the numismatic market, almost without record. It included a quantity of worn, older hemidrachms that were promptly sold in bulk. A remnant of the hoard, examined and photographed several years later, consisted almost exclusively of the hemidrachm variety with Athena's head left and a small letter A behind her neck (Lavva 160–162). Two of the older coins still remained, including one specimen with the letters TH visible behind Athena's neck (Lavva V54). Hemidrachms with such inscriptions, and the associated drachms, are sometimes described as the latest phase of Pharsalus' silver coinage. Yet there was a considerable difference in wear between this supposedly late hemidrachm and the many examples of the issue with the letter A behind Athena's neck. Clearly, the hemidrachms marked with the letter A represent an isolated emission produced somewhat later than the main Pharsalian silver series. These hemidrachms, together with the very rare obols of the same type and style (Lavva 162a), comprised the last silver issue of the mint.

A few of the best pieces from this hoard were sold to a London firm in spring 1999. In October of that year Polaroid photos of the London lot were supplied to B.C. Demetriadi for his records. Through his courtesy we are able to illustrate the London group in addition to the remnants photographed in 2004. In a letter of 25 October 2004 he reported that two very well preserved hemidrachms of the hemidrachm issue marked with the letter A were included in CH I, 27, though they were omitted from the hoard report. He estimated the date of this issue to fall «around the middle of the fourth century if not a little later».

CATALOGUE^{1*}

Obv. Helmeted head of Athena r., with hair rendered as pellets
Rev. Φ-AP (reading downward on r.) Horse head r., remnants of incuse fabric

Lava 31

1 Hoard remnant

Obv. Helmeted head of Athena r., tiny TH behind neck
Rev. Φ-A above horse head r., rest of legend below (off flan)

Lava V 54/R ?

2 Hoard remnant

Obv. Helmeted head of Athena l., A behind neck
Rev. Φ-A-P-ΣA Horse head r., three parallel bars on back of neck just above truncation

Lava 160 (V 74/R 92), erroneously given as V 74/R 93 in text

3 Hoard remnant
 4 Hoard remnant
 5 London lot
 6 London lot
 7 London lot
 8 London lot
 9 London lot

Obv. As last
Rev. As last

Lava – (V 75/R 93)

10 Freeman & Sear MBS 12, Oct. 2005, 121; 2.83 g.
 11 Freeman & Sear MBS 12, Oct. 2005, 122; 2.82 g.
 12 Hoard remnant
 13 Hoard remnant
 14 London lot
 15 London lot
 16 London lot

Obv. Head of Athena l. in crested Attic helmet ornamented with Scylla throwing rock;
 behind neck
Rev. Φ-A-P-ΣA Horse head r., three parallel bars on back of neck just above truncation

¹ * All the coins are illustrated on Pl. 18.



Catharine C. Lorber: Addendum to review St. Lava, Pharsalos, SNR 82, 2003 (1)

Lawa 161 (V 75/R 93)

- 17 Freeman & Sear MBS 11, Nov. 2004, 108; 2.83 g.
- 18 Freeman & Sear MBS 11, Nov. 2004, 109; 2.83 g.
- 19 Hoard remnant
- 20 Gemini II, Jan. 2006, 76; 2.87 g.
- 21 Hoard remnant
- 22 London lot
- 23 London lot
- 24 London lot
- 25 London lot

Obv. As last

Rev. ΦΑ-Ρ-Σ (retrograde)– Horse head r., two parallel bars on back of neck, just above truncation

Lawa 162 (V 75/R 94)

- 26 Hoard remnant
- 27 London lot

This small report supplements Stella Lawa's *Die Münzprägung von Pharsalos*, adding a fourth die combination to the three she recorded. More importantly, it corrects my review of her book in SNR 82, 2003, which on p. 155 proposed to reorder the silver emissions with letter controls, based on the sequence of letter-bearing bronzes. This approach was clearly misguided, as it resulted in placing the issue marked A in the very middle of the hemidrachm series. Lawa came much closer to the truth in listing it as the penultimate silver issue of Pharsalus.

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

Frédérique Duyrat

Arados hellénistique: Étude historique et monétaire

Bibliothèque archéologique et historique Tome 173

Institut français du Proche-Orient. Beirut, 2005.

xii + 433 pp., 50 pl., 13 maps, 17 figs. ISBN 2-912738-33-4, ISSN 0768-2506

The northernmost of the great Phoenician maritime cities, Aradus enjoyed an unusual status during much of the Hellenistic period and its history is thus of special interest. Frédérique Duyrat's doctoral dissertation, submitted in March 2000, reconstructs that history and provides an extensive record of Aradian coinage over more than three centuries, from the Macedonian conquest in 333/2 BC to occasional bronze issues of the first century AD. The corpus lists 4636 coins, arranged in three categories: royal Alexanders; civic emissions of the fourth century (a tiny class);¹ and autonomous emissions ranging in date from c. 246/5 BC to AD 92/3. The autonomous coinage of Aradus is classified into 8 silver series, identified by Roman numerals (Series I-VIII), and 18 bronze series, assigned Arabic numerals (Series 1-18). These series are presented chronologically, based on the date of the earliest known coin, so that silver and bronze series alternate unpredictably in the catalogue. The series vary greatly in size, with a high of 1218 examples of the Tyche/Nike tetradrachms (Series VII) and a low of 2 examples each of the Poseidon/Zeus tetradrachms (Series V) and the bronzes with beardless male head/reclining zebu (Series 18). Because some of the listings run on for pages, it would have been enormously helpful to have headers in the catalogue identifying the group or series listed on each page. A second minor complaint about presentation is that Phoenician characters are not reproduced as they appear on the coins, but are represented by italicized Roman letters or Arabic numerals. Remarkably, Duyrat was able to assign die numbers to nearly every coin in her corpus. An attempt was made to illustrate every obverse die in the plates and, despite inevitable lacunae, the coverage is very good. The illustrations are a mix of photos from casts and from actual coins. The former tend to be light, sometimes too light, while some of the latter are too dark.

Excluded from the corpus and plates are two possibly Aradian coinages whose corpora have already been published by other scholars. In 1976 Otto Mørholm surveyed the Ptolemaic «coins of an uncertain era,» identified the era as Aradian, and interpreted the coins as pseudo-Ptolemaic issues of the Phoenician city.² And in a 1991 article, Arthur Houghton associated the so-called «anchor Alexanders» with Seleucus I and divided them into four groups, one of which (Group III) he

¹ This already-small class will be significantly reduced by a redating proposed by O. HOOVER, *A Second Look at the Aradian Bronze Coinage Attributed to Seleucus I* (SC 72-73), *AJN* 18, 2006, forthcoming.

² O. MØRKHOLM, *The Ptolemaic «Coins of an Uncertain Era»*, *NNÅ* 1975/76, pp. 23-58.

gave to Aradus.³ Duyrat's handling of the «anchor Alexanders» is confusing. On p. 12 she mentions Martin Price's doubts about the attribution of certain «anchor Alexanders» to Aradus,⁴ yet does not engage his arguments. She notes that Houghton proposed the reassignment of his Group I from Aradus to Susa, reports Brian Krittr's rejection of this coinage from Susa,⁵ but fails to state her own view, leaving the reader to wonder whether E.T. Newell's original attribution to Aradus is to be accepted by default.⁶ In the catalogue (p. 35) she cites Houghton's 1991 paper for its quantitative data without specifying which group or groups she considers Aradian; only by consulting the article itself can the reader ascertain that Houghton's Group III is the source of the figures. In contrast, Duyrat's treatment of the Ptolemaic «coins of an uncertain era» is exemplary (pp. 115-119). She describes her attempt to reconstitute Mørkholm's die study; provides a tabular summary of his results; catalogues the specimens that have appeared since 1976, assigning letters to the new dies; and reviews the problem of die links between coins with widely separated dates. Unlike Mørkholm, Duyrat accepts the dates as accurate and assumes the intermittent use of certain obverse dies.

Numismatic analyses are segregated in Chapter III, where the coinage of Aradus is examined by group or by series. Die frequencies show that despite Duyrat's often huge samples, the majority of her series remain very imperfectly known. For the royal coinage of Alexander type she derives averages of annual die use; for series dated according to the Aradian era she presents graphs showing annual variations in production, with die counts superimposed on the number of recorded coins. There are also histograms of weights and, for bronzes, diameters. Circulation patterns are illustrated, where possible, by summarizing all relevant hoards and locating their find spots on maps. The Aradian system of control marks involved the use of both Phoenician and Greek letters, and as a test case Duyrat investigates the controls of the Tyche/Nike tetradrachms (Series VII), whose sample is the most complete and representative of the entire corpus. She argues against the hypotheses that the six Phoenician letters represent either workshops of the mint or *dimenoi* (two-month divisions of the year), but tentatively accepts that the paired Greek letters contract the names of mint magistrates, some of whom served for exceptionally long periods.

The second half of *Arados hellénistique* recounts the history of Aradus and attempts to place its coinage in historical perspective. The scantiness of the literary and epigraphic evidence means that coinage can sometimes help to fill in the narrative. Duyrat sets the scene with descriptions of the island of Arwad and the geography

³ A. HOUGHTON, Some Alexander Coins of Seleucus with Anchors, *Mediterranean Archaeology* 4, 1991, pp. 99-117.

⁴ M.J. PRICE, The Coinage in the Name of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaeus (Zurich/London 1991), pp. 414-425, dates the «anchor Alexanders» (nos. 3339-3364) to the period c. 311-300 but suggests on pp. 415-416 that they were almost certainly minted in Mesopotamia.

⁵ B. KRITTR, The Early Seleucid Mint of Susa (Lancaster 1997), pp. 87-88.

⁶ E.T. NEWELL, The Coinage of the Western Seleucid Mints (New York 1941), pp. 192-193, gave the «anchor Alexanders» to Aradus but denied their association with Seleucus.

of the surrounding region, supplemented by maps and photographs. To fill in the background before the Macedonian conquest, she summarizes the information available about Aradus and each of the cities of its *peraea* from early textual sources and from modern archaeological excavations. She also reports the principal results of excavations at other cities in coastal Syria, including Al-Mina, Ras el-Bassit (Posideion), Ras Shamra (Leukos Limen), and Ras Ibn Hani to the north, and Tell 'Arqa and Tripolis to the south, with brief surveys of the principal cities of the Orontes Valley (Emesa and Pharnacia-Pella-Apamea). The textual sources indicate that Aradus had been under the dominion of the kings of Amurru until the invasions of the Sea People c. 1180. During the chaos of the eleventh through ninth centuries, Aradus emerged as an independent city-state ruled by a king, the common pattern in Phoenicia. In this same troubled period, Aradus dominated numerous cities of the mainland, but lost them to Hamat by the mid-eighth century. The archaeology points to the conclusion that potential Syro-Phoenician rivals to Aradus, except for Marathus, were in decline on the eve of the Macedonian conquest or had not yet achieved importance, leaving Aradus itself in a favorable position to benefit from its harbor, its fleet, and the unusually hospitable coast of the opposing mainland. By this time Aradus again controlled extensive territories on the mainland. We lack specific evidence for the political institutions through which this domination was exercised. Henri Seyrig, followed by J.-P. Rey-Coquais, hypothesized a federation based on the sanctuary of Baetocaecé. Duyrat accepts the existence of a federation but questions the role of Baetocaecé, which appears to have belonged to the Seleucid Crown until the end of the dynasty. Thasos and Rhodes, each of which had a *peraea* on the mainland, provide possible parallels for the relation of Aradus to its mainland possessions.

After his victory at Issus in autumn of 333, Alexander elected not to pursue Darius until he had secured his rear by taking the coastal cities and Cyprus, whose contingents comprised the Achaemenid navy. Alexander wintered at Marathus, on the mainland close by Aradus. The Aradian crown prince and regent, Straton, offered his allegiance to Alexander, after which his father, King Gerostratos, defected from the Persian fleet with his flotilla. We have no record of the end of the Aradian monarchy, but Duyrat seeks some clues in the coinage. She suggests that the letter Γ in the left field of the earliest Alexander tetradrachms (her Group I) might be the initial of Gerostratos, in which case this coinage could have begun as early as c. 332, very soon after the invention of Alexander's royal types at Tarsus in 333 – a dating for which Duyrat finds support in the form of Ξ (with a vertical stroke) in the legend of Groups I and II. Group II consists of just four tetradrachms bearing the Phoenician inscription *mem aleph*, which also marks the fourth-century civic coinage of Aradus before the Macedonian conquest, and which Duyrat takes as evidence for the continuing survival of the monarchy. These *mem aleph* tetradrachms were considered the earliest Alexanders of Aradus by Ernest Babelon and by Newell; Duyrat chooses instead to bring them closer to the staters of her Group III, where *mem aleph* also appears. Group III is characterized by control letters on the obverse. There is a pronounced break in obverse style between Group III and the large Group IV, not noted by Duyrat, who instead finds continuity in control conventions (p. 11). This break may be indicative of intermittent production and

suggests an interval of mint inactivity between Groups III and IV; such an interruption seems the more likely because the volume of Groups I-III is hardly adequate to fill the allotted time period, 332?-c. 324/3.

The major Aradian coinage of the Macedonian period is represented by the Alexanders of Group IV, which bear the royal title and are mostly or entirely posthumous. Group IV represents a period of intense coin production, associated with the large-scale demobilizations of Alexander's army. Duyrat calculates annual die use of 1.75 dies per year for Groups I-III, assigned to the period 332?-324/3, and 45.5 dies per year for Group IV, dated to the period 324/3-320 (p. 123). The figure for Group IV is enormously larger than the average annual die use for Myriandrus/Issus,⁷ Tarsus, Sardes, Miletus, and Lampsacus, derived from a study by François de Callataÿ.⁸ (There is a methodological problem here: because of the huge disparity in size between Duyrat's sample and those of Callataÿ, one would have preferred comparisons based on statistical estimates of the original size of each coinage.) In order to smooth out the anomaly, Duyrat combines Groups I-IV to achieve an average of 16.33 dies per year. Yet the unevenness of the production is arguably its most interesting aspect: Group IV, Series 11, marked with a caduceus, is disproportionately large, accounting for 89 of the 181 obverse dies of Group IV. It might have been fruitful to ask if this sharp spike could be correlated with any specific historical event. Instead, Duyrat submits that the high production levels of Group IV and the mint's specialization in tetradrachms are evidence that Aradus served as a point of debarkation for demobilized soldiers, a proposition earlier rejected by Margaret Thompson.⁹ The hoard record shows that fourth century Aradian tetradrachms enjoyed a wide international circulation, with their heaviest concentrations in Asia Minor and Egypt. Since Asia Minor was well known as a source of mercenaries, Duyrat suggests the dispersal of Aradian tetradrachms as far as Upper Egypt may indicate the existence of Egyptian mercenaries.

Gold production was significant only during the reign of Philip Arrhidaeus. Duyrat calculates that it accounted for 21% of the value of Group IV and 49% of the value of Group V (coinage issued in Philip's name). These calculations appear to have been made on the basis of dies actually recorded; again, it probably would have been preferable to work from statistical estimates of the size of the original production. Of the five hoards containing Aradian staters, three were found in northern Greece or the Balkans and a fourth in Ukraine. Duyrat follows Callataÿ in suggesting that gold staters were intended for the pay of Thracian mercenaries.

