

SELENE PSOMA

MONETARY TERMINOLOGY IN PRE-ROMAN ASIA MINOR

aus: *Epigraphica Anatolica* 42 (2009) 170–180

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

MONETARY TERMINOLOGY IN PRE-ROMAN ASIA MINOR

I. Cistophori in Latin Authors and Greek Inscriptions: the Date of the Introduction of Cistophoric Coinage

Cistophoric coinage was an innovation in Asia Minor. From the late 330s to the early second century BC currency on the Attic weight standard circulated widely in this area.¹ Cistophori were issued on a lower weight standard with new types: a *cista mystica* (hence the new name) and a heavy ivy wreath all around on the obverse and two intertwined snakes on the reverse.² Several cities of the newly expanded Attalid Kingdom struck cistophori “under Attalid supervision”.³ Because the new coinage was introduced with a weight of 12.60 g,⁴ 25% lower than the Attic tetradrachm (17.2 g), Attalid Asia Minor became a closed monetary zone: plentiful hoard evidence reveals that cistophori did not circulate outside the Kingdom and that other coinage did not circulate within the area.⁵ On the frontiers of the Attalid Kingdom, one silver Attic weight

The author wishes to thank Riet van Bremen, F. de Callatay, E. M. Harris, O. Picard and P. Thonemann for discussion.

¹ For Alexanders in Asia Minor see G. Le Rider, *Les alexandres d'argent en Asie Mineure et dans l'Orient séleucide au III^e siècle a.C. (c. 275–225). Remarques sur le système monétaire des Séleucides et des Ptolémées*, *Journal des Savants* (janvier-septembre 1986) 3–51, pl. I–VI.

² For the early identification of these coins (in 1734) see also W. Szaivert, *Der Beitrag der literarischen Quellen zur Datierung des Beginns der Kistophorenprägung*, *NZ* 2005, p. 51 n. 5 and 6 (51–64).

³ The number of cities (Pergamum, Ephesus, Tralles, Sardis, Smyrna, Synnada, Apameia, Laodicea, Thyateira, Stratonicea, Adramyttium) that issued cistophori was increased with G. Le Rider's studies: *Un groupe de cistophores de l'époque attalide*, *BCH* 114. 2 (1990) 683–701 (Dionysopolis?, Blaundos? Lysias? Dioskome?); *idem*, *Monnayage cistophorique des Apaméens, des Praipénisseis et des Corpéni sous les Attalides. Questions de géographie historique*, *BCH* 115.1 (1991) 361–376 (Praipénissos, Korpenoi). For a list of cities that struck cistophori under the Attalids and later under the Romans see G. Le Rider, *BCH* 115.1 (1991) 365 with n. 8. As far as we know, the only cities which issued both currencies, cistophori and Attic weight tetradrachms, were Smyrna and Ephesus: on Smyrna see J. G. Milne, *The Autonomous Coinage of Smyrna II*, *NC* 1927, 46 nos. 186–189 (1–107, pl. I–V) and Ph. Kinns, 'Asia Minor', in *CRWLR* 108 n. 25 (105–119). On Ephesus see F. S. Kleiner, *The Dated Cistophori of Ephesus*, *ANSMN* 18 (1972) 17–32. For both cities, other Attic weight currencies issued by cities such as Tralles, and other issuing authorities in the Attalid Kingdom see also G. Le Rider, *La politique monétaire du royaume de Pergame après 188*, *Journal des Savants* (juillet-décembre 1989) 173 (163–189), pl. I. For the so-called cistophoric countermarks see P. Thonemann, *Cistophoric Geography: Toriaion and Kormaia*, *NC* 168 (2008) 43 ff.

⁴ Le Rider, *La politique monétaire* (n. 3) 164–169.

⁵ See Le Rider, *La politique monétaire* (n. 3) 181; R. H. J. Ashton, *The Coinage of Oinoanda*, *NC* 165 (2005) 73 (65–84). A number of hoards buried in 2nd century Asia Minor bring evidence on that direction. These are: *IGCH* 1326 (Balikesir, Mysia 1958), 1327 (anc. Ceraseis, Mysia 1963), 1328 (Euhippe, Caria 1952) 1330 (Priene, Ionia, 1895–8), 1340 (Smyrna, Ionia 1865), 1358 (Miletopolis, Mysia 1929; see also *CH* V 52), 1452 (Asia Minor 1876), 1455 (Asia Minor 1928), 1456 (Asia Minor 1971), 1458 (Asia Minor 1955), 1459 (Asia Minor 1935), 1460 (Asia Minor 1970), 1461 (Asia Minor 1996), 1462 (Asia Minor 1961), 1466 (Asia Minor bef. 1722), 1467 (Asia Minor 1868). See also G. Le Rider, *Sur un aspect du comportement monétaire des villes libres d'Asie Mineure occidentale au II^e siècle: leurs émissions de tétradrachmes de poids attique frappées entre 188 et c. 140*, in *Les cités d'Asie Mineure occidentale au II^e siècle a.C.*, edited by A. Bresson and R. Descat, Paris–Bordeaux 2001: 37–59, pls. I–III; *CH* II 94 (Ionia 1974), 130 (Turkey); *CH* VIII 525 (Asia Minor 199/92), 537 (unknown findspot, before 1986), 539 (Asia Minor 1988); *CH* IX 535 (anc. Colophon 1973). See also *CH* II 113 and V 56 for discussion and bibliography. For *IGCH* 1453 (Asia Minor 1962), which contains cistophori and Attic weight coinages (philetairoi of Westermarck group VII) see Le Rider, *La politique monétaire* (n. 3) 177–178: “aux confins du territoire de Pergame”.

tetradrachm was most probably exchanged for one silver *cistophorus* with a 25% gain, just as in Ptolemaic Egypt.⁶

