

Washington University in St. Louis

## Washington University Open Scholarship

---

Arts & Sciences Electronic Theses and  
Dissertations

Arts & Sciences

---

Spring 5-10-2024

### Lysimachos and His Coinage in Context: The “Hellespont Workshop” and the “Philo” Lysimachi, c. 302 to 255 BCE

Phillip Register

*Washington University in St. Louis*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/art\\_sci\\_etds](https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/art_sci_etds)



Part of the [Ancient History, Greek and Roman through Late Antiquity Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Register, Phillip, "Lysimachos and His Coinage in Context: The “Hellespont Workshop” and the “Philo” Lysimachi, c. 302 to 255 BCE" (2024). *Arts & Sciences Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 3093.  
[https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/art\\_sci\\_etds/3093](https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/art_sci_etds/3093)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Arts & Sciences at Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Arts & Sciences Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact [digital@wumail.wustl.edu](mailto:digital@wumail.wustl.edu).

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS

Department of Classics

Lysimachos and His Coinage in Context:

The “Hellespont Workshop” and the “Philo” Lysimachi, c. 302 to 255 BCE

by

Phillip Shane Register

A thesis presented to  
Washington University in St. Louis  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree  
of Master of Arts

May 2024  
St. Louis, Missouri

© 2024, Phillip Shane Register

# **Table of Contents**

List of Figures .....	iii
List of Abbreviations .....	v
Acknowledgments.....	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Why Lysimachos?.....	6
1.2 A History of Lysimachian Numismatics.....	8
1.3 Conclusion.....	16
Chapter 2: Die Study.....	17
2.1 Methodology .....	18
2.2 Lysimacheia and Lampsakos .....	19
2.3 Kios .....	31
2.4 Parion .....	37
2.5 Metrology .....	46
2.6 Predicted Production .....	47
Chapter 3: The Philo Lysimachi in Context .....	59
3.1 Lysimachos, Satrap of Thrace, 323-302 BCE.....	59
3.2 Lysimachos, King of the Hellespont, 302-288/7.....	75
3.3 Lysimachos, King of Greece, Thrace, and Asia, 288-281. ....	84
3.4 Lysimachos, Symbol of the Northern League, 281-255 BCE. ....	92
Conclusion .....	100
Bibliography .....	102
Appendices.....	109
Plates.....	120

# List of Figures

Figure 2.1: Issue 1 .....	22
Figure 2.2: Issue 2 .....	22
Figure 2.3: Issue 3 .....	22
Figure 2.4: Issue 4 .....	23
Figure 2.5: Issue 5 .....	23
Figure 2.6: Issue 6 .....	24
Figure 2.7: Issue 7 .....	24
Figure 2.8: Issue 8 .....	26
Figure 2.9: Issue 9 .....	27
Figure 2.10: Issue 10 .....	27
Figure 2.11: Issue 11 .....	28
Figure 2.12: Issue 12 .....	29
Figure 2.13: Issue 13 .....	32
Figure 2.14: Issue 14 .....	33
Figure 2.15: Issue 15 .....	33
Figure 2.16: Issue 16 .....	34
Figure 2.17: Issue 17 .....	34
Figure 2.18: Issue 18 .....	35
Figure 2.19: Issue 19 .....	36
Figure 2.20: Issue 20 .....	38
Figure 2.21: Issue 21 .....	38
Figure 2.22: Issue 22 .....	39
Figure 2.23: Issue 23 .....	39
Figure 2.24: Issue 24 .....	40

Figure 2.25: Issue 25 .....	40
Figure 2.26: Issue 26 .....	41
Figure 2.27: Issue 27 .....	41
Figure 2.28: Issue 28 .....	42
Figure 2.29: Issue 29 .....	42
Figure 2.30: Issue 30 .....	42
Figure 2.31: Issue 31 .....	43
Figure 2.32: Issue 32 .....	43
Figure 2.33: Metrology .....	47
Figure 2.34: Estimated Coverage .....	48
Figure 2.35: Estimated Number of Obverse Dies .....	49
Figure 2.36: Estimated Number of Reverse Dies .....	49
Figure 2.37: Estimated Total Production .....	50
Figure 2.38: Estimated Timespan of Production .....	53
Figure 2.39: Estimated Triremes Supported at 1.32 Talents per Trireme.....	55
Figure 2.40: Estimated Triremes Supported at 1 Talent per Trireme.....	56
Figure 3.1: Lysimachi Hoard Distribution Excluding Attested Lampsakene Lysimachi, <i>terminus ante quem</i> 270 BCE .....	89
Figure 3.2: Hoard Distribution of Lampsakene Lysimachi, <i>terminus ante quem</i> 270 BCE .....	90

# List of Abbreviations

All abbreviations of ancient authors are according to LSJ, 9<sup>th</sup> edition. All abbreviations of inscriptions are according to *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*.

ANS: American Numismatic Society.

BMC: British Museum Catalogue.

CH: *Coin Hoards* (1975 onwards).

CNG: Classical Numismatic Group, LLC.

HGC: Hoover, *Handbook of Greek Coinage* (2009 onwards)

IG: *Inscriptiones Graecae* (1873 onwards).