Group V, in the name of Philip III, is the only royal Macedonian coinage assigned to Aradus that does not bear the city's mintmark; instead, the letter Z replaces the mintmark beneath Zeus's throne. Duyrat believes that Group V succeeded Group

⁷ The location of the mint is challenged by J.D. BING, *Reattribution of the 'Myriandrus' Alexanders: The Case for Issus*, *AJN* 1, 1989, pp. 1-32.

⁸ F. DE CALLATAÿ, *Recueil quantitatif des émissions monétaires hellénistiques* (Wetteren 1997).

⁹ M. THOMPSON, *Paying the Mercenaries*, in A. HOUGHTON *et al.*, eds., *Festschrift für Leo Mildenberg* (Wetteren 1984), p. 246 n.19.

IV, but her handling of the chronology is inconsistent. On p. 213 she makes the transition contemporary with Ptolemy's conquest of Syria in 319.¹⁰ On p. 215 she notes that Group IV is entirely represented in the Demanhur hoard, but that the hoard contained no coins of Group V; it follows that Group IV must antedate the hoard's burial in 318/7, and Group V must postdate it. But after presenting this argument, Duyrat announces that «for convenience» she will retain Price's date of c. 320 as the boundary between Groups IV and V. Thus she elides the fact that there is very little time for the production of Group V in the name of Philip, which appears throughout the book under the deceptive rubric c. 320-c. 316 (pp. 11, 30, 125, 215). The imprecision of the chronology also renders meaningless the calculations of average annual die use for Groups IV and V (pp. 123, 125).

In the Diadochic period, northern Phoenicia was briefly occupied by Ptolemy, but fell to Antigonos in 316 and remained in his possession until his defeat at Ipsus in 301, when the region passed under the rule of Seleucus. No coinage is attributable to Aradus during the Antigonid phase. This conclusion is contrary to the consensus reached by Kriti and Houghton in the late 1990s when, on the basis of die links, they reattributed to Aradus all the coinage formerly given by Newell to Marathus, associated the anchor with Seleucus' command of the Ptolemaic fleet, and claimed this as evidence that Seleucus held Aradus from the time of his navy, c. 315, until his occupation of Syria in 301.¹¹ Duyrat refutes the Houghton-Kriti chronology as inconsistent with the literary sources, which show that Antigonos and Demetrius were firmly in control of northern Syria and Phoenicia from 316 to 302. If the anchor was really Seleucus' personal emblem, the «anchor Alexanders» could not have been minted in northern Phoenicia until after 301. Duyrat also reports her inability to verify a key die link cited by Kriti and Houghton and suggests that the die links may imply die sharing by Aradus and Marathus, rather than reattribution. After these criticisms, it is somewhat disconcerting that Duyrat provisionally accepts the erstwhile Marathus «anchor Alexanders» as the Aradian coinage of Seleucus after 301. She emphasizes the modest volume of this coinage and its surprising interruption of a long period of mint inactivity. Its purpose, she surmises, was to pay the troops that fought for Seleucus at Ipsus, to finance his conquest of Syria, and/or to maintain the port of Aradus while Seleucus' new foundations were under construction. Duyrat doubts that Houghton's Group IV, Series G belongs to Marathus and rejects the historical conclusions drawn from the attribution by J.D. Grainger. Perhaps due to conflicting publication schedules, *Arados hellénistique* does not mention the reattributions proposed in *Seleucid Coins: the Philips and «anchor Alexanders»* of both Aradus and Marathus are there reassigned to Baby-

¹⁰ The chronology of the early Diadochic period is currently under challenge. Duyrat follows the so-called low chronology. A return to the high chronology has been advocated by P.V. WHEATLEY, Ptolemy Soter's Annexation of Syria 320 BC, *Class.Quart.* XLV/2, 1995, pp. 433-440, who dates the Ptolemaic occupation of Syria and Phoenicia 320-315.

¹¹ KRITI, (*supra*, n. 5), pp. 87-88; A. HOUGHTON, Aradus, not Marathus, in: R. ASHTON/S. HURTER, eds., *Studies in Greek Numismatics in Memory of M.J. Price* (London 1998), pp. 145-146.

lonia, the Philips during Seleucus' first satrapy, the «anchor Alexanders» during his second.¹² This solution requires some adventurous arguments but has the advantage of allowing a single explanation for the anchor erasures that occur in both the «Aradian» and «Marathian» series – a phenomenon not confronted by Duyrat.

From 301 until the conquest of the Ptolemaic province of Syria and Phoenicia by Antiochus III in 200-198, Aradus and its *peraea* lay at the southernmost boundary of Seleucid Syria and served as a buffer zone between the Seleucid and Lagid kingdoms. The importance of its port and fleet assured that Aradus could extract favorable treatment from the Seleucid king, especially during the Second and Third Syrian Wars. It was during the Second Syrian War, in autumn 259, that Aradus received a grant of autonomy. Alain Davesne has alleged a Ptolemaic occupation of Aradus during the Second Syrian War and has submitted that the grant of autonomy came from the Lagid, not the Seleucid king. The linchpin of his case is a speculative attribution to Aradus of two series of Ptolemaic provincial tetradrachms (Svoronos 894-896 and 897-898).¹³ Duyrat demolishes this attribution, demonstrating that Davesne has misread the monogram he claims as an Aradian mintmark. She finds most of Davesne's reconstruction of the war to be dubious, though she is perhaps unduly skeptical when she questions the significance of Ptolemaic coin hoards found in Seleucid territory. Her own reconstruction of the war involves a brief Ptolemaic occupation of Cilicia and Syria Seleucis in 261/0, a rapid repulse of the invaders, and a renewed Lagid offensive, attested by a demotic ostrakon from Karnak that places Ptolemy II in Daphnae in autumn of 258 and further attested by allusions in the Zenon archives to military movements near the River Eleutheros in 257. Duyrat maintains that Aradus received its autonomy from Antiochus II, apparently as a mark of gratitude for the city's fidelity during these troubles.

The Seleucid kingdom suffered key losses during the Third Syrian War. Ptolemy III got possession of Seleucia in Pieria, the port of Antioch. An inscription found at Ras Ibn Hani attests to the presence there of a Lagid garrison that controlled access to the port of Laodicea. Ptolemaic coin finds have been cited to date this occupation to the Third Syrian War, and similar finds establish a Lagid presence at Ras el-Bassit (Posideion) as well. To refute Davesne's hypothesis of another Ptolemaic occupation of Aradus at this time, Duyrat notes the absence of Ptolemaic bronze coins in Aradian territory (though a hoard of Ptolemaic tetradrachms has to be explained away as a merchant's working capital). The production of autonomous Aradian coinage before 243/2 is also alleged to exclude a Ptolemaic presence, however the imprecision of the dating may leave the possibility alive. The autonomous coinage in question includes Alexander tetradrachms with the palm tree

¹² A. HOUGHTON/C. LORBER, *Seleucid Coins: A Comprehensive Catalogue, Part 1* (New York/Lancaster 2002), pp. 34-37, 43-48, 479-483.

¹³ A. DAVESNE, *Les monnaies ptolémaïques d'Éphèse*, in: H. MALAY *et al.*, eds., *Erol Atalay Memorial* (Izmir 1991), pp. 27-28; *id.*, *La seconde guerre de Syrie (ca. 261-255 avant J.-C.) et les témoignages numismatiques*, in: M. AMANDRY/S. HURTER, eds., *Travaux de numismatique grecque offerts à G. Le Rider* (London 1999), pp. 123-134.

(Series I) as well as silver fractions and Tyche/prow bronzes (Series II-III, Series 1). The minting of tetradrachms probably commenced when Laodicea passed under Ptolemaic control and ceased to issue its own Alexanders. Although Aradian production was not large, Duyrat asserts that it may have doubled the annual rate of Laodicea, which had apparently been the most productive mint of the western Seleucid kingdom. (This is another comparison that may be considered suspect, since it is based on actual dies recorded rather than statistical estimates of total production.) The «palm tree Alexanders» were minted intermittently from 246/5(?) to 168/7, with peaks of production associated with the Third, Fourth, and Fifth Syrian Wars, suggesting that this coinage was struck to cover military expenses.

The first peak of production of the «palm tree Alexanders» lasted through the War of the Brothers. During this fratricidal conflict Aradus sided with Seleucus II and was rewarded with a treaty allowing the city to give sanctuary to fugitives from his kingdom; Duyrat considers this to be the political form of *asylia*, limited in scope and a proof of the city's subjection to the Crown. The treaty also led to territorial gains in the *peraea*. Citing the opinion of Rey-Coquais that this was a turning point in Aradian history, Duyrat speculates that Aradus may have installed colonists on the mainland, in effect extending its civic territory after the model of the Rhodian *peraea*. Nevertheless, in the following years there is evidence for the autonomy of several of the mainland cities. Duyrat names Simyra as the only royal Seleucid mint within the *peraea*, associating its Seleucid-type tetradrachm, dated year 35 (225/4), with Porphyry's report that Seleucus III prepared a campaign against Ptolemy III in that year (Hier. *In Dan.* 11.44-45). Since *Arados hellénistique* went to press, an earlier tetradrachm of this type, apparently undated, was published as an issue of Seleucus II by Arnold Spaer.¹⁴ In addition, Carne is now known to have struck tetradrachms and probably also drachms with the types of Seleucus II, the former in 229/8 and the latter in either 230/29 or 229/8.¹⁵ This coinage, probably a contribution to Seleucus' Parthian campaign, indicates that Carne, like Simyra, was autonomous and allied with the Seleucid king. Also datable c. 230-225 are drachms of Marathus imitating the Athena/Nike types of Seleucia on the Tigris under Seleucus II.¹⁶ Marathus reaffirmed its *symmachia* in 218, in the course of the Fourth Syrian War. Duyrat recalls the discussion of Elias Bickerman concerning the status of such allied cities. They could send embassies to the king and engage in diplomacy with other cities and polities. They were not subject to conscription but maintained their own armed forces, from which they supplied contingents to the king. These criteria seem to apply to Aradus.

The series of Ptolemaic tetradrachms (and later, didrachms) «of an uncertain era» began in the decade of the 220s. In an appendix to Chapter VII (pp. 266-272),

¹⁴ A. SPAER, The Seleucid Mint of Simyra, SM 212, December 2003, pp. 75-76.

¹⁵ A. HOUGHTON/C. LORBER/O. HOOVER, Seleucid Coins: A Comprehensive Catalogue, Part 2 (New York/Lancaster), forthcoming, Addenda to Part 1, Ad154 (= AHNS 993) and Ad172.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, Addenda Ad156.

Duyrat summarizes the arguments supporting Mørkholm's attribution to Aradus and those supporting the hypotheses of R.A. Hazzard, who submitted that the coinage was dated according to an era of Ptolemy Soter commencing in 262, and proposed Pelusium as the mint.¹⁷ For various reasons, including the lack of mint-marks, Duyrat is reluctant to assign the era coinage to Aradus; she tends to favor the Soter era over the Aradian era because it yields better correspondences between periods of coin production and historical events. Though she offers perceptive critiques of both Mørkholm's and Hazzard's mint attributions, she cannot solve the mystery. She concludes that this was a royal Ptolemaic coinage whose mint remains to be determined but was probably in Egypt or Syro-Phoenicia. A listing of thirteen hoards in Chapter III (pp. 175-178) shows that the era coins circulated in the ancient zone of Lagid domination, on Cyprus but predominantly in the Syro-Phoenician province, apart from two hoards found on Aradian territory. Duyrat suggests that the current picture of their circulation may be distorted by the uneven pace of archaeological excavations in different Middle Eastern countries. She concedes that the circulation as presently known makes it difficult to envision an Egyptian mint, as we would have to assume that its entire output was exported, even at times when Egypt was struggling with a shortage of silver. But her alternative is problematic. Since the era coinage lasted into the 140s, a Syro-Phoenician mint could only be Aradus or an unidentified Ptolemaic outpost that somehow survived the Fifth Syrian War.

The conquests of Antiochus III in the Fifth Syrian War changed the geopolitical organization of Syria and Phoenicia. No longer a border state, Aradus lost its strategic importance and its power to extract special benefits from the Crown. The Treaty of Apamea affected Aradian naval operations inasmuch as the city was an ally of the Seleucid king; Duyrat proposes that this, rather than the Roman indemnity, may explain the cessation of regular annual issues of «palm tree Alexanders» after 191/0. A few fitful emissions followed, the last probably in 168/7. By that time Aradus had already initiated a new silver coinage, its first-ever drachms, imitating the bee/stag drachms of Ephesus (Series VI). These were intended to replace the very old drachms of Alexander III, which were finally disappearing from circulation, and to supplement the drachms of Ephesus, which also circulated in the Seleucid kingdom but whose production had effectively ceased. The pseudo-Ephesian drachms, though well represented in the corpus with 436 specimens, exhibit unusual die ratios that suggest they were not actually produced in great abundance. This probably resulted from the fact that the obverse dies bore the dates and control marks, so that they had to be discarded at the end of each year. However Duyrat offers an alternative explanation: to account for an anomalous (probably double struck) drachm, she hypothesizes that multiple obverse dies may have been engraved on a single piece of metal, so that the mint worker could strike different dies alternately. The inaugural date of the pseudo-Ephesian drachms

¹⁷ R.A. HAZZARD/M.P.V. FITZGERALD, *The Regulation of the Ptolemaieia: A Hypothesis Explored*, *Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society of Canada* 85/1, February, 1991, pp. 6-23; R.A. HAZZARD, *Imagination of a Monarchy: Studies in Ptolemaic Propaganda* (Toronto 2000), pp. 3-79.

(172/1?) and their heavy production through 169/8 are adduced to support the notion that they played a role in military preparations for the Sixth Syrian War, as well as in the actual campaigns. The absence of a drachm issue for 168/7 and the end of the palm tree Alexanders in the same year might be related to Porphyry's report that Antiochus IV ravaged the territory of Aradus in 168 to punish a rebellion by the city. However Duyrat questions whether such a rebellion occurred, citing the resumption of drachm production in 167/6 and the regular annual issues beginning in 165/4. An increase in drachm output from 162/1 to 160/59 may reflect Aradian support for the cause of Demetrius I. On the other hand, the very wide distribution of these drachms, from Smyrna to Tehran, including a sizable number in a Baghdad hoard, argues for at least a secondary circulation in commerce. There was a long interruption in drachm production after 152/1, with a second period of feeble issues between 129/8 and 111/10.