Hoard and other evidence indicate a date between 185–180 and 175–170 for the introduction of the *cistophori*.⁷ This evidence appears to clash with the mention of *cistophori* by Livy in his description of Roman triumphs during the very early second century BC.⁸ In four places Livy mentioned *cistophori* in the loot taken by the Romans: M. Acilius Glabrio over Antiochos III and the Aetolians in 190 (37.46.3), the naval triumph of L. Aemilius Lepidus over Antiochos III in 189 BC (37.58.4), the triumph of L. Cornelius Scipio over Antiochos III in 189 BC (37.59.4) and of Cn. Manlius Vulso over the Galatians in 187 BC (39.7.1).⁹ Two problems then arise. (A) If we date, with G. Le Rider *et alii*, the introduction of the *cistophori* in the years immediately following the peace of Apamea, how then can we explain the mention of the *cistophori* by Livy in his account of events before the peace of Apamea? (B) The hoards show that *cistophori* never circulated in Mainland Greece; why then do they appear in the loot of M. Acilius Glabrio at Thermopylae in Mainland Greece?

Because Greek literary sources never mention the *cistophori* as a monetary unit (all available evidence concerns the significance of the word *kistophoros* as a basket bearer in a religious context),¹⁰ to solve this problem one must turn to contemporary epigraphic evidence from Asia Minor and Mainland Greece. L. Robert thought that this monetary unit could be recognized in a heavy damaged inscription of first century BC date from Sardis.¹¹ However, the religious context of this inscription and the use of the dative for both *theois* and *kistophorois* proves that the term surely refers to basket-bearers. The initial letters κισ- of the monetary unit, κιστοφόρος, can be recognized in a late Hellenistic list of contributions from Magnesia near Sipylon, as L. Robert pointed out.¹² From the last lines of a list of donations of second/first century BC date from Priene,

⁶ On Ptolemaic Egypt see Le Rider (n. 1).

⁷ Le Rider (n. 4) 163–169 with discussion and bibliography. See also G. Le Rider – Fr. de Callataÿ, *Les Séleucides et les Ptolémées. L'héritage monétaire et financier d'Alexandre le Grand* (Paris 2006) 183.

⁸ See previous note and W. Szaivert (n. 2) 51–64: After close examination of all Latin literary evidence, Szaivert concluded that “die literarische Überlieferung für die Datierung des Beginns der Kistophorenprägung keine Relevanz hat und daher aus der Diskussion auszuschneiden ist, wie es ja schon – allerdings ohne Begründung – Mommsen getan hat” (p. 62). *Cistophori* are also mentioned by Sextus Pompeius Festus (359, 22 M.) and Cicero (*Dom.* 52, 6; *Att.* 2, 6, 2; 2, 16, 4; 11, 1, 2).

⁹ The discussion on the date of the introduction of the *cistophori* is rather long and was led by important specialists of Asia Minor. For full bibliography and discussion see G. M. Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor* (Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 1995) 236–237 and Le Rider – de Callataÿ (n. 7) 183 with n. 1. R. H. J. Ashton, The Coinage of Rhodes 408 – c. 190 BC, in *Money and its Uses in the Ancient Greek World*, A. Meadows and K. Shipton eds (Oxford 2001) 79–115 tried a reconciliation of the *opinio communis* that dates the introduction of the *cistophori* in the years following Apamea and the mention of *cistophori* by Latin authors. He suggested that “the *cistophori* and the Rhodian *plinthophori* may have been coordinated on the same standard and introduced initially to meet expenditure in the war against Antiochos III”: *Hellenistic Asia Minor, A Survey of Numismatic Research 1996–2001* (Madrid 2003) 135 (133–150). For the date of the introduction of Lycian *plinthophori* see R. H. J. Ashton, Recent Epigraphic Evidence for the Start of the Rhodian and Lykian League *Plinthophori*, *NC* 165 (2005) 85–89.

¹⁰ Harpocr. (= Photios and Suda s.v.) s.v.; *Scholia in Demosthenem* 18.296; *Anthol. Graec. Epigrammata sepulchralia* 519. 2.

¹¹ *ISard.* 195: [- - - θ]εοῖς ἔλαο[ν](- - -) / [- - - ἐ]π' ἐνιαυτῶ [- - -] / [- - - τ]οῖς κιστοφόρο[ι]ς(- - -) / [- - -] τοῖς θεοῖς [- - -]. L. Robert, *Études de numismatique grecque* 177.

¹² J. Keil – A. von Premerstein, *Bericht über eine Reise in Lydien und der südlichen Aiolis* (Wien 1908) no. 14: ἐπηγάλαντο εἰς τὴν --- ἐπανάρο(θ)οσιν. The first line of the voluntary payments is preserved; the amounts were

we learn that a prominent citizen, Poseidonios son of Andron, grandson of Epikouros and adoptive son of Menandros, promised to give one hundred and sixty cistophori: [το]ῖς συνβάκχοις εἰς τὸ[ν / ἄγορ]ασμὸν τοῦ προσκει[μένου] τῷ βακχικῷ τύπου κισ/[τοφόρ]ους ἑκατὸν ἑξήκον[τα].¹³

The way the monetary term cistophori is used in the list of donations from Priene, in the accusative plural, does not allow us to determine whether the term refers to staters or drachms. There are two ways to explain the term *kistophoroi* in the previously mentioned list of contributions from Priene: (a) *kistophoroi* refer to drachms (*kistophorous drachmas*) or (b) to staters (*kistophorous stateres*). Drachms – fourths of cistophori – were struck with lion’s skin hanging over a club on an oak-wreath on the obverse and a bunch of grapes on vine-leaf on the reverse.¹⁴ Thus, these drachms could not be called *kistophoroi* because they do not bear a *cista mystica*. There is then only one possibility: the term *kistophoroi* refers to staters. One should recall that the Latin authors who mention this coinage always use the adjective in the masculine form.