IGCH: *An Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards* (1973 onwards).

M: Marinescu (2017).

S: Seyrig (1958).

SC: Houghton and Lorber, *Seleucid Coins* (2002).

SEG: *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*.

SIG: *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*.

SNG: *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum*.

T: Thompson (1968).

# Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I thank Dr. William Bubelis. I thank you for your staunch willingness to read draft after draft, even under short and sometime unexpected time crunches. Without your guidance, I never would have attempted such a die study. Without your support, I never would have completed it. More importantly, I thank you for all you have instilled in me over the past two years: a commitment to precision, clarity, caution, and consistency. These are the traits I hope to emulate throughout my academic career.

I thank Dr. Roger Bagnall and Dr. Nicola Aravecchia, whose insights as members of my committee have proven invaluable. I will always beware of kaleidoscopic argumentation. I also thank the American Numismatic Society, especially David Hill, who graciously provided me with the newly digitized ANS Photofiles; Dr. Peter Van Alfen, who welcomed me to the ANS; and Aadya Bedi, who patiently supervised as I held those ancient coins in my own hands. I thank Dr. Constantin Marinescu, who assuaged my utter stupefaction regarding the posthumous Lysimachi.

I thank my friends and my family. I thank Charizard for his unwavering emotional support. I thank my best friend and wife, Caroline Register. Your support, your encouragement, and your determination all continue to inspire me.

Phillip Shane Register

*Washington University in St. Louis*

*May 2024*



# Chapter 1: Introduction

Between the Battle of Ipsos in 301 BCE and his death at Korupedion in 281 BCE, Lysimachos ruled a territory spanning Thrace, Asia Minor, the Black Sea coasts, and along the Aegean. At the center of this empire lay the Hellespont, straddled on one side by his capital at Lysimacheia in the Chersonese and on the other by the city of Lampsakos in the Troad. From the Hellespont, the coinage of Lysimachos circulated throughout and beyond his empire, as far as the Danube, Epiros, and Cilicia.<sup>1</sup>

The fiscal relationship between ruler and city – between Lysimachos and Lampsakos – was clearly close. From 301 BCE until his capture of Amphipolis in 288 BCE, Lampsakos was the most productive Lysimachian mint, and even afterwards retained preeminence within Asia Minor until 281.<sup>2</sup> Lampsakene importance, however, was not a Lysimachian invention. The city had a long tradition of minting prevalent civic and then Alexandrine issues prior to 301. Under Lysimachos, however, Lampsakos appears to have occupied a uniquely favored role among its neighbors: die links between Lampsakos and various *poleis* of northwest Asia Minor are found

---

<sup>1</sup> On hoard evidence, see Chapter 3, Section 3.3 (Figures 3.1 and 3.2) and Section 3.4.

<sup>2</sup> Some Lampsakene Alexanders dated to 302 may have been minted under Lysimachos during his brief occupation of the city, but the dating is unsure as he initially perpetuated the same mint marks and symbols as his Antigonid predecessors. See Chapter 3, Section 3.2.

especially among Lysimachi.<sup>3</sup> No other mint within Lysimachos' empire attests as many die links or stylistic similarities with other *poleis*.<sup>4</sup>

In 1968, Margaret Thompson published the first of these die links, an obverse shared between an issue from Lysimacheia (T13) and Lampsakos (T54a).<sup>5</sup> In this case, however, Lampsakos' typical role is inverted; it received rather than sent the die.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, the phi-lambda ( $\Phi\Lambda = \phi$  or "philo") monogram present in T13, 53, and 54 also appears in Lysimachi at neighboring Parion and Kios in Bithynia.<sup>7</sup>

What is the significance of this monogram? Other monograms also appear in multiple Lysimachian mints, but T54a is the only specimen with a shared monogram that is also on a shared die. Such monograms often represent a magistrate or mint official, as is the interpretation of contemporary Seleukid monograms by Taylor and of monograms on posthumous Lysimachi

---

<sup>3</sup> By Lysimachi, I mean "the coins bearing Lysimachos' name." Generally these denote lifetime Lysimachi (minted for the king during his life), but I will differentiate between these and posthumous Lysimachi (minted by various *poleis* after the king's death). One link exists among earlier Antigonid issues (with Abydos): Thompson (1991), Lampsakos Stater 88 = Abydos Stater 1. There are three known Lampsakene Lysimachos die links. Lysimacheia: noted in Thompson (1968), T13 = T54a. Mytilene: noted by Newell but lost prior to Thompson (1968), 167. Cahn (1991) recovered the link. T46 = T133. Sestos: found in the Armenak hoard. Thompson (1986), Armenak 659 (T24) = Armenak 674 (T42).

<sup>4</sup> For a breakdown of known inter-*polis* links, see Cahn (1991), as discussed in Section 1.2. Lampsakos was also one of the *poleis* within the Athena Polias *koinon* centered on Ilion, which included *poleis* such as Abydos and Parion: Pillot (2017) and Ellis-Evans (2016).