Around 140 Marathus seems to have passed under the control of Aradus, perhaps through a *sympoliteia* as suggested by Rey-Coquais. Around this same time (in 138/7) Aradus introduced a new silver coinage (Series VII), tetradrachms pairing the head of Tyche and a figure of Nike holding an aphlaston, the latter type symbolic of Aradian naval power. At this point Aradus abandoned the international Attic standard, instead striking these tetradrachms to a reduced weight standard, with an average weight of c. 15.00-15.29 grams. This reduced standard was also employed for the later pseudo-Ephesian drachms and was retained until the end of the city's silver coinage in the first century BC. Toward the end of the second century the Aradian standard was adopted by other regional cities: Seleucia in Pieria from 109/8, Tripolis c. 100, and Laodicea from 81/0. A comparative survey of hoards reveals that the adoption of this epichoric standard entailed the creation of a closed monetary zone that prevented the escape of silver currency while providing a regular revenue stream in the form of commissions on currency exchange. The Tyche/Nike tetradrachms were produced in regular annual issues of modest size, consistent with their function as a local currency and much in contrast to the fluctuations of earlier coinages that were linked to Seleucid military activity. Nevertheless Duyrat finds a correlation between periods of elevated coin production before 120/19 and events in the Seleucid kingdom, even as she rules out any military or financial involvement of Aradus in the rivalries of the Seleucid dynasty. Her narrative of these rivalries, unfortunately, involves a number of careless errors, whose survival suggests the dissertation did not receive much editorial attention on its way to becoming a book. The biography of Demetrius I is attached to Demetrius II, who is described as a Roman hostage who escaped to Syria (p. 264). Ptolemy Euergetes II is referred to both as Ptolemy VIII (p. 264) and as Ptolemy VII (p. 265) – perhaps a response to the currently unsettled state of the numbering of the latter Ptolemies. Cleopatra Thea is called Cleopatra II (p. 265), a numeration that is not justified in the Seleucid line and invites confusion with her mother, Cleopatra II of Egypt, who took refuge at the Seleucid court during the second reign of Demetrius II.

After the Seleucid civil wars brought the dynasty to its nadir, Tigranes II of Armenia occupied Syria. Neither the literary record nor archaeology hints at any contact with Aradus, but Duyrat notes the cessation of two Aradian bronze series

in 84/3 and 83/2 and the impressive number of Armenian bronzes overstruck on Aradian issues as evidence that Tigranes probably passed through the Aradian *peraea*.¹⁸ She disputes the numismatic arguments of Grainger, who claims that Gabala escaped the Aradian orbit between 129 and 86. She also rebuts the theory of B.E. Levy that the letters ΜΣ, which appear on many Aradian tetradrachms between 90/89 and 67/6, reflect a long mint magistracy held by Mithradates VI of Pontus. The arrival in the region of Pompey the Great correlates with increased tetradrachm production at Aradus and Laodicea, leading Duyrat to suggest some vague involvement of these cities with the stationing of Roman troops in Syria. After 64 many cities abandoned the Aradian era in favor of a Pompeian era and Aradus, while maintaining its own era, may have gained control over the important sanctuary of Baetocaecé. The region was subsequently caught up in the Roman civil wars. That Aradus participated in the preparation of a Pompeian fleet in 49 is known from an inscription but scarcely reflected in its coinage. Duyrat believes that Caesar punished Aradus for its Pompeian sympathies by depriving it of Gabala, which henceforth dated its coinage by the Caesarian era commencing in 46/5. Aradus declined steadily thereafter, striking its last silver coinage in 44 (at which point Laodicea abandoned the Aradian standard for the Ptolemaic). Aradus showed consistent hostility to Mark Antony and Cleopatra and, after the repulse of the Parthian invasion of 41/0-39, was the only city not to submit to the Romans. In 37 it was besieged by Antony's governor C. Sossius and fell after suffering famine and epidemic. Aradus is rarely mentioned in texts of the imperial period and did not enjoy the favor of the Roman emperors or their client-kings in the region.

Aradian bronze coinage, in Duyrat's view, was intended for small daily transactions and generally did not respond to historical events unfolding in Syria and Phoenicia. It circulated throughout the *peraea*, where it was far more abundant than the coinages of the mainland cities, and even farther abroad. Duyrat's 18 series are classified by their types, which seem usually to have served as denomination markers. But three series – Series 1, Series 3, and Series 7 – changed weights and modules abruptly, either doubling or halving the original denomination. Duyrat shows that the currency system involved four bronze denominations, not necessarily issued simultaneously, but circulating together. In many cases the same denomination was struck with different types over a short period of time, but normally one of the types disappeared soon thereafter, suggesting that this was a method of assuring a smooth transition.

Duyrat herself describes Aradian coin types as banal. The deities depicted are completely hellenized in their iconography, though the gods actually worshipped at Aradus were Phoenician. Thus Zeus on the coinage represents the Ba'al of Aradus, a god of rain, thunder, and high places, but also of the sea. The great Phoenician female divinity, Astarte, appears on the obverse of ten different Aradian coin series, sometimes in the guise of Europa or of Tyche. The poverty of imagina-

¹⁸ The bronze overstrikes will be reconsidered in a forthcoming paper by Oliver Hoover, which concludes that Tigranes' Syrian invasion should be dated around 75 BC. This is the date accepted in Houghton, Lorber, and Hoover, *Seleucid Coins, Part 2* (*supra*, n. 15).

tion contrasts strikingly with the inventive bronze types of the more southerly Phoenician cities under Antiochus IV.

Arados hellénistique concludes with a set of nine appendices, in the form of tables or lists that summarize such practical information as the dates of issue for each Aradian coin type; Phoenician and Greek dates on Aradian coins; a synopsis of the controls of Aradian coins; hoards found in the Aradian *peraea*; the dated coinage of the Seleucid rivals Antiochus VIII and IX, by mint; the eras of the Syrian cities; and a chronology of the Seleucid kings and Roman governors of Syria. There is a four-page résumé in Arabic at the very end of the book. One wonders how it can begin to do justice to the breadth and importance of Duyrat's contribution.

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

Benedetto Carroccio

Dal basileus Agathocle a Roma: Le monetazioni siciliane d'età ellenistica

Messina, 2004. pp. 291, 36 pls. ISBN 88-8268-013-X € 70.

Carroccio (C.) has undertaken a most ambitious task and often with considerable success. But, as will become apparent, it is marred by serious errors of judgement. From Agathocles to the fifth Syracusan Democracy he could build on sound foundations laid by other scholars and on his own distinguished research. But at times he is curiously tentative. Why for instance does he separate in date the wide flan Poseidon/Trident bronzes from the laureate Hieron/Horseman series?¹ The Polizzi Generosa hoard (see below) and the Morgantina site-finds (p. 114) surely show that they ran together from *c.*241 to *c.*225, as I have argued.² But C. dates them 263-218 and 241-230 or 230-218 respectively.

C. presents a vast variety of numismatic material, much of it in a series of Tables (*prospetti*) – covering points of style, typology, metrology, allusions, iconography. It is just a pity that his Index is not more help in hunting down particular points discussed. Too often he gives only a list of page references without further guidance. His book is handsomely and fully illustrated with 36 plates for all the coinages covered and usually with fine reproductions, even of the bronze. His *catalogo* (pp. 43-94) gives dates (approximate or more precise) for all the issues, although – apart from the coinage of Eunus at Enna in 138-134 – he dates no issue after 179 BC. This is strange since his study comes down to the First Slave War (pp. 25 and 120).

C. pays much attention to marks of value and other indications of denominations. The first seem limited to the period 215-185 (*Prospetto I*, pp. 150-153). But the Hispanorum coinage, *pace* Caltabiano, on whom C. relies,³ was struck not in this time bracket, but *c.*150-100 BC.⁴ More seriously, *prospetto I* is based on the theory – derived from Marchetti and Caltabiano – that from 215 Rhegion, the Mamertini and many Sicilian mints struck on the Roman standard – sextantal from 215, uncial from 211 and semiuncial from 204. Crawford rightly would have none of this.⁵ C. cites the Minturno hoard in support of his theory, but Crawford, dating that *c.*200 rather than 191, has argued that its semiuncial pieces are characteristic of the first phase of the denarius system: the Sicilian mints struck many pieces well under the sextantal standard.⁶ All our evidence shows that the uncial standard was reached *c.*150 after a long steady decline, and the semiuncial by law in 90/89.⁷

¹ *Catalogo* p. 84, no. 60 f.

² SNR 79, 2000, p. 43.

³ Sulla cronologia e la metrologia delle serie *Hispanorum*, NACQT 14, 1985, pp. 159-169.

⁴ K. ERIM, *Morgantina Studies II*, 1989, pp. 39, 64-66.

⁵ *Coinage and Money under the Roman Republic* (1985), p. 110, no. 15.

⁶ RRC p. 15.

⁷ RRC pp. 612-615.

On pp. 115-120 C. discusses the value of hoards for establishing chronology and makes sound points about treating them with care. But I find his handling of hoards disconcerting. Here are some of the chief examples.

1 Megara Hyblaia

C. dates its contents before *c.*200, following Caltabiano's attribution of its duoviral Enna coin to 216-214 BC.⁸ Now a Roman *municipium* in Sicily in the Hannibalic War is hard to accept. Moreover, the hoard was found in a destruction layer, apparently from the end of the city.⁹

2 Cava dei Tyrrheni

C. puts it in the First Punic War (p. 120). But three libral prow pieces and one semi-libral impose the dating *c.*217 BC.

3 Polizzi Generosa

Tusa dated it *c.*258-250 and Crawford essentially agreed.¹⁰ C. (p. 120) accepted Carbè's dating of some of its Tauromenion pieces to the Hannibalic War and argued that, since much of the hoard was lost, its value for dating was lost too. In SNR 79, 2000, p. 43, I showed cause for dating the hoard in the 230s.

4 Bisacquino

C. would date it *c.*150 (pp. 120 and 250), but he missed Crawford's judgement that the worn *asses* required a late second/early first century date.¹¹

5 Biancavilla

C. challenges its right to be considered a hoard (p. 117), but Crawford showed it to be a fairly normal hoard of *c.*150 (last *as* is C. Maiani, RRC 203).¹²

6 Campobello di Licata

C. wants it *c.*150 BC (pp. 120 and 157, n. 73). The *asses* must come much later. The sestertius of L. Naevius Surdinus brings the hoard down to *c.*15 BC.¹³

One of the great virtues of C.'s book and his *Catalogo* should be to throw light on the dating and arrangement of the great volume of bronze coinage from 212 BC to the late second century. Unfortunately such clarity is largely lacking and we do not often discover on what criteria his datings rest. But something can be done. For the mint of Catania C. was able to rely on the impressive study by Mina Casabona.¹⁴ He

⁸ Hestiasis V, 1988, pp. 349-375.

⁹ See my review in SNR 79, 2000, p. 36; for further support of F. Villard's *c.*40 BC dating: *Mél.Ecol.Fran.Rome* 63, 1951, pp. 47 f. and 34.

¹⁰ TUSA, *AIIN* 7-8, 1960/61, pp. 78-90; CRAWFORD, *supra* n. 5, p. 107 f.

¹¹ CRAWFORD, *supra* n. 5, p. 307; *id.*, *BAR Int. Series* 326 (1987), p. 43.

¹² *Roman Republican Coin Hoards* (henceforward RRCH) 129 with Table IX.

¹³ *Ibid* 494; SUTHERLAND, *RIC I*², pp. 31 f. 70 f.

¹⁴ *RIN* 100, 1999, pp. 13-46.

has incorporated all her arrangement in his *Catalogo*, pp. 46-48. I reproduce her scheme with some necessary changes.

Apollo / Goddess X	c.212 on	
Sarapis-Isis / Apollo X	c.200 on	
Sarapis-Isis / Two corn-ears		
Poseidon / Dolphin XII		
Dionysos / Dolphin XI		
Grapes / Dolphin		
Silenos / Grapes XI		
Dionysos / Two Catana brothers		monogram
Catana brother / Other brother	}	same three monograms
Sarapis bifrons / Demeter		
Sarapis / Isis with Harpokrates		
Zeus Ammon / Isis Diakosyne	}	same three monograms
Hermes / Nike		
Dionysos / Young dancer (maenad ?)		
Dionysos / Panther car		
River god reclining / Two pilei and stars: lion.		2 monograms
River god reclining / Two pilei and stars: owl over monogram		

Apollo/Goddess is found in Dep. 60 at Morgantina of 211 BC and is abundant always later; Casabona wrongly put it sixth. The Sarapis-Isis type is borrowed from tetradrachms of Ptolemy IV of c.211 or of Ptolemy V of c.200 BC.¹⁵ Casabona and Carroccio prefer the former, I plump for the latter.

The Dionysos/Catana brothers type was overstruck by Sarapis bifrons;¹⁶ this was not noted by Casabona and Carroccio, who put it near the end of the coinage. They correctly saw that the River god/2 pilei and owl issue was copied from Athens New Style issue 10. M. Thompson's 186/5 dating must be brought down to 153/2.¹⁷ C. dates the River god issue 186-170 which is quite impossible (p. 217). He and Casabona want to put the two late Dionysos types before 186 because, with Caltabiano, they believe that the *SC de Bacchanalibus* would have banned reference to the cult of Dionysos in Sicily (p. 209 f.). But this is uncertain. It may be that repression was confined to Roman Italy and that is all that our sources know. In any event these two late Catana issues must be much closer to 160 than 186.

There was certainly much celebration of Egyptian cults at Catana. Indeed there is little trace of them elsewhere in Sicily. We have Serapis/Nike in biga at Menainon, and Zeus/Isis and Isis/Uraeus at Syracuse. The rest listed in *Prospetto* 19 (p. 234 f.) from Agyrrhion, Panormos and Syracuse are very doubtful. The coinage of Menainon is very homogenous in style. C. dates the series 204/190; but there were specimens of the Apollo issue in the Aidone and Grammichele hoard of 212

¹⁵ See O. MØRKHOLM, EHC (1991), p. 109; Coin Hoards VII, 90.

¹⁶ Morgantina Studies II, p. 82 and on no. 136.

¹⁷ See my arguments in NC 1990, pp. 67-74 and M. PRICE, BAR Int. Series 326 (1987), pp. 74-77 with n. 28.

BC.¹⁸ Isis Dikaiosyne and Harpokrates seem to appear later in the Delos evidence than in Sicily: the first is first found in 115/4 BC, the latter in the early years of Athenian administration (160s).¹⁹

How did C. come by his often close dating of post 212 Sicilian bronze? Clearly one criterion is style. This can at least establish probable contemporaneity of issues. For instance, on p. 217 f. he argues that the very small and similar busts of Hermes at a number of mints could suggest a common mint or at least closeness in time. I would carry this approach further. I offer a number of parallel issues to show what perhaps can be done.

1 *Kallakte*, owl on amphora (*Catalogo* no. 46, no. 4). An unmistakable copy of Athens New Style. C. does not discuss it, but shows it on Pl. 2. He dates it 205?-190. But New Style began, we now know in 164/3 and not in 196/5. His dating makes no sense.

2 The *Romano-Sicilian* issues, with 'wolf and twins' reverse were probably taken from the Roman collateral semi-libral sextans (RRC 39) of 217-215. A specimen was found in the Sicilian hoard from Mandinici of c.211 BC (RRCH 71). A specimen of Romano-Sicilian no. 41 was found in the excavation around Hieron's altar c.210 BC.²⁰

3 The *Hispanorum* issue with Male head/Apex is so like Syracuse 102 that Erim suggested the possibility of a common mint.²¹ It must be dated c.100 BC and the Syracusan coin must come down as late – not 208-204. There is also a coin of Leontinoi with Apollo/Apex, which C. shows on Pl. VII, but does not discuss. It is extremely like the other two.