Thus the term cistophori refers to staters. All around the Greek world, stater refers to the heaviest coin of a monetary system and standard.¹⁵ The first coins with the weight of an Attic tetradrachm were issued by Euboean cities and they were called staters in contemporary inscriptions from Eretria.¹⁶ It was also the case in the Chalcidic peninsula (Sermylia), an area under strong Euboean influence in the early fifth century BC.¹⁷ Athenian documents of the 420s mentioned the staters of Akanthos.¹⁸ These are the well-known Euboean-Attic weight “tetradrachms” that were issued in large quantities during the early fifth century BC. In fourth century BC Thasos, the term stater was used for the heaviest silver coins struck after the reform of 390 BC; as a result there are Thasian staters of 14.4 g and drachms of 3.6 g.¹⁹ All currencies in Mainland Greece with the exception of the Attic tetradrachms were called staters where the TMSO (talent-mina-stater-obol) system was retained to the beginning of the first century BC.²⁰ It is interesting to note that in Cretan inscriptions of Late Hellenistic date, Attic tetradrachms are also called

calculated in cistophori and the letters *iota* and *sigma* (lunar) were written above the *kappa*. Keil and von Premerstein noted: “Buchstaben der späthellenistischen Zeit”. Cf. L. Robert, Quelques monnaies dans les inventaires de Délos athénienne, *Etudes de numismatique grecque* (1951) 177 and notes 2 and 3 (143–178).

¹³ SEG XXXI 983; *IPriene* 209. As the editor princeps H. Malay (*RA* 1981, 77–78) rightly pointed out “here the cistophori of the province are meant”.

¹⁴ F. S. Kleiner, *The Early Cistophoric Coinage* (New York 1977) 21.

¹⁵ S. Psoma, Σταθμητικοί κανόνες στην Χαλκιδική κατά τον 5^ο και 4^ο αι. π.Χ., *Οβολός* 4 (2000) 25–36.

¹⁶ E. van Effenterre, *Recueil d’inscriptions politiques et juridiques de l’archaïsme grec*, Nomima I (1994) 91: texts 1 and 3. See also H. Nicolet-Pierre, Epigraphie et numismatique: quelques remarques sur les noms de monnaies dans les inscriptions grecques archaïques, *Numismatic Archaeology, Archaeological Numismatics* (ed. K. A. Sheedy and Ch. Papageorgiadou-Banis). *Proceedings of an International Conference held to honour Dr. Mando Oeconomides in Athens 1995* (Oxford 1997) 70–76.

¹⁷ Psoma (n. 15).

¹⁸ *IG I³* 383 1 face A col. II fr. VIII 178.

¹⁹ O. Picard, Monnayage thasien du V^e siècle avant Jésus-Christ, *CRAI* 1982, 412–418; S. Psoma, Notes sur la terminologie monétaire en Grèce du Nord, Journée organisée par la Société Française de Numismatique en l’honneur d’Hélène Nicolet-Pierre, *RN* 2006, 93 (85–98).

²⁰ J. Bousquet, Les unités monétaires dans les comptes de Delphes, *BCH* 11 (1986) 273–283 (= *Etudes sur les comptes de Delphes* [Paris 1988] 185–199); id., *Bull. ép.* 1996, 221; D. Mulliez, Le denier dans les actes d’affranchissement delphique, *Topoi* 7 (1997) 94 and 102 (93–102).

stater.²¹ The official name of the so-called Ptolemaic tetradrachm was stater; they are mentioned in this way in papyri from Ptolemaic Egypt where these silver coins were legal tender.²²

In inscriptions of Asia Minor the term stater occurs from the late sixth century BC to the first century AD. This term had a long history and designated different coins in different cities.²³ The issuing authority of the staters is very rarely noted: in inscriptions from Ionia, Mysia and Troas, the areas we are interested in, the adjectives *Phokaeus* (of the Phokaians), *Darikos* (with Dareius' types) and also *chrysous* occur in very few cases and denote foreign (and international) currencies.²⁴ These are really exceptions to the rule. Staters are generally mentioned without any indication of their issuing authority or their metal and refer to the heaviest coin of a monetary system and standard.²⁵ Thus, different currencies issued by different issuing authorities were meant by this term, each of them referring to its own currency for which Samos used additionally the adjective *patrios* (*stater patrios*) around 250 BC (*IG XII*, vi 1, 172, 8).²⁶

This reveals the significance of the term stater in monetary terminology of the Ancient Greek world. While stater seems to be the term *par excellence* for the biggest silver denomination, the term *tetrachmon* is less frequent.²⁷ It is totally absent from Asia Minor inscriptions. In Mainland Greece, it refers to currencies of Attic weight that were issued during the Hellenistic period. It occurs only in very few cases outside Athens and areas under its influence such as Oropos, Megara and Delos.²⁸ At Delos, a place under Athenian influence and Athenian territory after 167 BC, this term is used to denote large silver denominations. This is the reason the terms *kistophora* or *kissophora*²⁹ *tetrachma* that denote cistophori in the Delian inventories dating after 167 BC can not be considered as direct evidence for the monetary term to which *cistophorus* referred to.³⁰ In the Delian inventories under the Athenians, the differences of weight or the official names of the coins were not taken into consideration because the cistophori were foreign

²¹ *IC I* viii 13 l. 21: treaty between Hierapytna and Cnossus, second century BC.

²² H. Caddell – G. Le Rider, *Prix du blé et numéraire dans l'Égypte lagide de 305 à 173*, *Papyrologica Bruxelensia* 30 (Bruxelles 1997) 20, 34, 60; F. Burkhalter – O. Picard, Le vocabulaire financier dans les papyrus et l'évolution des monnayages lagides en bronze, in F. Duyrat et O. Picard, *L'exception égyptienne? Production et échanges monétaires en Égypte hellénistique et romaine. Actes du colloque d'Alexandrie, 13–15 avril 2002* (Cairo 2005) 55 (53–80); Le Rider – de Callatay (n. 7) 131.