<sup>5</sup> See Chapter 2, Plates 2.1-2.3. The following abbreviations will be used to cite coin types: Seyrig (1958) = S. Thompson (1968) = T. Marinescu (2017) = M. For all abbreviations, see the List of Abbreviations above. For a brief overview of how die links occur in general and their utility for numismatists, see Marinescu (1996), 23.

<sup>6</sup> Thompson cites stylistic similarity with Lysimacheia and dissimilarity with Lampsakos, but a more clear-cut proof of the die's provenance is in die links (with previous Lysimacheian issue T11) and die-breaks (the Lysimacheian issues are visibly newer).

<sup>7</sup> The coins of these issues bearing the "philo" monogram will be referred to as "philos".

at Byzantion and Chalkedon by Marinescu.<sup>8</sup> In *Seleucid Coins*, Houghton and Lorber interpret the OP/PO monogram as a mint official who was active in at least six different Seleucid mints in the late 3rd century.<sup>9</sup> Lorber and Kovacs also interpret a unique and otherwise unattested combination of an owl control mark with an AP or ON monogram as a “mint worker” or “technician.”<sup>10</sup> But there are other possibilities.<sup>11</sup> In the case of the Lysimachi, most of these possibilities must be discarded (see Appendix 1.A).<sup>12</sup>

If ϕ denotes such a mint official (hereby referred to as “Philo”), he seems to have traveled between no less than three *poleis* to supervise or aid in minting. These *poleis* include Lysimacheia, Lampsakos, and the final known lifetime Lysimachi of the Kios mint (Marinescu issues M3-8) prior to their posthumous issues. The ϕ monogram also appears on early

---

<sup>8</sup> Taylor (2022). Marinescu (1996), 25-26, believes that “these [Lysimachi] monograms – whether a fanciful coupling of letters or a straightforward abbreviation of a name – undoubtedly refer to a person, although in some instances they serve as ethnics... the monograms must name either high ranking government officials – presumably, but not certainly, the principal city magistrate – or individuals in charge of different aspects of the mint. For the Lysimachi of Byzantium and Chalkedon it appears likely that the monograms do indeed record the involvement of mint officials rather than civic magistrates: this conclusion appears inevitable since on the local silver coinage of Byzantium the coin’s monogram is different from the name of the city magistrate which spells out in full in the coin’s exergue.”

<sup>9</sup> Houghton and Lorber (2002), 359-360.

<sup>10</sup> Lorber and Kovacs (1997), 95.

<sup>11</sup> Callataÿ (2012), 40-41, summarizes the possibilities. Outside the mint, possibilities include: the eponymous magistrate of the city, the magistrate in charge of monetary affairs, benefactors/liturgists who funded the mint, military commanders “for whom the coins were primarily issued”. Inside the mint: the mint master, the engraver, or “various subordinate monetary officers.” Non-personal possibilities: the mint itself, *officinae* (workshops functioning separately inside the same mint), indication of the source of the struck metal, the military unit for whom they were made, a mark of value, the year within an era, or “any numerical suite where A is used or 1, B for 2, etc.”

<sup>12</sup> Appendix 1.A lists, in tabular form, reasons for rejecting most typical interpretations of monograms among the Lysimachi.

posthumous issues of the Parion mint (Seyrig issues S9-15).<sup>13</sup> If  $\Phi$  does not denote a mint official, some other explanation is in order.<sup>14</sup>

Another monogram is intimately related to  $\Phi$ . At Lampsakos, the delta-xi ( $\Delta\xi = \text{Ⓢ}$ ) issues vastly outnumber the philo issues.<sup>15</sup> As will be shown in the die study, six of the thirteen philo reverses at Lysimacheia and Lampsakos feature  $\Phi$  engraved over a partially erased  $\text{Ⓢ}$ . Furthermore, engravers working under Delta-xi were responsible for all Kios lifetime obverses and were emulated in some posthumous  $\Phi$  issues at Parion. If  $\text{Ⓢ}$  and  $\Phi$  denote mint officials, the latter owes much to the former, and the two must have worked alongside one another often.

The aim of this thesis, then, is to firstly explain the relationship between Lysimachos, Lampsakos, and this enigmatic  $\Phi$  monogram, and secondly to explore the repercussions of that newly-understood relationship to our understanding of Lysimachian mint organization more specifically and, more broadly, to our understanding of Lysimachos' relationship with the *poleis* of his empire. This chapter will briefly review the history of Lysimachian numismatics and introduce the many issues plaguing it. Scholarship on Lysimachos in general is lacking, in part due to his ill treatment by ancient historians as compared to fellow diadochi such as Seleukos or

---

<sup>13</sup> Seyrig's order of the two mint marks must be reversed, however, so it seems  $\Phi\Lambda$  began but did not end Parion's Lysimachian minting. Both the  $\Phi\Lambda$  and  $\Pi\Lambda\text{P}$  issues are posthumous. See Chapter 2, Section 2.4.

<sup>14</sup> Thompson (1968), 167, remarks: "Does the recurrence of monograms imply a mobility of minting officials? In the case of common monograms one cannot safely assume an identity of magistrates, but [the  $\Phi\Lambda$ ,  $\Delta\xi$ , and another monogram] are unusual renderings."