4 *Menainon* no. 4, Demeter/Crossed torches. This is so like Syracuse 113 that both could come from the same mint.²² C. dates Menainon 204-190 and Syracuse 209-200. Menainon should probably take the Syracusan coin back to c.212.

5 The radiate Artemis of *Iaeta* (no. 6, Pl. VII) is strikingly like Syracuse 108 (Pl. XXXI). C. dates *Iaeta* 200-180 and Syracuse 211-200? They must be put close together.

6 *Akrai*. Kore/Demeter is very like Syracuse 104 (Kore/Demeter), see pl. I and XXXI. C. dates both post 212. But Syracuse 104 was found in the Megara Hyblaia hoard, which must be dated c.40 BC. At that date it can tell us much about Sicilian second / first century BC bronze coinage. There were 23 speci-

¹⁸ See CRAWFORD, *supra*, n. 5, p. 11.

¹⁹ See ID 2079, 2103 and 2117.

²⁰ See Not.Scavi 1954, p. 365.

²¹ Morgantina Studies II, p. 63.

²² See *ibid.*, p. 143 on no. 212 and p. 149 on no. 396.

mens of Syracuse 104 out of the hoard's 47 coins and they should be put in the first century BC, as the hoard's latest component. The 12 hoard specimens of Zeus/Nike in biga (Syracuse 100) would fit *c.*100 BC, since three specimens were found in Morgantina Stratum 46 of *c.*84 BC. The 8 specimens of Sarapis/Isis (Syracuse 116) must be put some time before *c.*140 BC, since a specimen of the surely contemporary Zeus/Tyche (Syracuse 102) was in Morgantina Hoard 43. The two Catana specimens of Zeus/Isis Dikaiosyne (Catana 13) are likewise shown to be before *c.*140 BC by the same hoard, which also contains a specimen of River god/Two pilei and owl (Catana 16). As we have seen, the earliest date of that is *c.*153/2 BC.

These are just a few suggestions of how stylistic links might be used to organise better the mass of post-212 material. Evidence of typology and metrology might help further to build up a firmer picture of this rather dark age of Sicilian numismatics. B. Carroccio has deserved well by bringing so much material together and I must not end this somewhat critical review without praising the care and devotion with which he has assembled for our benefit so much widely spread and often intractable evidence on a long period of critical numismatic history.

Prof. Harold B. Mattingly
40, Grantchester Rd
GB-Cambridge CB3 9ED

Bernhard Woytek

Arma et Nummi

Forschungen zur römischen Finanzgeschichte und Münzprägung
der Jahre 49 bis 42 v. Chr.

Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse
Denkschrift 312 = Veröffentlichungen der Numismatischen Kommission 40 =
Veröffentlichungen der Kleinasiatichen Kommission 14, Vienna 2003.
631pp., 12 plates. ISBN 3-7001-3159-3. € 147.80.

This is beyond question the most important work on any aspect of the Republican coinage to appear since Crawford's *Roman Republican Coinage* (hereafter Crawford or Cr.). The reviewer has always had the impression that Crawford's work was at its best and most incisive where his principal form of evidence – the hoards – led to new ideas; in any case, as this was the first reference work to embrace Thomsen's work on the early Roman coinage and the new dating of the earliest denarii, there was plenty novel to say about the coinage from its beginnings down to the mid-first century. By contrast the coinage from *ca.* 50 B.C. on offered less: the hoards were smaller and more equivocal, and the concept of multiple "moving mints" allowed the question of exact attributions to be skirted. The end of this period remained problematic: what to do with the IMP CAESAR and CAESAR DIVI F issues, most of which are plausibly pre-Actian?

These last fall outside the self-imposed chronological limitations of this massive work, which represents the outcome (expanded!) of a dissertation presented in 2000/2001. The period begins with the opening of the civil war, and ends with what is now a linchpin of chronology, the most satisfyingly secure of all the later republican colleges. Woytek (hereinafter W.) argues (p. 2) that these years transformed the Roman economy of state and with it the coinage. As he points out, Rome ceased to be the only or even the most prolific mint; gold came to be produced with increased regularity; there were important innovations in the base metal, some of which anticipate later imperial developments. Throughout the author has gone beyond numismatics to link the coinage to the historical record, and where we find ourselves unconvinced it is often owing solely to the lack of relevant source material.

There are three similarly-organized chapters, treating the periods 49-48 (Caesar and Pompey); 48-45 (the wars in Egypt, Africa, and Spain, and Caesar's disposition of the property of the Pompeians); and 44-42 (Caesar's absolute power to Philippi). Each of these is subdivided into sections treating at considerable length (A) the history of the period and, at somewhat greater length, (B) the coinage.

To take but one example of the nexus between coinage and military finance, W. points out (p. 28) that while Caesar, as a provincial governor, was not (at least until his return) responsible for his accounting to anyone, Pompey was officially dependent on decrees of the Senate; for the whole of the year 49, as proconsul, he was subordinate to the consuls C. Claudius Marcellus and L. Cornelius Lentulus

Crus. Much is also made of the *aerarium* and its supposed seizure in the early days of 49. From Livy 27.10.11 (209 BC) it is inferred that the *vicesima libertatis* was accumulated in the *aerarium sanctius ad ultimos casus* and not spent from year to year. The sum involved, then, was not inconsiderable. At p. 35 the chronology as presented by Caesar is criticized; it was clearly in Caesar's interest to alter this chronology, as it suggests that part of the treasury was removed. But W. (p. 37) believes that in keeping with the tradition preserved in *Att.* 7.15.3, 8.3.4 the whole treasury was left behind for Caesar. This would make sense of the order of Pompey on 7 February to deliver the treasury to him (*Att.* 7.21.2) and explain his later financial stringency. W. also supposes that in any case Caesar had plenty of cash on hand, left over from his proconsulship. Thus Shackleton Bailey¹ is right and Crawford (p. 639 n. 2) is wrong to read into Cicero's letter that "Caesar started without anything on hand." Even Suet. *Div. Iul.* 68.1, which shows the better-off financing the poorer and the soldiers serving without pay, is in W.'s view the result of illiquidity, not bankruptcy (p. 40).

Appendices I-III treat historical and iconographic problems, while the chronology and attributions are conveniently charted on pp. 553-559. Most attention will doubtless focus on the strikings summarized in the long table on pp. 558-559, "Verzeichnis der neuen Datierungs- und/oder Lokalisierungsvorschläge im Vergleich zu Crawford (RRC)," which provides a guide to the core of the strictly numismatic discussion. Many of these represent only slight adjustments, but all are worthy of consideration.

For Rome the chronology is essentially that of Crawford down to 44, and of course for the college of 42; but there are two linked exceptions, as follows:

1. coins of C. Clodius Vestalis, M. Arrius Secundus, C. Numonius Vaala, and L. Servius Rufus (Cr. 512-515), placed by Crawford in 41, are here assigned to 43; conversely,

2. the coins of L. Flaminius Chilo, P. Accoleius Lariscolus, and Petilius Capitolinus (Cr. 485-487), given by Crawford to 43, are here assigned to 41.

The reassignments are discussed on pp. 432ff. The case for identity of the college of Vestalis, Secundus, Vaala, and Rufus is made on pp. 433-434; the first attribution of it to 43 was made by Mommsen (*Münzwesen* p. 741 – but then Mommsen also attributed the triumviral portrait gold to 38, *ibid.* n. 6). The "restoration of the Republic" theme, following upon the coinage of 44 that is entirely devoted to Caesar, seems appropriate to this moment before the triumvirate. Further speculation has seen in the portraits images of Brutus, Antony, and even (Alföldi) Pansa. Now if these identifications are accepted, the case for 43 is proved, for Alföldi was certainly right to reject Crawford's supposition that the portrait of Brutus could have been

¹ D.R. SHACKLETON BAILEY, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus* vol. 3 (Cambridge 1968), p. 254 ad *Att.* 6.1.25.

revived as late as 41 (p. 437) and, as W. notes, others who accept that dating feel compelled to reject the identification of the portrait of Brutus (p. 439).

Crawford was driven to this extremity, however, by the evidence of the finds; with the exception of Agnola 1952, a hoard so sparse in its representation of issues after 48 that it can hardly be relied upon, the hoards uniformly confirm the Crawford chronology. W. addresses specifically the incomplete hoards Borzano and Alvinzano. But there remain Pieve Quinta 1879, San Bartolomeo 1834, Potenza (Basilicata) 1902, Firenze 1873, and Avezzano 1915, all of which include the issues attributed by Crawford to 43 and none of which endorse W.'s revised chronology. This is a methodological impasse: in spite of the superficial attractions of W.'s rearrangement, it has to be resisted in the face of the finds.

3. Cn. Nerius Q Urb. (Cr. 441)

W. makes a good case (pp. 97f.) for removing this coinage from the mint of the capital. Although there is nothing remarkable about its physical production (dies continue to be oriented irregularly), the "radiate" border on the reverse stands out from contemporary products of Rome; and though both the consular dating and the military imagery have been remarked in the past, they make best sense together as a military issue under the supervision of the consuls, who of course were in Illyria at this time. The presence of five of the coins in a hoard found near Tirana, along with Cr. 445/1a-b, attributed by Crawford to Apollonia, is highly suggestive. It is perhaps worth adding one small consideration: the *harpa* on the rev. of Cr. 445/1 may provide a link to the *harpa* that accompanies the head of Saturn on the obverse of Nerius' coins.

4. CAESAR with elephant (Cr. 443/1)

The obverse of this huge issue insists on Caesar's priestly functions – i.e. his legitimacy – and W., following both Crawford and the refinement of his argument by Backendorf, accepts the reverse as a battle between an elephant and an "unnatural animal", i.e. metaphorically a struggle between good and evil. Various arguments for the early dating are disposed of, this time on the basis of the hoard evidence. The issue makes its first appearance alongside that of M'. Acilius in the hoards of Cadriano and Cesario, while Carbonara and San Giuliano Vecchio show these as well as a few other coins. Unlike Crawford, W. regards the continuation of the elephant issue into 48 as "a priori unlikely" (p. 127), on the ground that Crawford was driven to extend the issue by his belief that the LII denarii of Caesar (no. 7 below) do not begin until July of 48.

5. Q. Sicinius, C. Coponius (Cr. 444)

W. refines Crawford's "moving with Pompey" to "west coast of Asia Minor." We do not know much about Coponius except that he was in command of the Rhodian contingent of Pompey's fleet. W., rightly it seems to me, recognizes the debt of the lion's skin and club reverse to the traditional cistophoric fractions; and he points

out that the Hercules references had special point for Pompey. He goes on to note stylistic development, or at least variation, in the series, which would seem to support the idea of a moving mint; in so far as it is associated with Coponius and not with Pompey this refines Crawford's attribution.

6. Magn. Procos, Cn. Piso Proq. (Cr. 446) and Varro Proq. (Cr. 447)

These too are identified by Crawford as "moving with Pompey", in 49 BC. W. prefers a date of 48 and an assignment to Illyria. W.'s attribution makes a great deal of sense if Dio 41.43.3 is to be trusted: in the absence of a *lex curiata*, the magistrates appointed by the Senate in exile styled themselves proconsuls, propraeors, proquaestors etc. (p. 116).

7. Aurei, denarii, and quinarii with LII – Trophy with CAESAR, C. 452/1-4

W. follows the old identification of the numeral as a reference to Caesar's age. Crawford had taken this to begin only with Caesar's fifty-second birthday on July 13, 48, but W. adduces evidence that the "annus coeptus" was sufficient, i.e. that any time after July 13, 49 Caesar might have used this designation of his age. W. connects this through the representations of a *securis* on 452/1-2 and a *cullulus* and *ancile* on 452/3 to the priestly theme of the Elephant denarius. From there the dating is speculative. W. sees the issue of L. Hostilius Saserna, which clearly also celebrates victories over the Gauls, as likely to be derivative from the CAESAR denarii struck in the field, and this makes the year of Saserna's magistracy, 48, a kind of *ante quem* that forces the LII coins with trophy into the early part of the year. But this idea loses plausibility with Saserna's most original type, the Gallic charioteer in retreat, which has no known antecedent. If he could devise this on his own, he was capable of coming up independently with the trophy type.

8. Denarii with Aeneas carrying the palladium (Cr. 458)

Since Crawford this issue has been attributed to Africa, and specifically to 47-46 BC., largely on the basis of its absence from the Carbonara and San Giuliano Vecchio hoards, both of which terminate with coins of the moneyers of 48. But as W. points out, 47 could be right only in a very limited sense, since Caesar did not take ship from Sicily until Dec. 25 of that year; and indeed the date and attribution, for Crawford, are interconnected (though as W. points out, p. 219, even if one accepts his dating the assignment to Africa does not follow automatically). If the one goes, so does the other, and the hoard evidence is slim enough that a return to Grueber's reading, which places the coinage after the battle of Pharsalus, is possible. Sydenham's attribution to Gaul never had the slightest thing to recommend it and is rightly dismissed. A technical point tells against association with other nearly-contemporary coins, and that is the die placement, regularly at 6:00. The "unruhige" surface of the Aeneas denarii leads W. to speculate that they might have been overstruck, albeit carefully; he claims to have an example to hand (pl. 3 no. 66). The exact placement is a matter of probabilities, which W. effectively

reduces to two: Egypt, where Caesar spent most time after Pharsalus, and Asia. W. supposes, deriving an argument from Crawford, that the absence of pontifical emblems or any reference to Gaul indicates that the coins were produced outside Caesar's direct control, and that, for him, points to Asia. This is pretty slim, but the likelihood that so substantial an issue was produced in Egypt is not great.

9. Denarii with Ceres/pontifical implements (Cr. 467)

A similar argument is used, to less effect I think, with respect to these coins, which remarkably lack the name of Caesar. The titles provide a linkage to the African War that would seem to carry an attribution in their wake, but Crawford had inferred, apparently from the unusual typological content, that "the issue was struck on Caesar's behalf by an underling without his actually being present at the mint himself" (p. 93; cited by W. p. 249), and in this he is followed by W. For him this makes an attribution to Africa itself "unglaublich." But if that is all there is to it, the reasoning is flawed. *All* minting is done by "underlings", and what general ever had time to supervise the activities of the mint? The authority for the issue is unmistakable: who else was DICT ITER, much less COS TER? Today we do not have the aid of context; but if these coins are indeed connected with the African War, their distribution to Caesar's troops will have been sufficient to identify their source and their authority.

10. L. PLANC PRAEF VRB, C. CAES DIC TER (Cr. 475)

Here Crawford worked from the *ante quem* provided by the end of Caesar's third dictatorship and settled upon 45 B.C.; and proceeded from the *post quem* provided by Plancus' term as *praefectus urbi* – which is itself unknown. But W. would count Plancus among those prefects appointed by Caesar before his departure for Spain, hence in late 46. But Plancus' term of office is not in any case necessarily congruent with his striking of this issue. The adjustment is as minor as the proof is wanting.