²³ S. Psoma (n. 15) 25–36; ead., ΣΤΑΤΕΡ ΜΑΧΟΝ, *Nom. Chron.* 20 (2001) 13–44; ead. (n. 19) 85–98.

²⁴ For *phokaeus* see *SEG* 15. 751, l. 1 (G. Daux, Décret de Sigée trouvé en Corse, *BCH* 80 [1956] 53–56: first half of the third century BC) and for *Darikos*, *IEphesos* 10. l. 30 (summary of an old sacred law concerning sacrifices).

²⁵ Psoma (n. 15) 25–36.

²⁶ See commentary *ad l.* 8 of *IG XII*, vi 1, 172 with all previous bibliography.

²⁷ For the term *tetrachmon* see D. Knoepfler, Tétradrachmes attiques et argent “alexandrin” chez Diogène Laërce, *Mus. Helv.* 44 (1987) 233–253; 46 (1989) 193–230. Cf. *Bull. ép.* 1988, 97 and 1990, 208. See also D. Knoepfler, Alexandreion nomisma. L'apparition et la disparition de l'argent d'Alexandre dans les inscriptions grecques. Quelques réflexions complémentaires, *Topoi* 7.1 (1997) 33–50.

²⁸ These are: (a) the well known Amphictyonic decree from Delphi on the value of the Attic tetradrachm (*CID* IV 127) and (b) the honorary decree of Lycosoura for Damophon. For Delphi see S. Psoma, À propos de drachmes d'argent du décret amphictyonique *CID* IV 127, *ZPE* 160 (2007) 83 n. 36 (79–88).

²⁹ The term *kissophora* was alternatively used, referring to the heavy ivy-wreath surrounding the *cista mystica*: Robert (n. 12) 177 with n. 9.

³⁰ *IDélos* 1409 l. face B. fr. A col. I 17: 166 BC; *IDélos* 1430 l. 1. l. h 13: 153/152 BC; *IDélos* 1439 l. face Abc. col. 1. 13: 166–140/139 BC; *IDélos* 1441 l. 1. face A. fr. col. 1. 45: ca. 150 BC; *IDélos* 1443 l. 1. face A. col. I 149: 145/144–142/141 BC; *IDélos* 1449 l. face A. fr. ab. col. II. 22: post 166 BC; *IDélos* 1450 l. 1. l. face A. 37: 140/139 BC. L. Robert recognized these coins in the *kistophora* and sometimes *kissophora tetrachma* of the Delian inventories: Robert (n. 12) 143–178, esp. 168 and 177. For these inscriptions see also Le Rider (n. 4) 163 with n. 2.

currency at Delos where only Athenian coinage was legal currency, the so-called *stephanephora tetrachma*.³¹ To describe foreign coinages as the *kistophora* or *kissophora tetrachma* that had to be excluded from local circulation, the Delian inventories followed the Athenian model which introduced the term *stephanephora (tetrachma)* and *glaukophora (tetrachma)* for Athenian new and old style coinages.³² Thus, the Delian bureaucracy invented descriptive adjectives deriving from the reverse types of foreign coinages and the ending *-phoros*:³³ the *kraterophoroi* of Naxos, the *tetrachma kaina taurophora* of Eretria, the *drachmai phoinikophoroi* of Delos etc.³⁴ In the Delian inventories, the *plinthophoroi (drachmai)* for Rhodian currency minted in the second century BC are also mentioned although this term never occurs in official Rhodian documents.³⁵ The Delian inventories mention the *kistophora (kissophora) tetrachma* although these were called staters in the area where they were legal tender. We should recall that Delian inventories also mentioned the *Ptolemaika tetrachma* while these coins are called *stateres* in Ptolemaic papyri.³⁶

We do not know when the term *kistophoroi* came into official use in Asia Minor. We learn from the two inscriptions mentioned above that it was used officially in the first century BC. This is also true for the *kitharephoroi* of Lycia that are mentioned in a private document of similar date.³⁷ Thus, referring to coins in this way was “courant”, as L. Robert pointed out.³⁸ However, with the exception of the Athenian *stephanephora* for which the term was first used, the earliest mentions of *kistophoroi* and *kitharephoroi* in inscriptions from Asia Minor date only from the first century BC. We recall that the term *plinthophoroi* for Rhodian drachms was never used in Rhodian documents. We may assume that the descriptive adjective (*kistophoros*) occurred by itself, without the monetary term for silver (*stater*) on the new standard after a period during which both the descriptive adjective and the monetary term or only the monetary term *stater* was used. In any case, the term *kistophoroi* was used to describe staters.

After 133 BC, a number of cities continued to issue cistophori. As Ph. Kinns observed, “they served as the coinage of the new province”.³⁹ The creation of the province of Asia brought no apparent change to the silver currency of the region.⁴⁰ Later, between 58 and 49 BC, the so-called proconsular cistophori were struck in the most important cistophoric mints under central super-

³¹ J. Tréheux, L'administration financière des ἐπι τὰ ἱερὰ à Délos: une théorie nouvelle, *BCH* 115.1 (1991) 249–352.

³² For both terms, *stephanephoron* and *glaukophoron*, see L. Robert, Les drachmes du stéphanéphore d'Athènes, *Etudes de numismatique grecque* (Paris 1951) 129–132 (105–135). For other descriptive terms created by Delian bureaucracy see C. Prêtre, Un collier délien, *REA* 99 (1997) 371–376, sp. 376: «une rigueur dans l'innovation terminologique, particulièrement susceptible».

³³ See n. 30.

³⁴ Robert (n. 12) 157–159; id., Monnaies dans les inscriptions grecques, *RN* VI ser. vol. 4 (1962) 7–21.

³⁵ See *IDélos* 461 face B fr. b 49; 1415.3; 1422.12; 1443 A col I 151; 1449 A fr. ab col. II 12, 24; 1450 A 97, 103. The term may occur in an inscription of Didyma, see *IDidyma* 441.5.

³⁶ See n. 22.

³⁷ Robert (n. 12) 150–152.