<sup>15</sup> In the Armenak hoard, delta-xis (T49-52, Armenak coins 715-772) outnumber philos (T53-54, Armenak 773) by 57 to 1: Thompson 1986.  $\Delta\xi$  could denote any number of names attested in the 4th-2nd centuries BCE, the majority of which start with the  $\delta\epsilon\xi$ - prefix. One  $\Delta\acute{\epsilon}\xi\iota\omicron\varsigma$  is attested from Parion in the third century BCE, the father of a mercenary Pythion: *I. Tralles* 28, line 12.

Ptolemy.<sup>16</sup> As such, we must increasingly rely on numismatics to reveal the inner workings of his empire and administration.

Chapter 2 consists of a die study on the issues bearing the  $\phi$  monogram: Lysimacheia Thompson 13, Lampsakos Thompson 53 and 54, Kios Marinescu 1-8 (= T181-185), and Parion Seyrig 9-15. Contrary to Thompson's chronology, it appears that the Lampsakene delta-xi series continued throughout the 280s BCE, with philo and other "subsequent" issues in fact representing sporadic instances of other mint officials using previously-made dies from Delta-xi's reserves for special, limited emissions. Kios' philos (most likely representing the same mint official) may have been simultaneous with or just subsequent to the Lampsakene delta-xis. The Parion philos, however, belong to the 260s BCE and are more intimately related to other posthumous "philo" issues at Byzantion and Chalkedon.

Following this revised chronology, Chapter 3 will explore Lysimachos' relationship with Lampsakos and the wider Propontis, from his abortive occupation of Lampsakos in 302 BCE to the collapse of his empire following his death in 281 BCE and the perpetuation of his coinage by independent Propontic *poleis*. As one of the first cities in Asia Minor to embrace Lysimachos, Lampsakos seems to have been rewarded with some degree of numismatic primacy, becoming the center of a "Hellespont workshop." The mint official at the head of this central Hellespont workshop was Delta-xi, who likely minted coins to support the royal navy. Philo and others were in charge of more limited emissions in Lampsakos and other cities of the Propontis, likely for

---

<sup>16</sup> For discussion on this problem, see Lund (1992), 13-18.

specialized and sporadic purposes.<sup>17</sup> Some time after the king's death, this prolific Hellespont workshop transformed into Marinescu's Bosphoros workshop. These posthumous engravers imitated their lifetime predecessors, sometimes with extraordinary precision as in some philo issues at Parion in the 260s BCE. Decades after Lysimachos' death, the coins bearing his name retained their role as protection for the Propontis against Thracian and Seleukid invaders.

## 1.1 Why Lysimachos?

Of the major diadochi, Lysimachos remains the least researched, especially in regard to numismatics. Scholars of Seleukos might consult the comprehensive *Seleucid Coins* while those of Antigonos have at their disposal *Antigonid Coins Online*; the closest analogue for Lysimachos, as noted below, is Thompson's 1968 "Mints of Lysimachos", a general but far from comprehensive "skeleton listing" as per Arnold-Bucchi.<sup>18</sup> Helen Lund's 1992 biography of Lysimachos is the only of its kind in English, compared to Seleukos' five.<sup>19</sup>

One reason for this lack of scholarship is Lysimachos' poor standing among the ancient historians. Lysimachos is conspicuously absent for long stretches of Diodorus Siculus' *Library of History*, and the narrative for the years of the king's apogee following the battle of Ipsos in 301 BCE – precisely those focused upon in this study – is unfortunately lost.<sup>20</sup> Elsewhere, Lysimachos appears merely as an antagonist in Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* of Eumenes, Pyrrhos,

---

<sup>17</sup> As noted above, the interpretation that these monograms as representing mint officials must remain an assumption. This assumption is a useful analytic tool to interpret these issues, but it is an assumption nonetheless.

<sup>18</sup> Arnold-Bucchi (1998), 5-6.

<sup>19</sup> Five Seleukos English biographies: Mehl (1986), Grainger (1990), Kosmin (2014), Ogden (2017), Hannestad (2020).

<sup>20</sup> Diodorus' relevant extant books for this study are Books 17-20 (335-302 BCE). For Diodorus' reliability as a historian, see Oldfather (1933), xxiii; Hau (2016), 73-123; and Gray (1980), 306-326. Diodorus (D.S.) and other ancient authors will be abbreviated in citations according to LSJ convention.

and especially Demetrios Poliorcetes. Diodorus' and Plutarch's major source for this period, Hieronymus of Cardia, was supposedly hostile to Lysimachos due to the fact that the king had forcefully relocated the population of his home *polis* to his new capital at Lysimacheia.<sup>21</sup> We must, therefore, turn to sources beyond literary evidence, including "public inscriptions, coins, sculpture, painting, city ruins and other archaeological finds."<sup>22</sup> Of these, coins offer a uniquely rich set of material. The sheer quantity of surviving Lysimachian coinage is immense. From these coins we may gain insights into, among other things, mint organization – and, therefore, wider issues of Lysimachian administration and his relationship to the *poleis* of his empire, which were ostensibly free but nonetheless under his control.