11. C. CLOVIVS PRAEF, CAESAR DIC TER (Cr. 476)

These bronzes were assigned to an uncertain mint by Crawford and the editors of RPC (at no. 601, with incomplete bibliography), but to Rome by almost everyone else. W. reminds us that the attribution goes back to Haverkamp in the 16th century, and has been endorsed by the likes of Bahrfeldt. Clovius is seen here as another of the eight prefects appointed by Caesar; the issue is therefore part of his adjusted chronology (see on 10 above) and subject to the same limitations. But this may be wrong: Crawford is surely right to observe, p. 94 n. 1, that one would expect the full title, PRAEF VRB *vel sim.*

12. SEX. MAGNVS PIVS IMP/ SAL (B)/PIETAS (Cr. 477)

W.'s treatment of this issue is not very satisfying. The general placement of the coinage is not in doubt: it belongs to Sextus Pompey and was produced in southern Spain. The legend on the obverse was interpreted by Buttrey as Sal(pensa), by Bahrfeldt as sal(utatus, sc. imperator); the B that appears on one die would be an iteration. But the Latinity of this, already questioned by Buttrey, is more doubtful than W.'s footnote (776, p. 490) would make it appear. We should not make, with him, allowance for "Spanish" Latin, unless we suppose a quite different authority for the issue; and of the two citations from Tacitus, only one is possibly in point, since *salutavit* at *Ann.* 2.18.2 cannot have the technical meaning of *appellavit*.

13. MAGNVS PIVS IMP and variants/EPPIVS LEG asses (Cr. 478)
and MAGNVS and variants/PIVS IMP (Cr. 479)

Here W. marshals the arguments – many of them already brought forward by Martini,² for attribution of the whole group to Sicily. These consist in dissimilarity of fabric and die axis to the asses with CN. MAG IMP (Cr. 471) attributed to Spain, and the Morgantina find. Cr. 479 is the much larger series and it displays a progressive degeneracy of style that suggests its striking over a lengthy period, which W. admits is difficult to specify but which must end with Sextus' second imperial acclamation in 38. The two groups belong, in just about everybody's view, to different mints.

14. NEPTVNI/Q. NASIDIVS (Cr. 483)

Crawford reasoned that the issue, which lacks mention of Sex. Pompeius' tenure of the office of *praefectus classis*, must antedate 43, and he placed the beginning of the issue in 44. W. takes the tack that technically the issue is in the name of Nasidius, so no such title should be expected; and if that is so the *ante quem* disappears. The chronology, for W., is further complicated by his own reassignment of the issue of L. Flaminius Chilo to 41 rather than 43 (see (2) above), for the presence of one example of Cr. 483/2 in the Pasquariello hoard, which otherwise terminates with issues of Chilo, would suggest the near-contemporaneity of the two. For W. then the inaugural date is 42; and though the series might extend down to 38, his clear preference is for an earlier date between the termini (p. 505).

² R. MARTINI, *Monetazione bronzea romana tardo-repubblicana II. Sextus Pompeius. Le emissioni hispaniche del tipo CN. MAG, le serie di Eppius e gli "assi" siciliani*, *Glaux Series Speciale I* (Milan 1995).

15. M. ANTON(I) COS or IMP/M. LEP(ID) (COS) (IMP) (denarii and quinarii) (Cr. 489/1-3); M. ANT IMP alone (quinarius); unsigned (quinarius, Cr. 489/5) or ANTONI IMP III VIR RPC (quinarius, alone)

These are attributed broadly by Crawford to Gallia Transalpina and Cisalpina, 43-42 BC. As W. observes, a *terminus post quem* is provided by the joining of Antonius' and Lepidus' forces on 29 May 43; as he points out, the types of the denarii show their respective priestly accoutrements, those appropriate to the augurate for Antonius and the high priesthood for Lepidus. That Antony was the senior partner in the coinage is suggested by his name alone on the accompanying quinarius. The quinarius with LVGV DVNI and XL (Cr. 489/5) seems to refer to Antony's age, as does the last which reflects the creation of the triumvirate and advances his age to XLI. W. engages in a long discussion of the interrelationship of these issues, arguing the separation of Cr. 489/1-4 from Cr. 489/5-6; only the first of these latter is assigned confidently to Lugdunum, and there is a detailed treatment of the complications of this assignment as it connects to the foundation of the colony of Copia there. In the end we emerge not far from Crawford's view. It is worth observing that if the numerals XL and XLI do indeed represent Antony's age (and no other interpretation seems plausible), they represent the modern system of counting rather than that employed earlier by Caesar (above no. 7).

16. LEPIDVS PONT MAX IIIVR R P C/(C) CAESAR IMP III VIR R P C (Cr. 495/1-2).

This substantial issue, which is known, from a piece lost in the Paris theft, to have included gold, was regarded by Crawford as "struck from the proceeds of the proscriptions in preparation for the campaign of 42" and dated to 42. W. takes the date back to 43, on the ground that it responds to the joint issue of Antony and Octavian and its omission of the title COS, which would be expected if it were struck in 42 (p. 487). This places the beginning of the issue right after the formation of the triumvirate on 27 November 43 – a fine distinction, but one worth making in a context of numismatic dialogue among the triumvirs. The attribution, given the style and rough execution, is no clearer than before.

17. M. ANTONIVS IMP III VIR R P C with Sol or temple of Sol (Cr. 496)

W. first departs from the view of Alföldi and Bernareggi (cited p. 489) that Cr. 496/2 was struck in Rome, or at least that its dies were cut by the engraver of dies for C. Vibius Varus. For him the question becomes whether these coins would have been struck in Italy or across the Adriatic. An answer of sorts can be sought in the stylistic differences between Cr. 496/2 and 496/3, as well as the presence, on Cr. 496/3, of the title IMP, which seems to establish the relative chronology of these two; this is reinforced by the absence of a beard on Cr. 496/3, which for W. signifies the watershed of Pharsalus: the end of mourning and the new beginning. So that striking, for him, belongs in Greece; Cr. 496/2 he assigns to Italy, following Newman and Sear, without really being able to defend this as any more than an instinct

(p. 491). As for the temple type, it is also found at Buthrotum in the Augustan period. Crawford hedged his attribution: “it perhaps portrays a local temple, and if it does, there is a strong presumption that at least this part of the issue was struck at Buthrotum” (Crawford p. 100). W. is right to resist this reasoning; on the whole it is as plausible that the type was copied later. But the rejection of this identification does not lead inexorably to acceptance of Panvini Rosati’s proposal that this is the temple of Sol in the Circus Maximus. The question of localization of this piece is left open.

18. Venus/Q. OPPIVS PR with Victory facing (Cr. 550/1) or walking l.
(Cr. 550/2-3c)

Crawford was clearly mystified by this issue and elected to associate it with the only known Q. Oppius of the Republic, who governed Cilicia in 88 BC. In support he cited a known provenance from Cilicia, discarding the Roman provenance of another piece as unimportant. W. adds some further western provenances and disputes Crawford’s contention that metal content shows no similarity to the coinage of Clovius, with which this has always been associated. On W.’s reconstruction – entirely speculative – these precede the more unified issue of Clovius, in which the weights are stabilized and only one major type is struck. If this is correct the Praetor Oppius (for so W. expands PR) must precede the praefecti among whom he numbers Clovius (above, no. 10), and his term of office must be put back to 46. The problem with the coinage of Oppius and Clovius as products of the mint of Rome is the types; if the coins belong to these years and to the capital, we must suppose a reversion to traditional prow reverses in the later coinage of the 40s and 30s, which were in fact, quite apart from the widespread use of portraits, the most innovative period of the whole pre-Augustan coinage. But it is hard to know where to look for evidence that would materially advance the question, failing hoards and more extensive find evidence; for the moment W.’s return to the traditional chronology seems a step in the right direction, attribution to Rome perhaps a step too far.

19. MAG PIVS IMP ITER PRAEF CLAS ET ORAE MARIT, various types
(Cr. 511)

These are not discussed in detail here, since the author’s earlier discussion and the treatment of Evans have removed them beyond the chronological limits of the current investigation.

* * *

This review has been confined to the most important part of the numismatic content of this massive work: the reattributions. Of these nos. 1 and 2 above are to be rejected, 3-8 are plausible, 9-12 a little less so, 13-14 are very likely to be correct, 15-17 clarify our understanding of these issues, and 18 raises new concerns about the attribution. If this sounds spotty, it is not: even where W. is wrong (as at 1-2) he

lays out the evidence fully, and thus has insured the continued utility of his work. And this is to say nothing of the expanded treatment of issues where he accepts earlier chronologies and attributions: there too the incorporation of discoveries and studies new since 1974 make rewarding reading. W. has, in short, set new parameters for the discussion, and that is no mean achievement in the wake of Crawford's *magnum opus*.

Whether the author has succeeded fully in linking coinage to military necessity is another question. For example, the detailed discussion of the *aerarium* and the *aerarium sanctius* at the beginning of the Civil War (pp. 33ff.) is used to argue a case (*viz.* that Pompey was impoverished and Caesar enriched by the consuls' failure to take the treasury with them). But we have no idea how much money was in the treasury, and in any case it is a long step from this observation to identifying a coinage struck from its contents, if any. For when Caesar arrived, he had to promise a donative rather than give one; he settled it only in the following year, according to W. from the almost incredible proceeds of the African War (pp. 182ff.). Even where a donative per head is given by our sources, none of them contemporary, the number of heads is a matter of guesswork.

From the side of the Liberators, it is also hard to know what Cicero means when he says (*ad Brutum* 1.18.5) "maximus autem, nisi me forte fallit, in re publica nodus est inopia rei pecuniariae;" or Brutus when he says "duabus rebus egemus, Cicero, pecunia et supplemento" (*ibid.* 2.3.5). What is clear, e.g. from D. Brutus' remarks in *Fam.* 5.20, is that the Liberators, like Caesar before them, traded in promises as much as in coinage to secure the loyalty of their troops.

With the numismatic evidence placed in a context that historians are likely to appreciate, these questions can get the kind of systematic attention they deserve; and whether or not we agree with his views in detail, we owe a great debt to the author for boldly addressing this Herculean task.

William E. Metcalf
Professor (Adj.) of Classics and
Curator of Coins and Medals
Yale University
william.metcalf@yale.edu

Stephan Berrens

*Sonnenkult und Kaisertum von den Severern bis zu Constantin I.
(193-337 n. Chr.)*

Historia Einzelschriften Heft 185. Franz Steiner Verlag Stuttgart 2004.
282 S., mit 18 Abbildungen auf 2 Tafeln. ISBN 3-515-08575-0

Stephan Berrens (im Folgenden B.) veröffentlicht in diesem Band die ergänzte Version seiner 2002 eingereichten Promotionsschrift. Das Thema ist sehr gründlich bearbeitet, vor allem auf Grund der wichtigsten erhaltenen Quelle, der Münzprägung. B. untersucht nach Vorwort und Einleitung die «politischen und religiösen Rahmenbedingungen» (S. 17-38), die «historische Entwicklung von Septimius Severus bis Constantin I.» (S. 39-169), formuliert die Ergebnisse in einem Kapitel über «Kaisertum und Sonnenkult: Strukturen und Merkmale» (S. 171-228), gibt noch einen kurzen «Ausblick: Sonnenkult und Imperium Christianum (4./5. Jh.)» (S. 229-234) und eine «Zusammenfassung: Sonnenkult und Kaisertum im 3. und frühen 4. Jh. n. Chr.» (S. 235-242). Am Ende findet sich eine Bibliographie, ein Personenindex und ein Stellenregister für antike Literatur, Inschriften und Papyri sowie die erwähnten Münzen. Als Leser, der keine Seminarbibliothek zur Verfügung hat, vermisse ich allerdings ein Abkürzungsverzeichnis. Der Autor verweist nur auf die jeweiligen Bände der *Année Philologique*.

B. findet viele Anzeichen, dass es sich beim Sonnenkult um eine Form der «Herrschaftsideologie» beziehungsweise der «Herrschaftslegitimierung» handelt (S. 172, 235, 242). Der Begriff Ideologie ist leider vorbelastet. Er drückt den Verdacht aus, irgendwelche Ideen dienten bewusst oder unbewusst nur der Sicherung von Macht. Ob es nicht besser ist, methodisch so vorzugehen, dass man in einem ersten Arbeitsschritt den Handelnden das, was sie sagen, glaubt? Für Kaiser und Volk war das, was sie auf Münzen verkündeten beziehungsweise gesagt bekamen, zuerst einmal Wirklichkeit. Natürlich kann man B. zustimmen, dass hinter vielen Behauptungen die Absicht auf Erwerb und Erhaltung von Macht steht. Es ist einzusehen, dass es in einer Krisenzeit wichtig war, die Herrschaft zu legitimieren. Die alte legitime Form an die Herrschaft zu kommen, war der Beschluss des Senats, der eine Berufung durch die Götter feststellte. Im 3. und 4. Jahrhundert war der Senatsbeschluss zu einer Formalität herabgesunken. Die Herrscher wurden von einer Heeresversammlung ausgerufen. Das Heer entschied sich für den, von dem es Siege erwartete und hielt dann diesem als «Garanten der Sieghaftigkeit» (S. 236) die Treue. Das Motiv der *Victoria* spiegelt dies wieder, aber auch die *Victoria* in der Hand des *Sol* und der Gefangene zu dessen Füßen. Die Hilfe des Sonnengottes im Kampf legitimierte so den Kaiser. Im Laufe der Zeit wurde die Geburt (oder Adoption) als Kaisersohn immer wichtiger. Junge Kaiser wurden als *Oriens*, als am Horizont erscheinende aufgehende Sonne begrüßt und zugleich als Anfang eines neuen «Goldenen Zeitalters» (S. 176-184). Auch die zweite Bedeutung des Wortes *Oriens* = Osten diente der Legitimation kaiserlicher Politik. So wie die Sonne im Osten und Westen scheint, soll auch der Kaiser von Osten bis Westen herrschen. Gerech-

fertigt werden sollen die unglaublich hohe Opfer fordernden Feldzüge gegen die Perser.