³⁸ Robert (n. 12) 177–178.

³⁹ Ph. Kinns, Asia Minor, in *CRWLR* 108 (105–119).

⁴⁰ Kinns (n. 39) 109. For hoard evidence see M. T. Göktürk, Un trésor des monnaies cistophores trouvées à Izmir, *Anatolia Antiqua* 5 (1997) 83–85. See also F. de Callatay, *L'histoire des guerres mithridatiques vue par les monnaies* (Louvain-la-Neuve 1997) *passim* who frequently discusses the role of the cistophori during the Mithridatic wars.

vision and remained the basic unit of currency.⁴¹ Even after the introduction of the denarius in Asia Minor, “the massive cistophoric re-coinages by Antony and the Augustus” show that “the cistophoric system was retained”.⁴² The cistophori therefore remained the basic unit of currency in Asia Minor for a long time after the creation of the province of Asia.

We can now turn to the mention of cistophori in Latin authors.⁴³ All the puzzling passages of Latin authors become clear, if we interpret cistophori to mean staters. In Asia Minor, before the peace of Apamea and the introduction of cistophori in the early second century BC, the Romans collected *Alexandreia tetrachma* and local currencies issued on non Attic standards. These, as the cistophori, were called *stateres*, as we learn from contemporary inscriptions. As far as Mainland Greece and the triumph of M. Acilius Glabrio are concerned, the hero of Thermopylae brought with him, *inter alia*, *Attica tetrachma* and money on the Aeginetan and probably also the Corinthian standard, which were the main currencies in Greece south of the Olympus during the third century BC. These coins on the Aeginetan, the reduced Aeginetan, the Corinthian or the reduced Corinthian standards mentioned in contemporary inscriptions of Central Greece as staters,⁴⁴ were called “cistophori” by Livy, although cistophori never circulated in Mainland Greece.⁴⁵

For Livy, a historian who lived and worked under Augustus, the parallel use of the descriptive contemporary term cistophori and the old official term stater created confusion.⁴⁶ Thus, cistophori became for Livy a *terminus technicus* for describing non-Attic weight currency in southern Greece and Asia Minor, as H. Seyrig rightly recognised for Asia Minor.⁴⁷ From that point of view, it strongly reminds one of the use of *Philippeios* describing gold coins on Attic standard by late Antiquity and Byzantine authors.⁴⁸ It is not a simple coincidence that Livy used also the term *Philippeioi* in the relevant passages to describe gold currency on the Attic standard that the Romans brought with them to their triumphs in Rome. As G. Le Rider pointed out following E. T. Newell: «ce terme (sc. *philippeios*) désignerait alors les statères d’or de poids attique de cette aire

⁴¹ Kinns (n. 39) 111–112. For these cistophori see also J. Müller, *The Chronology of Ephesos Revisited*, *SNR 77* (1998) 73–80.

⁴² Kinns (n. 39) 112.

⁴³ For a detailed presentation of money and other goods collected by Romans for their triumphs see W. Szaivert (n. 2) 53–58.

⁴⁴ For mention of stateres in Hellenistic inscriptions from Central Greece see *IG IX 1, 3*, 706 of 280 BC from Oiantheia, Locris (the «Lokrische Mädcheninschrift»); *IG IX 1*, 267 from Opous, Locris (third/second century BC). For Aitolia, *IG IX 3*, 748 of ca. 190 from Delphi and *IG IX 1²*, 1, 188 of 213/212 BC from Melitaia, part of Aitolia at that date.

⁴⁵ For the presence of one cistophorus in the 1968 Larissa hoard see M. Jessop Price, *The Larissa 1968 Hoard (IGCH 237)*, *Kraay Mørkholm Essays. Numismatic Studies in Memory of C. M. Kraay and O. Mørkholm*, *Numismatica Lovaniensia 10* ed. by G. le Rider et al. (Wetteren 1989) 240 (233–43, pl. LIV–LV).

⁴⁶ The evidence of Livy on the introduction of the cistophori was considered as anachronistic by R. Thomsen (*Early Roman Coinage* [Copenhagen 1961] 146–148).

⁴⁷ H. Seyrig, *Monnaies hellénistiques V. Questions cistophoriques*, *RN 6^e série*, tome V 1963, (24 n. 1) 23–31: «Tite Live, par un anachronisme facile à comprendre, n’a dû compter en cistophores, d’après une de ses sources, qu’un mélange disparate de monnaies, et son texte ne saurait être traité comme une pièce de comptabilité»; Le Rider – de Callataÿ (n. 7) 183 n. 1 with discussion and bibliography.

⁴⁸ G. Le Rider, *Monnayage et finances de Philippe II. Un état de la question*, *MEΛETHMATA 23* (Athènes 1996) 66 n. 7 who is referring to M. Caltabiano et P. Colace, *L’Eponimia monetale: dall’esperianza orientale a quelle di età ellenistica*, *NAC 16* (1987) 33–35 (25–46).

géographique (Grèce, Asie Mineure, Orient séleucide), qu'ils fussent frappés au nom et aux types de Philippe II, d'Alexandre, de Lysimaque, de Démétrios Poliorcète ou des rois séleucides». ⁴⁹

We can conclude that epigraphic evidence from Asia Minor, an area where cistophori were legal tender, reveals that this term is used to denote staters. In this way, one can explain all the puzzling passages of Livy that mention cistophori in historical events antedating their introduction. The cistophori were not introduced for the first time to pay for expenses incurred during the war against Antiochos III; ⁵⁰ Attic weight currency was much needed for mercenaries and other expenses in case of war in this area. ⁵¹ The introduction of the cistophori needs to be placed in the historical context of the period following the peace of Apamea as this was very thoroughly described by G. Le Rider. ⁵²