Both Lysimachos and Lampsakos have received a surge of scholarly attention over the past half-decade. Aneurin Ellis-Evans has published four articles on Lampsakene numismatics: its archaic silver coinage (2018), its connections with the Spartan fleet under Lysander (2016), its time under Memnon of Rhodes (2018), and its late Hellenistic tetradrachms in connection with Parion (2020).<sup>23</sup> Meanwhile, Killen in 2018 has built upon her previous work on *parasemata* to analyze the evolution of the winged horse protome in Lampsakene coinage, stelae, and lead weights.<sup>24</sup> Other publications on Lysimachi in general include Arnold-Bucchi's 1998 article on Pergamene tetradrachms, in which Arnold-Bucchi uses stylistic parallels (following Cahn) between Lampsakene and Pergamene Lysimachi as a *terminus post quem* for the latter's initial

---

<sup>21</sup> Paus. 1.9.7-8. D.S. 20.29.1. See Lund (1992), 31-45.

<sup>22</sup> Lund (1992), 18.

<sup>23</sup> Ellis-Evans and van Alfen (2018), 41–51; Ellis-Evans (2016), 1–19; Ellis-Evans (2018), 33–69; Ellis-Evans (2020), 93-125.

<sup>24</sup> Killen (2018), 53–64.

issues, and Petac’s 2020 article examining early Lysimachian stater of Lampsakos, which in fact bear many of the same monograms and symbols as the tetradrachms. A similar Lampsakene stater with an identical type to Thompson 57 was analyzed in Duyrat 2020.<sup>25</sup> Finally, as explored below, Marinescu in 2017 published a die study of Kian Lysimachi, building upon his 1996 dissertation on the posthumous Lysimachi of Byzantion and Chalkedon. The time is ripe, then, for further research on Lysimachian numismatics.

## 1.2 A History of Lysimachian Numismatics

Though Lysimacheia was not founded until 309 BCE, the other three *poleis* of this study (Lampsakos, Parion, Kios) each had long histories of independent civic issues prior to Lysimachos. Parion minted silver drachms and hemidrachms with the gorgoneion type from at least the late sixth century.<sup>26</sup> Its fourth-century silver and bronze emissions typically retained the gorgoneion obverse but added other symbols on the reverse, usually the letters ΠΑΠΙ and a bull looking backwards alongside a grain ear, star, grape bunches, dolphin, or the city’s great altar.<sup>27</sup> Kios, meanwhile, minted its Persian-standard silver drachms, hemidrachms, and quarter-drachms bearing Apollo on the obverse and a prow (often with grain ear to right) on the reverse from ca. 350 to 315 BCE at latest.<sup>28</sup> Lampsakos began minting in the late 6th century, and from 510 to ca.

---

<sup>25</sup> Duyrat and Blet-Lemarquand (2020), 175–193. Petac (2020) argues that the disappearance and then reappearance of Athena’s spear is related to the war between Lysimachos and Demetrios Poliorcetes in 287–6 BCE.

<sup>26</sup> Meadows (1998), 41. *BMC Mysia*, Parium nos.1-13. See Plate 3.1.

<sup>27</sup> *BMC Mysia*, Parium nos.14-56. Le Rider (1963), 53–55. See Plate 3.1. For the chronology of these issues and the ‘philo’ issues in relation to wider historical context, see Chapter 3, Appendix 3.A.

<sup>28</sup> Corsten (1985), 31; Le Rider (1963), 32–39. See Plate 3.1.



330 BCE its gold staters featured two iconic types: the janiform head and the winged-horse protome.<sup>29</sup>

In her 1991 *Alexandrine Drachms of Lampsakos and Abydos*, Margaret Thompson provided a die study of lifetime, Antigonid, and the earliest Lysimachian Alexandrine issues of Lampsakos.<sup>30</sup> These initial Lysimachian drachms and staters contain links with previous Antigonid strikings and also perpetuate local monograms and civic symbols (i.e. the lion protome). Thompson identifies the presence of two separate drachm workshops, both opening very soon after Ipsos in 301 BCE.<sup>31</sup> Both workshops continue the lion protome symbol, but the first introduces a new control (a dolphin) while the second perpetuates the winged-horse protome emblematic of pre-Lysimachian issues. Both workshops introduce a torch as a secondary control alongside a unique arrangement of ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΛΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ, and both contain different monogram sequences. This unique mint organization is intriguing, especially since Thompson did not identify two separate workshops in her 1968 study.<sup>32</sup> It is possible that one of the workshops was limited only to drachms, or perhaps one of the workshops closed shortly after the initial issues covered in Thompson (1991). Chapter 2 will further explore the possible function of multiple Lysimachi workshops within Lampsakos.

---

<sup>29</sup> Baldwin (1924), 88.

<sup>30</sup> The die link between Lampsakos and Abydos mentioned above occurs during the Antigonid Alexandrine issues: Thompson (1991), Lampsakos Stater 88 = Abydos Stater 1.