Ein wichtiges Motiv, das mit dem Bild der Sonne verbunden wurde, war das der *Aeternitas*, der Ewigkeit oder besser Beständigkeit der Herrschaft Roms und seiner Kaiser. «Die rasche Abfolge teils sehr kurzlebiger Kaiser» (S. 34) weckte im Volk den dringenden Wunsch nach einer dauernden Herrschaft, nach Kaisern, auf die man sich so verlassen kann, wie darauf, dass Sonne und Mond regelmässig aufgehen. Darauf antwortete das Versprechen einer Herrschaft «solange Sonne und Mond scheinen». Die Möglichkeit, mit einem Bild und Wort mehr als eine Bedeutung zu verbinden, erwähnt B. nicht. Bei der *Aeternitas* wäre es doch immerhin möglich, dass auch an jenen Zeitengott (*Aion* oder *Zrovan*) zu denken ist, der noch über der Sonne steht, der die Bewegung aller Gestirne und den Ablauf der Geschichte bestimmt. Das Motiv der *Aeternitas*, verbunden mit dem Bild von Sonne und Mond weist der Autor schon für die frühere Kaiserzeit nach. Seine Hinweise auf die Münzprägung schon in der Republik überzeugen allerdings nicht ganz. Der von ihm (S. 172 Anm. 12) zitierte *As* von Iguvium aus der Zeit um 220 v. Chr. mit der zwölfstrahligen Sonne auf der einen, der Mondsichel und vier kleinen Sternen auf der anderen Seite ist zwar wunderschön,¹ aber was soll er mit *Aeternitas* zu tun haben? Die Sonne schenkt Licht und Wärme, der Mond nach antikem Glauben Tau und Fruchtbarkeit, damit sind sie ein Münzbild wert. Natürlich gehört dazu, dass sie beständig, also ewig, diese Gaben spenden, man kann in ihnen sogar den Gedanken der beständigen Weltordnung im steten Wechsel angedeutet sehen, aber auf der betreffenden Münze weist nichts darauf hin. Für die S. 18, 121, 172 und 238 angeführte römische *Uncia* aus der Zeit 217 – 215 v. Chr.² mit der frontalen Sonnenbüste und der Mondsichel zwischen zwei Sternen, bei der Berrens (S. 172) eine Verbindung «über die Dioskuren mit der Stadt Rom» findet, gibt es eine andere Deutung, die noch dazu gut in die Motivwelt passt, die B. auf S. 178 ff. beschreibt: «The astral constellation of the rebirth of the Golden Age, a promise of unstinted luck after the terrible sufferings of the dreadful war»³: Diese Deutung dürfte näher liegen als ein Hinweis auf die *Roma aeterna*.

Ein Fehler, der bei jemand, der sich schon einmal mit Münzen der Römischen Republik beschäftigt hat, nicht vorkommen dürfte, unterläuft B. auf der gleichen Seite bei dem Denar des P. Nerva von 113/112,⁴ wo er das Denarzeichen (X mit Querstrich) für einen Sonnen-Stern hält, der zusammen mit der Mondsichel über dem Haupt der behelmteten Göttin einen Bezug der *Aeternitas*-Symbole auf die Roma zeigen soll. Da muss man schon sagen, dass er einen «sehr lockeren Umgang mit den Quellenzeugnissen» hat und dass seine «Schlussfolgerungen auf einer sehr dünnen Grundlage stehen», um jene Urteile zu verwenden, die B. (S. 171 Anm. 7) über F. Cumont fällt.

¹ Auktion Garrett I (Numismatic Fine Arts/Bank Leu, Mai 1984), 625; Haeblerlin Taf. 78, 1-2.

² RRC 39/4

³ A. ALFÖLDI, The Main Aspects of Political Propaganda on the Coinage of the Roman Republic, in: Essays presented to H. Mattingly (Cambridge 1956), S. 70.

⁴ RRC 292/1.

B. stellt sowohl bei der Besprechung der Münzprägung der einzelnen Kaiser als auch bei der Zusammenfassung gut und überzeugend dar, dass es eine «Angleichung des Kaisers an den Sonnengott» (S. 213) gibt. Am Ende warnt er dann allerdings zu Recht vor «der Postulierung einer in diesem Rahmen immer wieder vorgenommenen Vergottung des Kaisers» (S. 242). Dann sollte er aber auch vorsichtiger sein bei Beispielen, wo ein Kaiser deutlich die Rolle einer Gottheit zu übernehmen scheint. Es ist doch zu fragen, ob die nach rechts eilende Gestalt mit Strahlenkranz, langem Gewand und Globus in der Rechten auf den Antoninianen des Valerian und Gallienus in Antiochia mit RESTITVT(or) GEN(eris) HVM(ani)⁵ und auf Aurei von Samosata mit AETERNITAS AVGG⁶ mit B. (S. 75) als Valerian zu interpretieren ist. B. meint dazu: «Wie die aufgehende Sonne symbolisiert die Ankunft des Herrschers die Rückkehr friedlicher, sicherer Zeiten». Ob man darin nicht besser mit Andreas Alföldi «Sol ... mit seinem orientalischen Gewand» sehen kann?⁷

Der Titel *Conservator*, Bewahrer stand in Rom ursprünglich Jupiter zu (S. 119 Anm. 301). Augustus konnte sich Bewahrer und Vater *des Staates* nennen lassen (SPQR PARENTI CONS SVO,⁸ also mit einer Spezifizierung des Titels. B. glaubt (S. 119) auf einer Festmünze Aurelians⁹, die Legende AVRELIANVS AVG CONS als AVRELIANVS AVGVSTVS CONSERVATOR lesen zu können. Es ist eindeutig CONSVL gemeint. Es stimmt, dass das Wort *Consul* meistens COS abgekürzt wird. Das gilt aber nur für normale Kaisertitulaturen. Auf den Grossbronzen Aurelians steht die genannte Umschrift neben dem Bild des Kaisers, der das Opfer zu Beginn des Konsulats darbringt.¹⁰ Dieses Opfer, das dem Staat Glück für das kommende Jahr bringen sollte, war fast die einzige Funktion, die das Konsulat noch hatte. Mit diesem Opfer hat das CONS der Inschrift zu tun. Jedenfalls präsentiert sich Aurelian hier nicht als irdischer Jupiter.

Im Vorwort seines Buches bekundet B. die Absicht, «gegen den nunmehr 150 Jahre praktizierenden Chor der «Orientalisten» eine neue Sichtweise aufzuzeigen» (S. 7, ähnlich S. 236). Unter Orientalisten versteht er anscheinend alle Wissenschaftler, die östlichen Einfluss auf die römische Religion annehmen. Hinweise auf Mithras haben ihn dabei wohl gestört. Er erwähnt den Stier auf den römischen Antoninianen des Gallienus mit SOLI CONS AVG (S. 77), geht aber mit keinem Satz darauf ein, dass es sich hier um jenen Stier handeln könnte, mit dem Mithras kämpft. B. mag recht haben, dass es sich bei der Mithrasverehrung um einen «exklusiven, für die Umwelt nahezu unsichtbaren Kult» gehandelt hat (S. 186, auch schon S. 26); er übersieht aber, dass die geheimgehaltenen Mysterien von einer weitverbreitete Stimmung in Heer und Volk begleitet gewesen sein konnten. (Man vergleiche aus

⁵ RIC V/1, S. 55, 220 und S. 91, 296.

⁶ RIC V/1, S. 41, 3 und S. 73, 69.

⁷ A. ALFÖLDI, Die Hauptereignisse der Jahre 253 – 261 n. Chr., Neudruck in: Studien zur Geschichte der Weltkrise des 3. Jahrhunderts nach Christus (Darmstadt 1967), S. 125.

⁸ RIC I, 2. Aufl. S. 48.

⁹ RIC V/1, S. 301, 319.

¹⁰ Cf. R. GÖBL, MIR 47, Aurelian, I, S. 49.

der Neuzeit die Geheimhaltung der Riten der Freimaurer, die einer weiten Verbreitung ihrer Aufklärungs-Ideen nicht im Wege stand.)

B. glaubt, das gehäufte Auftreten des Sonnenmotivs in der von ihm untersuchten Zeit sei «im Wesentlichen unter dem Gesichtspunkt offizieller Herrscherideologie zu betrachten», «nicht als der Siegeszug bestimmter religiöser Ideen oder einzelner lokaler Kulte» (S. 242). Das mit den lokalen Kulturen stimmt insofern, als der Sonnenkult in Emesa nur kurzzeitig unter Elagabal von Bedeutung gewesen sein dürfte. Etwas anderes ist der Kult des Sol von Emesa. Wie schon bei Augustus der Apoll von Actium in Rom lange verehrt wurde, weil für die Römer eine Gottheit immer mit dem Ort verbunden blieb, wo sie sich als hilfreich gezeigt hatte, so doch wohl auch der Gott, der in der Schlacht vor Emesa durch den Brand (Zosimus I 52) seiner Strahlen die Panzerreiter der Palmyrener besiegt hatte. Zweifellos stimmt, was B. (S. 125) ausführt: «Man darf Aurelian keinesfalls die gesetzlich fundierte und von den staatlichen Organen gewaltsam durchgesetzte Etablierung eines Sonnenkultes als einzige legitime Religion im Römischen Reich unterstellen». Allerdings ist unklar, wer das zu unterstellen versucht haben soll.

Kritisch zu beurteilen ist, was B. über «das Eindringen neuer philosophischer und theologischer Ideen» sagt (S. 242). Sicher hat kein Theologe oder Philosoph so viel Einfluss gehabt, dass er den Sol als Symbolfigur hätte durchsetzen können. Aber Gedanken Einzelner sind auch Ausdruck des Zeitgeistes, und der bewirkt viel. B. schreibt unter anderem: «Der Rückgriff auf syrisch – orientalischen Einfluss ist auch nicht erforderlich» (S. 172). Da ist eine grundsätzliche Frage zu stellen: Wenn etwas ohne Einfluss von aussen zu erklären ist, ist das schon ein Beweis dafür, dass kein Einfluss stattgefunden hat? In der Geschichte (auch unserer Zeit) haben doch alle wichtigen Ereignisse mehrere Ursprünge. Es gibt überall ein Geflecht von Einflüssen. Warum soll es keine Übernahme von Ideen zum Beispiel aus Persien gegeben haben? B. selbst erwähnt die *imitatio Alexandri* (S. 241); Alexander der Grosse war auch in der Spätzeit Vorbild der Kaiser. Alexander hatte aber ganz bewusst von Persien gelernt. Nach B. setzt die «Entwicklung des Leitmotivs der Herrschaftslegitimation durch den Sonnengott» unter Gordian III. ein (S. 69). Ob das nicht mit dem Persienfeldzug des jungen Kaisers zu tun hat? Dort gab es unter Ardaschir I. 224-241 eine Prägung auf die Investitur durch Ahura Mazda, den Herrn des Lichtes.¹¹ Die Feindschaft zwischen den beiden Reichen spricht nicht dagegen. Es ist ein bekanntes Phänomen, dass Gegner im Lauf der Auseinandersetzung einander ähnlich werden. Es wird kein Zufall sein, dass das Medaillon mit VIRTVS AVGVSTI, auf dem der Kaiser vom Sonnengott den Globus, das Zeichen der Weltherrschaft erhält (S. 68, abgebildet bei Cohen Nr. 396) in der Zeit 241/242 nach Abschluss der Kämpfe im Osten geprägt wird.¹²

Bei Constantin I. bringt B. dann eine religiöse Idee ins Spiel, wo es nicht notwendig wäre. In Thessalonica wurde 319 ein Nummus geprägt, der zur Umschrift VIRT EXERC (*virtus exercitus*, Tapferkeit des Heeres), eine kleine Sol-Figur mit

¹¹ R. GÖBL, *Antike Numismatik II* (München 1978), Abb. 2118.

¹² Datierung nach M. WEDER, *Seltene Münzen der Sammlung Dattari*, NZ 96, 1982, S. 62.

Globus und erhobener Rechten über einem Gebilde von sich kreuzenden Linien zeigt. B. meint, es handle sich um einen Hinweis auf eine Apollo- beziehungsweise Sonnen-Vision Constantins aus dem Jahr 310 (S. 156f.), von der Constantin behauptete oder behaupten liess, dass sie ihn zur Herrschaft berufen habe. Die Linien sollen ein Strahlenkreuz sein, genauer gesagt, eine in einem Sonnenhalo sichtbar gewordene kreuzförmige Figur (S. 202). Die von oder für Constantin erzählte Vision ist doch zu weit weg vom Prägedatum 319. Es gibt eine einfachere Erklärung. Thessalonica war um diese Zeit, wie B. schreibt, eine wichtige Garnisonsstadt. Das erklärt die Legende. Die Stadt war auch Kreuzungspunkt militärisch wichtiger Strassen, der Via Egnatia von West nach Ost und einer Strasse von Nord (über Stobi) nach Süd. In der Stadt selbst gab es einen berühmten Sol-Tempel, der auch auf dem Galeriusbogen beim Bild der Stadt zu erkennen sei (S. 161 Anm. 183). Die Münze ist einfach eine Ehrung der Stadt, eine Art Stadtplan mit sich kreuzenden (doppelspurigen) Strassen und dem Heiligtum.

Die wichtigste Idee, die m.E. aus dem Osten eingedrungen ist, und zwar schon in früher Zeit, ist die des Kampfes von Licht und Finsternis. Im Osten glaubte man an zwei Gottheiten, Ahura Mazda, den Herrn des Lichtes und Ahriman, den Gott der Finsternis. Gehilfen Ahura Mazdas waren Mithras, Gott des Lichtes und die Sonne, die von ihm ihre Leuchtkraft erhält. (Dass dem Verhältnis Mithras – Sol kein «streng logisches System» zugrunde gelegt werden soll, so M. Claus, den B. auf S. 26 Anm. 67 zitiert, stimmt natürlich, – Mythen sind nicht logisch.) Im Westen wusste man, dass Dunkel verschwindet, wenn Licht leuchtet. Im Osten sah man zwei Realitäten in stetigem Kampf. (Von dort beeinflusst glaubte man, wie wohl bekannt sein dürfte, in einigen Richtungen des Judentums an den Kampf guter und böser Geister.) Könnte die Bezeichnung *INVICTVS*, unbesiegt, oder unbesiegtbar, die zunächst für Mars und Hercules verwendet wurde (so B. auf S. 46), nicht unter dem Einfluss dieses kämpferischen Denkens «erst spät auf offiziellen Zeugnissen» (S. 198) zur Bezeichnung für die Sonne geworden sein?

B. hat sicher Recht, dass der Sonnenkult auf den Münzen nichts mit «dem Stichwort der persönlichen Erlösung» (S. 242) zu tun hat, – wenn man unter Erlösung die Befreiung von Sündenschuld versteht. Im Denken jener Zeit hofften aber viele Menschen (warum nicht auch die Kaiser?) auf einen Weg aus dieser Welt in eine höhere Region, wobei ihnen die Sternengötter helfen sollten. Sie hatten Angst vor bösen Gestirngeistern und hofften auf Hilfe durch die Sonne. Ein Beleg dafür dürfte der bei B. (S. 29) beschriebene Goldring sein, der auf der Oberseite den stehenden Sol zeigt, auf der Rückseite die Worte *IESUS CHRISTUS, GABRIE(L), ANANIA, AME(N)*. Das ist nicht, wie B. meint, eine christliche Weihinschrift, sondern eine magische Schutzformel, für die man Worte aus allen möglichen Kulturen zu benützen pflegte.