II. Other Monetary Units in Inscriptions from Asia Minor

As we have already noted, the term *tetrachma* never occurs in inscriptions of Asia Minor. Beside the term “stater”, we also find the term drachms. We will not discuss the Rhodian drachms that have already been discussed by specialists of Rhodes and Caria. We will turn to *drachmai Antiocheiai*, *Alexandreiai* and *Attikai* and to the staters donated to Kyme by Archippe. ⁵³

The drachms of Antiochos III (*drachmai Antiocheiai*) are explicitly mentioned in two inscriptions of Iasos. The first one dates from the late third century BC and is the letter of Queen Laodike V to the city of Iasos (*Iasos* 4.24); the Queen's donation is calculated in drachms issued by her husband, Antiochos III: εἰς προΐκας τὰς τῶν ἀσθενούντων πολιτῶν θυγατράσιν, διδόντες μὴ πλέον Ἀντιοχέων δραχμῶν τριακοσίων ἐκάστη τῶν συνοικιζομένων. The second inscription is a decree of the Dionysiac Artists for the Iasians (*Iasos* 152. 22) dated to ca. 150 BC. Royal Seleucid currency on the Attic standard issued by Antiochos III, arrived at Iasos during the years of the Seleucid occupation. ⁵⁴ Iasos relied on this currency as the city never issued Attic weight currency with Alexander's types or civic types during the second century BC. ⁵⁵ Thus, the Attic weight drachms of Antiochos the Great were the only currency of international character available at Iasos in the years between 160 and 150 BC. It was with this currency of international character that the Dionysiac Artists preferred to be paid. ⁵⁶

As we have already noted, inscriptions from Asia Minor never mention *tetrachma*. The term *Alexandreiai drachmai* of a significant number of inscriptions from Asia Minor that date from the late fourth century BC to the first century BC, served to denote currency (tetradrachms and

⁴⁹ G. Le Rider, *BCH* 116.1 (1992) 274; E. T. Newell, *The Coinage of the Western Seleucid Mints from Seleucus I to Antiochos III* (New York 1941) 398 n. 10.

⁵⁰ R. H. J. Ashton, *Hellenistic Asia Minor, A Survey of Numismatic Research 1996–2001* (Madrid 2003) 135 (133–150).

⁵¹ Le Rider (n. 4) 179.

⁵² See n. 4.

⁵³ For the terms *argyrion* and “light Rhodian money” in the second century BC “leases” of Mylasa, see R. H. J. Ashton and G. Reger, *The Pseudo-Rhodian Drachms of Mylasa Revisited, Agoronomia. Studies in Money and Exchange Presented to J. H. Kroll*, ed. by P. van Alfen (New York 2006) 126–127 (125–150).

⁵⁴ For the relations of Antiochos III and his wife Laodike with the Carian city of Iasos see J. Ma, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor* (Oxford, New York 1999) 89, 112, 161, 180–2, 216–7, 230, 232, 334–5.

⁵⁵ Le Rider (n. 5) 40.

⁵⁶ S. Psoma, *Profitable Networks: Coinages, Panegyris and Dionysiac Artists, Mediterranean Historical Review* 22.2, December 2007, 237–255; ead., *Panegyris Coinages, AJN* 20 (2008) 227–255.

drachms) in the name and types of Alexander.⁵⁷ This currency on the Attic standard was struck by a number of mints in Western Asia Minor from the 320s to the end of the third century BC.⁵⁸ During that same period, Alexander's tetradrachms and drachms circulated widely in that area (and elsewhere) and were very frequently buried in hoards. From the last decades of the third century BC onwards, "Alexanders" became increasingly rare in Asia Minor and Mainland Greece.⁵⁹ They continued to be issued down to 170 by some cities of Asia Minor and afterwards only by a restricted number of cities all situated on the coast of Black Sea.⁶⁰ *Alexandreiai drachmai* continued to be mentioned in a number of inscriptions of second and first century date.⁶¹

The earliest mention of *Attikai drachmai* in inscriptions from Asia Minor is in the A2 decree for Archippe (*SEG* XXXIII 1036, l. 24). All others are of imperial date.⁶² As Louis Robert pointed out, in Asia Minor and almost all around the Greek world, *Attikai drachmai* mentioned in inscriptions of imperial date refer to *denarii*. It is also in literature of that period that the same term *Attikai* is used for the *denarii*.⁶³

The mention of the term *Attikai drachmai* in this decree for Archippe presents special interest because it refers to the contemporary Attic-weight currency struck by the city with its own types and ethnic in the 150s.⁶⁴ The adoption of this term *Attikai drachmai* for the currency on the Attic standard issued by the city of Kyme ca. 150 BC with its own types and legend can be

⁵⁷ D. Knoepfler has convincingly shown that the terms *Alexandreia tetrachma* and *Alexandreiai drachmai* mentioned in literary sources and inscriptions from the late fourth century BC to the first century BC refer to the coinage issued by Alexander, his successors and a number of cities with the types and name of Alexander: see D. Knoepfler, *Topoi* 7.1 (1997) 33–50 and 33 n. 1 for previous bibliography (n. 27).

⁵⁸ See n. 1.

⁵⁹ See n. 1.

⁶⁰ See M. Jessop Price, *The Coinage in the Name of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaeus: a British Museum Catalogue*. 2 vols. (Zurich, London 1991) 173–174.

⁶¹ D. Knoepfler dressed a list of second and first century BC epigraphic documents mentioning *Alexandreiai drachmai*: see n. 57.