<sup>31</sup> It is possible that some of these issues were minted during the king's abortive occupation of the city in 302: see Chapter 3, Section 3.1.

<sup>32</sup> See below, Section 1.2. All but two of the eleven types are present in the preceding 1968 study, so the delayed identification of two separate workshops was perhaps not a matter of available evidence but rather divided attention.

Based on notes by Newell, Thompson's 1968 "Mints of Lysimachus" is to date the only general – albeit far from comprehensive – summary of Lysimachian issues.<sup>33</sup> According to Thompson's chronology, the initial Lampsakene Lysimachian Alexanders (T32-38) were minted from 301/0 to 297/6. Thompson argues that Lampsakos minted Lysimachi (T39-52) most profusely from 297 until 287, the year in which its subsequent emissions (T53-61) drastically slowed and decreased production in favor of the newly gained mint at Amphipolis.<sup>34</sup> Her relative ratio between Lampsakene issues is confirmed in the 1986 Armenak hoard (*IGCH* 1423), wherein the preceding eta-rho  $\text{H}^{\rho}$  (T 44-48, Armenak coins 680-714) and especially delta-xi  $\text{X}^{\delta}$  (T 49-52, Armenak coins 715-772) issues vastly outnumber our 'philo'  $\text{X}^{\phi}$  issues (T 53-54, Armenak 773) by 34 to 1 and 57 to 1 respectively.

As discussed above, Thompson was the first to point out the enigmatic obverse die link between Lysimacheia (T13) and Lampsakos (T54), as well as the shared monogram with Kios (T181-185). According to Thompson,  $\text{X}^{\phi}$  first appears in T53, where the new mint official erases that of his predecessor and engraves his own. Thompson gave her theory on  $\text{X}^{\phi}$  as follows: "It is entirely possible that [ $\text{X}^{\phi}$ ] was shifted temporarily from Lysimachia to Lampsacus after the earthquake destroyed the former city [c. 287 BCE] and was then transferred to Cius to supervise operations there between 286 and 281."<sup>35</sup> The philo emissions (T53 and 54), then, mark a major turning point.

---

<sup>33</sup> Thompson (1968), 163-182. Prior to Thompson, the best overview of Lysimachi was Ludwig Müller's comprehensive 1858 *Die Münzen Des Thracischen Königs Lysimachus*. Though inevitably outdated, Müller's attributions often remain the only examples of their type, and many modern catalogues list only the Müller attribution even when Thompson or others have more recently identified the type.

<sup>34</sup> Thompson (1968), 171 and 179.

<sup>35</sup> Thompson (1968), 167.

Thompson's straightforward chronology, however, must be revised. As shown in Chapter 2, the T54s in fact precede the T53s as demonstrated by an obverse die-break.<sup>36</sup> Moreover, as noted above, six philo obverses at Lysimacheia and Lampsakos feature  $\phi$  engraved over a partially erased  $\Omega$ .<sup>37</sup> There are also die links between delta-xis (T49) and "later" issues (T55).<sup>38</sup> Within eta-rho and delta-xi issues, those of T49 alone are linked with T47, T50, and T52, among many others.<sup>39</sup> Such a preponderance of inter-Lampsakene links diminishes our ability to form straightforward chronological orders of issues, and once again implies the existence of multiple workshops operating within Lampsakos simultaneously.

Though Thompson did not note these die links, she did point out the "marked homogeneity of style" among three groups of mints.<sup>40</sup> Her tentative explanation for these similar styles is the central workshop hypothesis: "it seems more likely that there were central workshops for the production of dies and that these dies were then distributed to meet the needs of various mints."<sup>41</sup> She does not identify a possible location for these central workshops. Cahn in 1991 expanded upon Thompson's groupings, identifying three major types of portraiture on

---

<sup>36</sup> See Chapter 2, Section 2.2. This die-break is visible on the T53 and T54b specimens that Thompson examined.

<sup>37</sup> This includes both the T53 and T54b specimens examined by Thompson, of which she only noted the former.

<sup>38</sup> See Chapter 2, Section 2.2, Plate 2.17.

<sup>39</sup> Thompson 1986, Armenak 707 (T 47) = Armenak 707 (T 48); Armenak 708 (T 47) = Armenak 715 (T 49); Armenak 727 (T 49) = Armenak 755 (T 50); Armenak 721 (T 49) = Armenak 772 (T 52). Thompson (1968) lists preexisting links between 48 and 49 as well, so 47, 48, and 49 are all mutually linked, while 49 is also linked with 50 and 52.

<sup>40</sup> Group 1: "early period" Lysimacheia, Lampsakos, Abydos, Magnesia, and Alexandra Troas. Group 2: "late period" Amphipolis and Pella. Group 3: "late period" Lampsakos, Magnesia, Alexandria Troas, Pergamon, and Smyrna.

<sup>41</sup> Thompson (1968), 167.