Es ist B. zuzustimmen, dass man den Sonnenkult der Kaiser insofern als Ideologie bezeichnen kann, als er zur Rechtfertigung ihrer Herrschaft diente. Aber war das nicht erst dadurch möglich, dass das Bild des Sol ein Echo im Glauben des Menschen fand, deren religiöse Sehnsucht auf eine höhere Welt zielte? Bei Constantin I. ist anzunehmen, dass die Struktur seines Glaubens immer gleich blieb. Er scheint den Glauben an einen Kampf seines neuen Gottes als «Sonne der Gerechtigkeit» gegen die Mächte der Finsternis zur Rechtfertigung seiner Kriege

aber auch der Tötung seiner angeblich untreuen Frau und seines Sohnes benutzt zu haben. (Das zeigt meines Erachtens die durchbohrte Schlange auf Nummi von Constantinopel 327/328).¹³ B. schreibt von einer möglichen «Interpretation des Sonnengottes als Kompromiss zwischen heidnischen und christlichen Religionsvorstellungen» bei Constantin (S. 162). Ob die religiösen Vorstellungen Constantins wirklich christlich waren, ist eine Frage, die über die Grenzen der fleissigen Arbeit von Stephan Berrens weit hinausgeht.

Wendelin Kellner
D-88048 Friedrichshafen

¹³ RIC VII S. 573, 26.

Hans-Markus von Kaenel/Maria R.-Alföldi/Ulrike Peter/Holger Komnick (Hrsg.)

*Geldgeschichte vs. Numismatik. Theodor Mommsen und die antike Münze.
Kolloquium aus Anlass des 100. Todesjahres von Theodor Mommsen (1817-1903)
an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main 1.-4. Mai 2003*

Berlin; Akademie Verlag, 2004. xiv + 316 S., 11 Taf., ISBN 3-05-004042-4

Der angezeigte Band ist eine Veröffentlichung des Projekts «Griechisches Münzwerk» an der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Er erschien aus Anlass des 100. Todestages des Begründers des «Griechischen Münzwerks», Theodor Mommsen. Theodor Mommsen starb im November 1903. Das von ihm angeregte Grossprojekt «Corpus Nummorum»/«Griechisches Münzwerk» wurde fast genau ein Jahrhundert später, im Dezember 2003 – sozusagen mitten aus dem Leben heraus und weit entfernt vom Erreichen seiner Ziele – eingestellt. Eine späte Erbgeneration der kulturbewussten Gesellschaft und der grossen Gelehrten des 19. Jahrhunderts hatte sich als nicht willens erwiesen, den langen Atem und die nötigen Mittel für die Fortsetzung des generationenübergreifenden Projekts aufzubringen. Damit sind wohl auch solche Früchte dieser Arbeit verloren, die sozusagen schon im Heranreifen waren.¹ Der Band, der sich mit dem Verhältnis Mommsens zu den Münzen und ausführlich auch mit der Geschichte des «Corpus Nummorum»/«Griechischen Münzwerks» beschäftigt, wirkt fast wie eine Gedenkschrift für dieses grossangelegte Projekt, in das im Lauf der Jahrzehnte immense Arbeit und viel Hoffnung und Geld investiert worden sind.

Fast alle Aufsätze des Bandes gingen aus den Beiträgen eines Kolloquiums hervor, das vom «Griechischen Münzwerk» und vom Projekt «Fundmünzen der Antike» der Mainzer Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur am 1.-4. Mai 2003 in Frankfurt a. M. veranstaltet wurde. Sowohl am Kolloquium wie am Band beteiligten sich 21 Autoren aus Deutschland, Grossbritannien, Italien und den USA. Sie verfassten 23 gedruckte Beiträge. Davon skizziert eine kurze Einführung (aus der Feder H.-M. von Kaenels) das Anliegen der Publikation.

Vier Aufsätze widmen sich der Geschichte des «Corpus nummorum»/«Griechischen Münzwerks» (Autoren: H.-M. von Kaenel, B. Kluge, U. Peter, M. R.-Alföldi); und die meisten anderen behandeln verschiedene weitere Aspekte des Verhältnisses Mommsens zur Numismatik. Sie betrachten – in der eigenartig unsystematischen Reihenfolge des Bandes aufgezählt – Mommsen als Wissenschaftsorganisator (S. Rebenich); in seinen Beziehungen zu Ludwig Friedlaender und zum Berliner Münzkabinett (B. Weisser); als Verfasser der 1860 erschienenen «Geschichte des römischen Münzwesens» (H. Schubert); sein Urteil über die Echtheit des einzigen bekannten Aureus der italischen Verbündeten im Bundesgenossenkrieg (M.H. Crawford); sein Verhältnis zur griechischen Numismatik (H. Leppin); seine Sicht der kaiserzeitlichen Münze (H. Brandt); seine Beschäftigung mit der republika-

¹ Manche im Rahmen des Projekts geleisteten Vorarbeiten für weitere Publikationen sind bis zum Stadium vorliegender und freilich nochmals zu bearbeitender Manuskripte gediehen; siehe den Beitrag von U. Peter im angezeigten Band, S. 48 ff.

nischen Münzchronologie (W. Hollstein); seine Bemühungen um die keltische Numismatik (G. Gorini); seine Methoden einer Auswertung von Münzfunden (F. Berger); sein Eingehen auf Numismatisches im «Staatsrecht» und im «Strafrecht» (M. R.-Alföldi); sein Bild der Provinzialprägung (J. Nollé); seine Dyarchiethese (R. Wolters); seine metrologischen Studien (H. Komnick); seinen geldgeschichtlichen Zugang zum Fachgebiet der Numismatik (H. Chr. Noeske); und im letzten Artikel des Bandes die Frage, was Mommsen denn heute, im 21. Jahrhundert, als wichtige numismatische Aufgaben ansehen und in Angriff nehmen würde (W.E. Metcalf). Dazwischen eingestreut finden sich ausserdem eine Arbeit über die britische Numismatik des 18./19. Jahrhunderts (A. Burnett) und zwei Aufsätze über Mommsen, die ohne jeden numismatischen Bezug sind und in diesem Kontext doch als Fremdkörper wirken (K. Bringmann über Mommsen als Historiker der Republik; und W. Nippel über Mommsens «Staatsrecht»).

Auf so zahlreiche Beiträge zu einem so breiten Themenspektrum kann eine knappe Rezension schwer eingehen. Vernünftig scheint hier aber, sich mit dem Leitgedanken etwas zu beschäftigen, den die Herausgeber für das Frankfurter Kolloquium und für den hier angezeigten Band gewählt haben. Diesen Gedanken drückt die Titelformulierung «Geldgeschichte vs. Numismatik» aus. Der Mitherausgeber H.-M. von Kaenel erklärt die Bedeutung dieser Formel so (S. 4): «Mommsen war Historiker – Numismatiker waren und sind dagegen ihrem Wesen nach in der Regel eher Antiquare als Historiker. Sich heute dem Thema «Mommsen und die Numismatik» zu stellen, bedeutet demnach auch, sich mit dem ... Spannungsfeld zwischen Geschichtsschreibung und antiquarischer Forschung auseinanderzusetzen. Die Formulierung des Titels ... (Geldgeschichte vs. Numismatik) versucht, darauf Bezug zu nehmen.»

Dem Rezensenten scheint dieser Titel allerdings nicht glücklich. Zum einen ist er nicht sofort verständlich, denn die Geldgeschichte wird ja auch als ein Bestandteil der Numismatik angesehen.² Zum andern stellt aber das «vs.» (abgesehen von der Frage, ob man diesen Anglizismus ansprechend findet) eine stark überspitzte Formulierung dar. Geldgeschichte und rein antiquarisch betriebene Numismatik bilden ebensowenig ein wirkliches Gegensatzpaar wie in der Klassischen Philologie die Literaturgeschichte und die Grammatik. Mommsen wollte, dass sich die Reine Numismatik mit der aus historischem Blickwinkel betrachteten verbinden solle. So merkt er in einem Zeitschriftenaufsatz von 1871 an:³ die Antiquare beschrieben wohl Münzen oft «ohne sich viel dabei zu denken». Ihre Beobachtungen gäben aber für den Historiker Stoff zu Überlegungen ab. «Das Denken ohne Sehen hilft nicht weit; aber das Sehen ohne Denken reicht auch nicht immer aus. Vielleicht kommt man Hand in Hand am besten vorwärts».

Nun hat aber das über den antiquarischen Horizont hinausgehende historische Nachdenken über die Münzzeugnisse nicht erst mit Mommsen und auch nicht erst – so H. Chr. Noeske S. 279 – mit dem 19. Jahrhundert allgemein begonnen. Was unter den Beiträgen des Bandes fehlt, ist eine Arbeit, die sich den Vorläufern der

² R. GÖBL, *Antike Numismatik I* (München 1978), S. 19 f.; ders., *Numismatik* (München 1987), S. 14.

³ TH. MOMMSEN, *Imperatortitel des Titus*, NZ 3, 1871, S. 459.

Mommsenschen Forschungsansätze in der Geschichte der Numismatik widmen würde. Stattdessen wird an verschiedenen Stellen des Buches der Eindruck erweckt, als ob erst mit Mommsen oder erst mit dem 19. Jahrhundert Entwicklungen begännen, die in Wahrheit älter sind. So waren Mommsen und seine Zeitgenossen auch nicht etwa die Begründer der Fundnumismatik (wie Noeske S. 285 schreibt). Dieser Ehrentitel kommt vielmehr schon dem gebürtigen Ostpreussen und St. Petersburger Professor für Altertumswissenschaft Theophil Sigfrid Bayer (1694-1738) zu. Er hat in seinem Buch «De numis Romanis in agro Prussico repertis» (Leipzig 1722) wohl erstmals die Fundmünzen einer bestimmten Region historisch gedeutet. In einer Akademieabhandlung des Jahres 1729 legte er ausserdem die erste Publikation eines Hortfonds vor.⁴ Reine Fundnachrichten enthielt die numismatische Literatur aber bereits seit jeher; und was speziell die Münzzeugnisse für die Schlacht im Teutoburger Wald angeht – mit denen sich auch Mommsen beschäftigt hat, worauf der Beitrag F. Bergers im rezensierten Band (S. 207 ff.) eingeht –, hatte schon der Historiker und Theologe Hermann Hamelmann (1525-1595) aus Funden von Münzen Rückschlüsse auf die Lokalisierung gezogen.⁵ Berger erwähnt das in seinem Aufsatz nicht, spricht aber von einem ähnlichen Schluss des Historikers Johann Eberhard Stüve aus dem Jahr 1789 (S. 210).

In die Irre führt auch, wenn der Beitrag H. Komnicks (S. 265 ff.) so formuliert ist, als habe erst das 19. Jahrhundert eine mit historischer Zielsetzung betriebene Metrologie gekannt. Die Metrologie zählte ja zu den ältesten Themen numismatischer Forschung.⁶ Dabei war schon der Humanist Willibald Pirckheimer (Pirckheymer; 1470-1530) über die blossе Verwertung antiker Literaturquellen hinausgegangen und hatte mit dem Nachwägen von Münzen begonnen;⁷ und der niederländische Mathematiker und Physiker Willebrord Snellius (1580 ? – 1626) hatte sich bereits um eine breitere Basis genauer Wägedaten bemüht, die er tabellarisch präsentierte.⁸ Sowohl Pirckheimer wie Snellius gewannen den Resultaten ihrer Wägungen geldgeschichtliche Erkenntnisse ab.

Unglücklich ist schliesslich die Formulierung B. Kluges (S. 66), dass Mommsen seine Vorstellungen von der Gestaltung eines numismatischen Corpus im Lauf der Zeit wiederholt geändert habe, so dass es «schwierig werden» dürfte, «Mommsen forschungsgeschichtlich einen Kranz als Urheber des Corpusgedankens in der Numismatik zu flechten». Als «Urheber des Corpusgedankens» kommt Mommsen allerdings nur in Frage, wenn man den Corpusbegriff auf das von Mommsen zeit-

⁴ Eingehende Würdigung dieses Aufsatzes bei PH. KINNS, Two Eighteenth-Century Studies of Greek Coin Hoards: Bayer and Pellerin, in: M.H. CRAWFORD/C.R. LIGOTA/J.B. TRAPP, Hrsg., Medals and Coins from Budé to Mommsen (London 1990), S. 102 ff.

⁵ Darauf machen P. BERGHAUS und CHR. SCHRECKENBERG, in: Der Archäologe. Graphische Bildnisse aus dem Porträtarchiv Diepenbroick ([Ausstellungskatalog] Münster 1983), S. 145 aufmerksam.

⁶ Vgl. dazu P. BERGHAUS, Der deutsche Anteil an der numismatischen Literatur des 16. Jahrhunderts, in: ders., Hg., Numismatische Literatur 1500-1864 (Wiesbaden 1995), S. 12 f.

⁷ W. PIRCKHEYMER, Priscorum numismatum ad Nurenbergensis monetae valorem facta aestimatio (postum erschienen Tübingen 1533).

⁸ W. SNELLIUS, De re nummaria liber singularis (Leiden 1613).

weise favorisierte Stempelcorpus einengt. Das Typencorpus war ja als Kind schon der Numismatik des 16. Jahrhunderts ein alteingeführtes Arbeitsmittel (und zugleich ein weiterhin aktuelles Forschungsziel).

Während also ein Beitrag über die Vorläufer der Forschungsansätze Mommsens fehlt, hat sich das Buch immer wieder mit der Frage auseinandergesetzt, wie es um dessen Nachwirkung auf die neuere und die heutige Forschungsszene bestellt ist. Zusammenfassend gibt W.E. Metcalf noch einmal im Schlusssatz des Buches (S. 302) eine hübsche (wenn auch logisch nicht ganz durchdachte) Antwort darauf. Wäre Mommsen heute unter uns – schreibt er –, so würde er Mark Twains Äusserung zitieren können (gemeint ist, schon wegen Mommsens Nachwirkung): «The report of my death was an exaggeration». Nicht weniger originell sind die von Metcalf gestellten Fragen, welche numismatischen Projekte Mommsen einerseits als ein Zeitgenosse des 21. Jahrhunderts würde fördern wollen (wobei Metcalf aber auch an die verschiedenen Fundmünzencorpora hätte denken sollen, die doch wohl Mommsens Segen hätten), und andererseits, «how Mommsen would have evaluated his successors» (S. 297). Auch damit gibt uns Metcalf einen interessanten Denkanstoss.

Überhaupt steht den Dingen, die wir kritisch angemerkt haben, gegenüber, dass der Band eine sehr materialreiche Behandlung viel zu selten untersuchter forschungsgeschichtlicher Fragen bietet und den heute tätigen Vertretern des Faches einige ungewöhnliche, aber die Auseinandersetzung lohnende Denkanstöße gibt. Einen derartigen Anstoss enthält schon die «Einführung» H.-M. von Kaenels (S. 4). Er empfiehlt der antiken Numismatik, auch im Interesse ihrer möglichst erfolgreichen Selbstbehauptung Mommsens Vorbild zu folgen, indem sie der geldgeschichtlichen Perspektive intensiver nachgehe. So könne sie ihrer Umwelt deutlicher – um eine beliebte alte Formel aus der Vergangenheit des Faches zu benützen – «Wichtigkeit und Nutzen» (*praestantia et usus*) der Numismatik zeigen und bringe «sich überzeugend in einen Dialog ein, der in zunehmendem Masse interdisziplinär wird».