⁶² *IG* XII 1, 94 (Rhodos, "aet. Rom."); *ICos* 357 l. 5; *IPrusias* 72 l. 18; *TAM* V 665 l. 12–13 (Lydia, 3rd century AD); V 2, 866 l. 4 (Thyateira, 3rd century AD); V 2, 1076 l. 4 (Thyateira, 3rd century AD); V 2, 1149 l. 3 (Thyateira, 244–247 AD); II 1–3, 330 l. 12–13 (Xanthos, Lycia: 3rd century AD); *MAMA* 4, 31 l. 2 (Phrygia); 6. 335 l. 11 (Akmonia); M. Waelckens, *Die kleinasiatischen Türsteine: typologische und epigraphische Untersuchungen der kleinasiatischen Grabreliefs mit Scheintür* (Mainz am Rhein 1986) 480 (Phrygia, 215–220 AD); *AAT* 101.1966/67.304. 22 l. 4 (Hierapolis): *non vidi*; G. Reimer, *Altertümer von Hierapolis* (Berlin 1898) 148 l. 5, 149 l. 6, 324 l. 1; *SEG* 16. 753 l. 10 (Dorylaion, Phrygia); *ILampsakos* 12 l. 8; G. Radet et H. Lechat, *Inscriptions du temple de Zeus Panamaros*, *BCH* 11 (1887) 373–404, sp. 398 l. 7 (Kaikos, after 212 AD); J. G. C. Anderson, *Festivals of Men Askaenos in the Roman Colonia at Antioch of Pisidia*, *JRS* 3 (1913) 267–300 sp. 284, no. 11 frg. f. 7 (Pisidia); *SEG* 2. 733 l. 8 (Pisidia); G. Radet, *Inscriptions de Lydie*, *BCH* 11 (1887) 445–484, sp. 481, no. 62 l. 5 (upper Kaikos, 3rd c. AD); A. Conze und C. Schuchhardt, *Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon 1886–1899*, *MDAI* 24 (1898) 97–240 sp. 178, no. 30 l. 13 (Pergamum, 18/17 BC–14 AD); *IEphesos* 26 l. 10 and 3058 l. 10; *MAMA* 8, 571 (*Aphrodisias* 438); 547. 5 (*Aphrodisias* 535); *IMylasa* 465 l. 8 and 9; R. Heberdey – A. Wilhelm, *Reisen in Kilikien* (= *DAN* 44. 6 [1896] 125, 202) l. 7. See also following note.

⁶³ Robert, *RN* 1962 (n. 34), 11–13; id., *D'Aphrodisias à la Lycaonie*. *Compte rendu du volume VIII des Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua, Hellenica* XIII (Paris 1965) 211 n. 2; id., *Les inscriptions de Thessalonique*, *RPhil* 1974, 217 n. 224 (180–246). See also *Bull. ép.* 1976, 85, 136, 360 (Thessaloniki); 1974, 579 n. 75 (Nicomedia).

⁶⁴ Contemporary dates are proposed for the decrees for Archippe and the Attic-weight currency of the city with solid arguments by R. van Bremen (The Date and Context of the Kymaian Decrees for Archippe (*SEG* 33. 1035–1041), *REA* 110.2 (2008) 362–369 (357–382). For monetary units in the decrees for Archippe see O. Picard, *Monétarisation et économie des cités grecques à la basse période hellénistique: la fortune d'Archippè de Kymè*, *Approches de l'économie hellénistique*, *EAHSBG* 7 (2007) 85–119.

easily explained if we recall that the city struck currency on the Attic standard with the name and types of Alexander III from ca. 215 to ca. 170 BC. The term to denote these coins was *drachmai Alexandreiai*.⁶⁵

III. The staters in the decrees for Archippe

The decree for Archippe also mentions staters (*SEG XXXIII 1036*, l. 22 and 24) and staters *chalkou* (pillar B, decree no. 2: *SEG XXXIII 1039* l. 51–52, 57, 58).⁶⁶ For O. Picard, the term stater refers to the tetradrachms that the city issued around the mid second century BC on the Attic standard. As a tetradrachm consists of four drachms, a thousand staters (1000) was the equivalent of four thousand (4000) drachms. According to O. Picard, that amount of money was paid by Archippe in bronze coins, issued by the city of Kyme either at the same time as the Attic weight silver tetradrachms of Kyme (*SNG v. Aulock 1630–35*), or at a later date and with different types (*SNG v. Aulock 1641–2*). For O. Picard, all other amounts in staters, though mentioned in the decrees without the additional “chalkou” were also paid in bronze coins, the only exception being the seventy (70) Attic weight drachms specified for the purchase of the victim. These were paid, as O. Picard rightly suggested, with the wreathed tetradrachms that were issued in Asia Minor at the time.⁶⁷

We can thus follow Picard as far as the *Attikai drachmai* are concerned. But, what about the term stater in the decrees for Archippe? If we follow O. Picard, the term stater refers to the Attic weight currency issued by Kyme and other cities of Asia Minor.⁶⁸ This would force us to assume that one and the same coinage – the Attic weight wreathed currency of Kyme (and other cities of Asia Minor) – was referred to in the same inscription both as stater and as Attic drachm. This is difficult to accept.⁶⁹ As stated above, in Greek inscriptions the term stater denotes the heaviest silver coin of a monetary system and occurs (with very few exceptions related to special circumstances) without an adjective that reveals its issuing authority. In this way, the term stater refers to the city’s own currency struck with civic types and on the local standard. The inscriptions indicated the metal of the staters when this was not silver. These are the reasons why we believe that the term stater in the decrees of Kyme refers to the city’s silver coins of ca. 10 g that were struck with Amazon’s head/Horse standing, KY and monograms.⁷⁰ These also date from the second century BC and were legal tender at Kyme during this period. The Attic weight tetradrachms that were struck in the 150s shared types with the staters, the only distinctive element being the heavy wreath on their reverse.

⁶⁵ For the alexanders of Kyme see M. Jessop Price (n. 60) 217–239, nos 1612–1644; Le Rider (n. 5) 40–41.

⁶⁶ H. Malay, the *editor princeps* of the decrees of pillar B, noted: “in the expression *στατήρες τοῦ χαλκοῦ*, the word *χαλκός* may have its general meaning of “money” since staters were never minted in bronze”: Three decrees from Kyme, *EA 2* (1983) 14 ad l. 83 (1–17) who refers to *Bull. ép.* 1978, 434. Jeanne and Louis Robert did not make any comments on these staters *chalkou* (*Bull. ép.* 1984, 351), while R. Merkelbach was surely right to wonder: “Welcher Stater gemeint ist, wissen wir nicht, auch nicht, in welcher Beziehung der Stater zur attischen Silberdrachme steht”: *IKyme 13 ad l.* 42 (p. 36).