Lysimachian obverses.<sup>42</sup> Cahn assigns Lysimacheia tetradrachms T10-18 (including our T13) to his type A, as well as Lampsakos issues T40-46. He assigns Lampsakos issues T47-53 to his type A2. Our shared die, Thompson 54, marks his transition point for Lampsakos to type B (T54-61).<sup>43</sup> This chronology is not perfect, however. While T54 and onwards are all type B, the transition from type A to A2 and A2 to B is not uniform. Thompson's own example for T50 in 1968 is clearly type B, as are some specimens from T46.<sup>44</sup> Type A2 and type B specimens are present within T50, while T51 is type A2. Some of this confusion may be again due to multiple mints operating within Lampsakos simultaneously. If Cahn's groupings are broadly correct, they may be useful in dating these simultaneous emissions. But such stylistic dating must remain tentative, especially since some posthumous emissions clearly imitate earlier type A coins.<sup>45</sup>

Cahn rejected the notion that Lampsakos could have minted so many issues: "Das Übergewicht der Prägungen von Lampsakos – in Armenak-Schatz 160 von 423 Tetradrachmen, also ca. 37 Prozent – ist nicht plausibel."<sup>46</sup> As discussed above, however, Thompson in the same year demonstrated a clear transition in Lampsakos between Antigonid Alexanders, Lysimachian Alexanders, and the first Lysimachi. But Cahn is right to be alarmed by the degree of Lampsakene supremacy. By comparison, Kyzikos, whose mint was one of the most productive in

---

<sup>42</sup> Cahn (1991), 85. Type A features a smaller head whose horn wraps around the ear, with rich hair curls on the neck and a "meist enger, feiner Perlkreis." Type B features a larger head whose horn curves over the ear and sometimes covers the outer ear, with hair curls that often leave the neck exposed and a perlkreis so wide that it is sometimes not visible. There is also a type A2, appearing first in Lampsakos, which features emphasized neck muscles, a head that appears to look upwards, and an Ammon's horn the ends behind the outer ear.

<sup>43</sup> Cahn (1991), 90.

<sup>44</sup> See Chapter 2, Plates 2.17, I-P.

<sup>45</sup> Such as at Parion c. 260 BCE: See Chapter 2, Section 4.

<sup>46</sup> Cahn (1991), 88.

the Greek world throughout the 5th and 4th centuries, is assigned a paltry few Lysimachian issues.<sup>47</sup> With reattribution firmly off the table, then, the most likely explanation may be that Lampsakos served as the base for a central Hellespont workshop.

Such a central workshop is not unattested among the Lysimachi. Marinescu's 1996 die study of Byzantion and Chalkedon proves the feasibility of a "single engraver's workshop" producing for numerous neighbouring cities, although these post-date Lysimachos himself by twenty years. The engravers of this "Bosporus Workshop," produced the posthumous silver Lysimachi as well as "local civil issues in silver and bronze."<sup>48</sup> The Lysimachi were "intended for external payment and export, while the silver locals [were intended] for everyday use on the premises of the cities."<sup>49</sup> Furthermore, Marinescu demonstrates that

these [engravers] were not exclusive employees of the two Bosporan cities, but exercised their art in other places, engraving Lysimachi dies used for striking coins for several other Propontic and Pontic cities. This phenomenon indicates that what previously used to be considered a local urban mint dedicated to serve the needs of only two cities is in fact a major regional minting workshop, an entity which I have called the 'Bosporus workshop' and whose existence suggests that our conception of civic mints in the Hellenistic period is in need of revision.<sup>50</sup>

According to Marinescu, Byzantion began minting Lysimachi in the late 270s BCE.<sup>51</sup> If the Bosporos workshop had its predecessor in the Hellespont, that leaves a gap of roughly one decade between Lysimachos' death in 281 (the presumed halt of the minting of Lysimachi at

---

<sup>47</sup> Cahn (1991), 88.

<sup>48</sup> Marinescu (1996), 4.

<sup>49</sup> Marinescu (1996), 432.

<sup>50</sup> Marinescu (1996), 4.

<sup>51</sup> Marinescu (1996), 326. For recent developments, see Marinescu (2014).

Lampsakos) and the beginning of the Bosphoros workshop in the late-270s at earliest. Where did these Lysimachi engravers go between 281 and the late 270s?

One possible answer is Kios. In 2017, Marinescu published a die study including 246 Kian Lysimachi (243 tetradrachms and 3 staters). Of these, he identifies 43 lifetime Lysimachian specimens, with 7 obverse dies and 18 reverse dies.<sup>52</sup> There are eight issues in total utilizing three combinations of primary controls: the grain stalk (issues M1-2), the grain stalk plus  $\phi$  (M3-4), and  $\phi$  alone (M5-8). Die links within (but not between) these three groupings provide his order. He dates these eight issues to a three-year span (assuming consistent striking per Mørkholm and Callataÿ) sometime ca. 285-275. As Chapter 2 will show, Marinescu's chronology and dating are sound.<sup>53</sup>

After these lifetime Lysimachi (M1-8), Kios minted a slightly more numerous emission (M9-19), estimated by Marinescu to have taken place over ca. 3 to 5 years sometime between 270 and 260. It is during the beginning of this second emission that the Bosphoros workshop supposedly opened at Byzantium. At Kios, this was followed by a third, even more numerous emission over ca. 5 to 8 years from ca. 260 to the late 250s BCE. Both the second and third emissions exhibit similar weight distribution to contemporary Lysimachi at Byzantium and Chalkedon.<sup>54</sup> The fourth and final emission, dating sometime in the late 250s or early 250s, contains a die (die 42) which "is strikingly similar to obverses at Byzantium, Chalkedon and Perinthus... at this very moment [the introduction of die 42], as Cius' Lysimachi come to an

---

<sup>52</sup> Marinescu (2017).