Lic. phil. Günther E. Thüry
Schmittbachweg 1/3
D-72108 Rottenburg
guenther.e.thuery@web.de

*Sylloge der Münzen des Kaukasus und Osteuropas im Orientalischen
Münzkabinett Jena. Orientalisches Münzkabinett Jena 1*

Bearbeitet von Tobias Mayer
Mit Beiträgen von Stefan Heidemann und Gert Rispling

Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden 2005. XXII, 243 pp mit 91 Taf., kartoniert
ISSN 1613-9682, ISBN 3-447-04893-X, Preis (Deutschland) € 78,00

Vor mehr als einem Jahrzehnt begann die von Lutz Ilisch geleitete Forschungsstelle für islamische Numismatik in Tübingen mit der Herausgabe der *Sylloge Numorum Arabicorum Tübingen*, von der bisher fünf Bände erschienen sind. Das Projekt, das sich an der traditionsreichen *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum* orientiert und wie diese primär topographischen Ordnungskriterien folgt, hat wesentlich dazu beigetragen, das unübersehbare Missverhältnis zwischen vorhandenem und publiziertem Sammlungsmaterial im Bereich der orientalischen Numismatik zu reduzieren; dasselbe gilt für das in der Folge begründete Oxforder Unternehmen der *Sylloge of Islamic Coins in the Ashmolean* mit Luke Treadwell als Herausgeber und Stephen Album als Hauptautor (vorläufig drei Bände).

Nunmehr hat sich das Orientalische Münzkabinett Jena mit einer von Stefan Heidemann und Norbert Nebes herausgegebenen neuen Reihe ebenfalls dem Sylloge-Unternehmen angeschlossen. In Jena kann die wissenschaftliche Beschäftigung mit islamischen Prägungen auf eine lange Tradition zurückblicken: bereits 1775 wurde hier an der Universität islamische Münzkunde unterrichtet, und auf Initiative des Orientalisten Johann Gustav Stickel (1805-1896) gründete das Haus Sachsen-Weimar-Eisenach im Schloss von Jena 1840 das Grossherzogliche Orientalische Münzkabinett, das von Stickel geleitet wurde und ihm als Grundlage für seine Forschungen diente. Den Kern der Jenaer Sammlung bildeten die von dem Herrnhuter Missionar Heinrich August Zwick in der Wolgaregion zusammengetragenen islamischen Münzen, die bald durch wichtige Ankäufe und Schenkungen vermehrt wurden. Gefördert wurde das Kabinett vor allem durch die Gattin von Grossherzog Carl Friedrich, die russische Grossfürstin und Goethe-Verehrerin Maria Pawlowa, deren Beziehungen zum Zarenreich auch den geographischen Schwerpunkt der Sammlungstätigkeit vorgaben. In den Sechzigerjahren des 19. Jahrhunderts nahm Jena mit etwa 14000 Exemplaren den gleichen Rang ein wie die entsprechenden Kollektionen in London und Paris.

Leider gingen Interesse und Verständnis für die Orient-Numismatik später vehement zurück; die grossherzogliche Sammlung wurde auseinandergerissen und teilweise nach München verkauft, der verbliebene Rest nicht mehr wissenschaftlich betreut. Erst nach der deutschen Wiedervereinigung wurde ein Neubeginn gesetzt: Norbert Nebes und Stefan Heidemann bemühen sich seit 1993/94 erfolgreich um die systematische Reaktivierung und den Wiederaufbau des einstmals so bedeutenden Bestandes und konnten den verbliebenen Torso von weniger als 9000 Münzen mit Hilfe grosszügiger Förderer bereits wieder auf über 15000 Ex-

emplare erweitern. Die Jenaer Sammlung ist somit auf dem besten Weg, erneut eine wichtige wissenschaftliche Arbeitsgrundlage zu bilden.

Für den ersten eigenen Sylloge-Band hat man Osteuropa und die Kaukasusregion gewählt – jenes Gebiet also, das von Anfang an in der Sammlung dominierte. Der Bearbeiter Tobias Mayer, der als Autor bereits bei der Tübinger Sylloge Erfahrungen sammeln konnte, gliedert sein Material geographisch in vier Teilräume (Wolgaregion, Schwarzmeerregion, Armenien/Georgien und das nördliche Aserbaidschan), innerhalb derer die rund 45 im Material belegten Prägestätten wie üblich nach dem arabischen Alphabet gereiht sind; Exemplare ohne lesbare Münzstättenangabe, die offensichtlich in den gegebenen Kontext gehören, sind an geeigneter Stelle integriert. Unter den insgesamt vorgelegten 1470 Nummern bilden die Prägungen der Goldenen Horde aus Südrussland mit über 900 Stück einen umfangreichen, repräsentativen Block; die weniger dichten islamischen Serien aus der Kaukasusregion wurden durch Aufnahme des in Jena vorhandenen georgisch-bagratidischen Materials ergänzt. Ein von Gert Rispling verfasstes Kapitel behandelt schließlich 72 osteuropäische Nachahmungen arabischer Dirhams in Jena, wobei Rispling als kompetenter Spezialist auf diesem Gebiet auch eine sehr willkommene Zusammenfassung des Forschungsstandes zu diesem schwierigen Thema bietet.¹

Der dem Hauptteil vorangestellte Beitrag von Stefan Heidemann bespricht die Geschichte des hier aufgearbeiteten Bestandes und erörtert generell die Bedeutung der islamischen Numismatik innerhalb der Orientalistik sowie die verschiedenen Editionsmöglichkeiten numismatischer Quellen. Derlei methodische Überlegungen zu Beginn einer neuen Reihe sind natürlich gerechtfertigt. Auch wenn man Heidemann vielleicht nicht in allen Details vorbehaltlos zustimmen will: im Orient bilden jedenfalls Münzen auf weite Strecken die einzigen greifbaren historischen Primärquellen, und es kann nicht oft genug betont werden, dass islamische Prägereihen wichtige Textdokumente darstellen, die es systematisch zu erschliessen gilt. Ein wenig irritiert in diesem Kapitel die Verwendung von *prähistorisch* beziehungsweise *vorgeschichtlich* anstelle von *frühgeschichtlich* oder *frühmittelalterlich* sowie der abwechselnde Gebrauch von *der* und *das* für den Begriff *Corpus*. Auch ist die zu Stickels Jena-Publikation von 1870 gemachte Bemerkung «Die hohen Kosten für Photographie und Lichtdruck erlaubten nur wenige Kupfertafeln» korrekturbedürftig: tatsächlich erschien nur eine einzige Tafel, und die ist lithographiert.

Die Goldene Horde, deren Münzen den Schwerpunkt des Katalogs bilden, war ein politisch nur zeitweise geeintes mongolisches Teilreich, das die mittelalterliche Geschichte Osteuropas wesentlich mitbestimmte und in seiner Kultur deutlich mediterrane Einflüsse zeigt. Gut vertreten sind in Jena Ausgaben vom Einsetzen der Prägung um die Mitte des 7./13. Jahrhunderts (AH/AD) bis zum Ende des 8./14. Jahrhunderts; spätere Emissionen hingegen nur spärlich. Mayer gibt für die Gruppe eine kurze historische und münzgeschichtliche Einleitung sowie eine Zu-

¹ In der zugehörigen Bibliographie nachzutragen ist der 2001 in Stuttgart erschienene erste Band von Ian Blanchards monumentaler Monographie *Mining, Metallurgy and Minting in the Middle Ages*, einem Werk, an dem man trotz mancher Bedenken nicht gut vorübergehen kann.

sammenstellung ihrer osteuropäischen Münzstätten, wobei *Aq Saray* als neuer, erstmals so gelesener Prägeort aufscheint. Wenn auch manche Örtlichkeiten bis heute nicht sicher lokalisiert sind, wäre eine Kartenskizze zu diesem Kapitel doch sehr erwünscht gewesen. Insgesamt darf man sich von dem knappen Einleitungsteil keinen wirklich umfassenden Überblick über das Münzwesen der Goldenen Horde erwarten – das ist im vorgegebenen Rahmen auch zu akzeptieren; eine wenigstens kursorische Besprechung der oft bemerkenswerten Münzlegenden und Bildtypen sowie eine etwas eingehendere Diskussion der Nominalien- beziehungsweise Wertangaben auf den Münzen hätten der Sache aber sicher nicht geschadet. Hingegen hat Mayer dankenswerterweise die umfangreiche, jedoch stark zersplitterte Literatur zum Thema gründlich recherchiert und vielfach auch in den Katalogteil eingearbeitet, was zweifellos keine leichte Aufgabe war: sie ist überwiegend in Russisch abgefasst, zum Teil schwer erreichbar und oft nur mit Mühe benutzbar. Ein kleines Manko der Bibliographie ist die weitgehende Vernachlässigung der zu manchen älteren Werken vorhandenen Reprints und Übersetzungen sowie der unterbliebene Hinweis auf ein Standardwerk zur russischen Numismatik, das auch das Geldwesen der Goldenen Horde mitbehandelt.²

Das Beschreibungsschema folgt im wesentlichen den Usancen der Tübinger und Oxforder Sylloge-Bände. Arabische Legenden werden in arabischem Typendruck, uiguro-mongolische in Transkription wiedergegeben; die lineare Darstellung der Legenden (mit Zeilentrennern) ist gegenüber der in älteren Katalogen üblichen mehrzeiligen Wiedergabe zwar platzsparend, jedoch deutlich weniger übersichtlich. Ob sich die zusätzlich zu den Katalognummern eingeführten Typnummern beim Zitieren bewähren werden oder ob sich die Doppelzählung eher als Ballast erweisen wird, bleibt abzuwarten. Gelegentlich liesse sich wohl über die Kriterien zur Definition eines Typs diskutieren: so begründet bei Typ 59 bereits der offensichtlich verderbte Nachschnitt der Randlegende einen neuen Typ, während bei Typ 67 der doch recht markante Bildwechsel vom Löwen mit aufgehender Sonne zum Löwen mit ganzer Sonne das nicht tut. Einzelne kleine Versehen finden sich bei Kat.-Nr. 84 (die Abbildungsnummer bei Fraehn ist CCCXXV), Kat.-Nr. 845 (lies *Fomičev*) und Kat.-Nr. 902 (Av. und Rv. bei der Abbildung vertauscht); bei Kat.-Nr. 907 (lies *zeitgenössische* Fälschung) ist das Fragezeichen wohl redundant.

Die Einordnung münzstättenloser beziehungsweise undatierter Stücke im Katalog wird von Mayer nicht immer eigens begründet. Vielfach wirkt sie plausibel, gelegentlich wird man aber doch Bedenken anmelden dürfen. So könnten bei den unter der Münzstätte Saray angeführten Kupferprägungen mit dem Sonnenlöwen (Typ 67) jene Exemplare, bei denen weder Münzstätte noch Jahr lesbar sind, zum Teil vielleicht doch aus Azāq stammen, wo der gleiche Typ bereits etwas früher ausgegeben wurde. Im übrigen empfiehlt es sich, bei allzu dürftig scheinenden Angaben im Katalog den Einleitungsteil durchzusehen – das gilt etwa für die Kat.-Nr. 892 aus der Münzstätte Qrim, der auf Seite 4 ein eigener Absatz gewidmet ist, während sie im Hauptteil weder datiert noch einer Dynastie zugewiesen ist. Bei den als russische Nachahmungen angesprochenen Silberprägungen (Kat.-Nr. 812-

² G.A. FEDOROV-DAVYDOV, *Monety Moskovskoj Rusi*, (Moskva 1981); französisch «Le Trésor de Saransk» (The Russian Numismatic Society, USA 1985).

824, kursorisch unter zwei Typ-Nummern zusammengefasst) hätte man aus dem Material vielleicht noch etwas mehr herausholen und sowohl Beschreibungen wie Hinweise auf Prototypen ausführlicher gestalten können; auch über die Abgrenzungskriterien gegenüber den in die Hauptreihe aufgenommenen Stücken mit barbarisierten Legenden erfährt man nichts.

Neben dem umfangreichen Bestand an Münzen der Goldenen Horde bietet der Katalog auch für die transkaukasischen Gebiete manches Interessante, angefangen von frühem bagratidischem Silber sāsānidischen Typs (Kat.-Nr. 1001) und einer Reihe umayyadischer Dirhams³ bis hin zu den in das 19. Jahrhundert heraufreichenden städtischen Ausgaben. Auf Münzstättennotizen oder Kommentare hat Mayer hier verzichtet, ebenso wiederum auf eine Übersichtskarte. Formal gerechtfertigt, im gegebenen Zusammenhang jedoch nicht sonderlich befriedigend ist die Verwendung des Begriffes *anonym* für Ausgaben, die durchaus bestimmten Prägeherren oder zumindest Herrscherfamilien zugewiesen werden können: so handelt es sich bei Kat.-Nr. 1378-1382 um Abbasis der Khane von Ganḡa, teilweise mit dem Couplet des Zand-Herrschers Karīm Khān; Kat.-Nr. 1383 ist offensichtlich ein Viertel-Abbasi zu der zwischen 1215 und 1217 AH in Ganḡa nach persischem Fuss und im Namen des Qāḡāren Fath ‘Alī Shāh ausgegebenen Silberserie. Ähnliches gilt für die Prägungen der Khane von Shekī aus Nukhūy (Kat.-Nr. 1384 ff.).

Gut bearbeitete Bestandskataloge orientalischer Münzen sind nicht nur für die Rekonstruktion der Prägesysteme wichtig, sie stellen auch wertvolle Bestimmungshilfen für Sammler, Händler und Kustoden dar. Dazu tragen im vorliegenden Fall die sorgfältig erstellten Digitalfotos wesentlich bei, die auch bei schlecht erhaltenen oder mangelhaft ausgeprägten Stücken immer noch relativ viele Details erkennen lassen. Zukünftige Bände könnten vielleicht noch etwas benutzerfreundlicher dadurch gestaltet werden, dass man sich zumindest für bestimmte Serien zur Erstellung von Legendenindices, chronologischen Tabellen, Konkordanzen zu älteren Zitierwerken und dergleichen entschließt; bei den heute gerne als methodisch veraltet bezeichneten Katalogen des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts war manches davon selbstverständlich. Auch die zusätzliche Berücksichtigung der christlichen Zeitrechnung bei den Herrschaftsdaten muslimischer Regenten wäre kein Nachteil.

Mit der im handlichen Quartformat gehaltenen Publikation ist jedenfalls ein wichtiger Sammlungsbestand kompetent erschlossen worden, wofür allen Beteiligten zu danken ist. Jena wird ab nun zweifellos wieder ein ähnliches Gewicht in der deutschen Islam-Numismatik haben wie vor eineinhalb Jahrhunderten, und man darf hoffen, dass die dem Andenken Gustav Stickels gewidmete neue Reihe bald um weitere Bände vermehrt werden wird.

Dr. Stefan Nebehay
Seilergasse 16
A-1010 Wien
stefan.nebehay@aon.at

³ Für sie empfehlen sich jetzt Zitate nach M.G. KLAT, *Catalogue of the Post-Reform Dirhams. The Umayyad Dynasty* (London 2002).