⁶⁷ Picard (n. 64) 95.

⁶⁸ For this and all other second century BC so-called wreathed coinages on the Attic standard see Le Rider (n. 5) 37–59, pls. I–III. For Kyme see J. H. Oakley, The autonomous wreathed tetradrachms of Kyme, Aeolis, *ANSMN* 27 (1982) 1–37, pl. 1–17; Le Rider (n. 5) 43; van Bremen (n. 64).

⁶⁹ Picard (n. 64) 93–95.

⁷⁰ Head, *HN²* 553; *BMC Aeolis* 58 (silver), 59–72 (bronze).

To sum up. In inscriptions from Hellenistic Asia Minor, the monetary terms that are frequently (with the exception of staters) used are the following: *Alexandreiai drachmai* that refer to Attic weight currency (tetradrachms and drachms) issued with the types and in the name of Alexander III, *Antiocheiai drachmai* in the inscriptions of Iasos that refer to Attic weight currency (tetradrachms and drachms) in the name of Antiochos III and *Attikai drachmai* in the decrees of Kyme for Archippe. This term refers to Attic weight currency struck with civic types and a heavy wreath on the reverse.

Abbreviations

AJN = *American Journal of Numismatics*

ANSMN = *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes*

BMC Aeolis = W. Wroth, *Catalogue of Greek Coins of Troas, Aeolis and Lesbos* (London 1894)

CH = *Coin Hoards I–IX*

CRWLR = *The Coinage of the Roman World in the Late Republic. Proceedings of a Colloquium held at the British Museum in September 1985*, ed. by A. M. Burnett and M. H. Crawford. “British Archaeological Reports” 326 (1987)

CRAI = *Comptes rendus de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*

EAHSBC = *Entretiens d’Archéologie et d’Histoire de Saint Bertrand-des-Comminges*

Head, B. V., *HN²* (Oxford 1911)

Heberdey, R. and A. Wilhelm, *Bericht über eine Reise in Kilikien* (Wien 1896)

IC = *Inscriptiones Creticae*

ICos = Segre, M., *Iscrizioni di Cos* (Rome 1993)

IDélos = Durrbach, F. et al. *Inscriptions de Délos*. 7 vols (Paris 1926–1972)

IPriene = McCabe, D. F., B. D. Ehman and R. Neil Elliott, *Priene Inscriptions, Texts and List* (Princeton 1987)

ISard = Sardes V. *Greek and Latin Inscriptions*, ed. by Buckler, W. H and D. M. Robinson (Leyden 1932)

IGCH = M. Thompson, O. Mørkholm, and C. M. Kraay (eds), *Inventory of Greek Coins Hoards* (New York 1973)

NAC = *Numismatica e Antichità Classica*

NC = *Numismatic Chronicle*

NomChron = *Nomismatika Chronika*

RN = *Revue Numismatique*

SNR = *Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau*

Waelkens, M., *Die kleinasiatischen Türsteine: typologische und epigraphische Untersuchungen der kleinasiatischen Grabreliefs mit Scheintür* (Mainz am Rhein 1986).

Abstract

Livy’s use of the term *cistophori* in connection with Roman triumphs after the War with Antiochos III appears to be inconsistent with the numismatic for the date of the introduction of *cistophori* as the main currency of the Attalid Kingdom in the years following the peace of Apamea. Epigraphic evidence from Asia Minor, an area where *cistophori* were legal tender down to the late 1st century BC, shows that with the term *cistophori* staters were meant. Livy and other Latin authors also mention *cistophori* always in the masculine plural. Thus, the puzzling passages of Livy become clear, if we interpret *cistophori* to mean staters. For Livy, the parallel use of the descriptive term *cistophori* and the old official term *stater* created confusion and *cistophori*

became for him a *terminus technicus* for describing non Attic weight currency in Asia Minor and Southern Greece, an area where cistophori never circulated. Other monetary units in inscriptions from Asia Minor of this period are: the *drachmai Antiocheiai* in decrees of Iasos, the drachms of Antiochos III, the *Alexandreiai drachmai* that refer to tetradrachms and drachms struck with Alexander's types and legend, the *Attikai drachmai* in the decrees for Archippe meaning the contemporary Attic weight silver issued with the types of Cyme, and the city's ethnic, and staters also in the decrees of Cyme referring to the city's silver issued with the types of Cyme and the city's ethnic but on the local standard.

Özet

Livius'un Romalıların Antiokhos III ile yaptıkları savaşta elde ettikleri zafer ile bağlantılı olarak *cistophori* ifadesini kullanması, Apameia barışını izleyen yıllarda kistophorların Attalos (Bergama) Krallığı'nın ana para birimi olduğuna ilişkin nümizmatik bilgilerle çelişiyor gibi görünmektedir. Kistophorların İ.Ö. I. yüzyıl sonlarına kadar temel para birimi olduğu Anadolu'da bulunan yazıtlar bize, kistophor ifadesinin stater anlamında kullanıldığını göstermektedir. Livius ve diğer Latin yazarları kistophor sözcüğünü hep eril ve çoğul olarak kullanmışlardır. Eğer kistophor sözcüğünden *stater* anlamı çıkarırsak, Livius'un çelişik gibi görünen ifadeleri böylece açıklığa kavuşur. Çünkü Livius için kistophor ifadesi ile eski resmî *stater* ifadesi karmaşa yaratmıştı ve kistophor ifadesi Livius için Anadolu'da ve kistophorların hiçbir zaman kullanılmadığı Güney Yunanistan'da Attika-dışı standartı ifade üzere teknik bir terim (*terminus technicus*) haline gelmişti.