<sup>53</sup> Chapter 2, Section 2.3.

<sup>54</sup> Marinescu (2017), 217.

abrupt end, those of Byzantium and Chalkedon continue unabated, both cities striking gold as well as silver.”<sup>55</sup> By this point, the Bosphoros workshop was in full operation. It is possible, then, that Kios served as a sort of bridge in the gradual transfer of the Hellespont workshop at Lampsakos to the Bosphoros at Byzantium.

As Marinescu demonstrates, these posthumous Bosphoros engravers “relied more and more on earlier coins as sources for inspiration, sometimes even making close copies of earlier designs.”<sup>56</sup> One *polis* which minted such retrospective designs was Parion. Seyrig in 1958 recorded fifteen Lysimachos types, of which his 1 through 8 “lifetime” emissions bore a ΠΑΡ (ΠΑΡ) while his 9 through 15 were posthumous and bore the ϕ monogram.<sup>57</sup> Among these latter issues is a ‘type A’ obverse mimicking lifetime dies attested among Lampsakene delta-xis and eta-rhos.<sup>58</sup> The same prototype coin was probably used by the same posthumous engraver for obverses at Byzantium in the late 260s.<sup>59</sup> Another Parion philo obverse is nearly identical in style to Chalkedon issues dated by Marinescu ca.260-245 BCE.<sup>60</sup> It is clear, then, that Parion was firmly entrenched within the Bosphoros workshop. Though Seyrig was correct in identifying these issues as posthumous, Chapter 2 will demonstrate that his issues S1-8 in fact post-date issues S9-15. Chapter 3 will explore the repercussions of this redating.

---

<sup>55</sup> Marinescu (2017), 219.

<sup>56</sup> Marinescu (1996), 431.

<sup>57</sup> Seyrig (1958), 603-625.

<sup>58</sup> See Chapter 2, Section 2.4.

<sup>59</sup> Müller 60, 01/20/89, 61 = Marinescu (1996) Byzantium issue 11, O16. See Chapter 2, Section 2.4, Plate 2.18, S.

<sup>60</sup> Marinescu (1996) Chalkedon issue 18, no.44. See Chapter 2, Section 2.4, Plate 2.18, Q. Gorny & Mosch 255, Lot 3100.

If Thompson's "central workshop" was at Lampsakos, and if Lampsakos indeed contained multiple workshops minting simultaneously, how can we hope to construct an accurate chronology of the Lampsakene Lysimachi? One possible delimitation may be in the Lampsakene civic symbols. While Thompson's Lampsakene monograms progress in a relatively stable (though overly simplified) order, the civic symbols seem to oscillate between the torch (appearing three separate times), star (four times), crescent (seven), and herm (five) with no discernable pattern. Though there are some die links between them, I strongly suspect that these different symbols denote different *officinae* or mints within the wider Hellespont workshop at Lampsakos. Such a suspicion, however, could only be confirmed by a full die study of all Lampsakene Lysimachi. This thesis is, in part, one preliminary step towards that overarching goal.

### **1.3 Conclusion**

This chapter has introduced the problems and the unique advantages of Lysimachian numismatics. As demonstrated above, the chronologies of the Lampsakene and Parion Lysimachi both require revision. Chapter 2 will begin this process. A die study on the  $\Phi$  monogram issues (Lysimacheia T13, Lampsakos T53-54, Kios M 1-8, and Parion S9-15) will be followed by examination of these issues' metrology, estimated size of production, estimated length of production, and estimated dates. Chapter 3 will place this new evidence in its historical context, tracking the activities of Lysimachos, Lampsakos, Parion, and Kios in conjunction with hoard evidence in order to determine the purpose and broader implications of the  $\Phi$  emissions within Lysimachos' empire.



## Chapter 2: Die Study

This chapter presents a die study of the  $\phi$ -monogram ( $\phi$  or ‘philo’) Lysimachi of Lysimacheia, Lampsakos, Kios, and Parion. I will briefly review methodology before presenting the first two *poleis* together, followed by brief discussion. Of the thirteen reverses of Lysimacheia and Lampsakos in this study, six feature philo monograms engraved over partially erased delta-xi monograms. In combination with other evidence, it seems that the Lampsakene delta-xi series continued throughout the 280s, with philo and other “subsequent” issues (according to Thompson’s chronology) representing sporadic instances of other mint officials using previously-made dies from Delta-xi’s reserves for special, limited emissions. The Kios issues are more straightforward, in large part thanks to the framework already provided by Marinescu. Though new die combinations tighten Marinescu’s chronology, unfortunately none have appeared to bridge the gap between his issues 1-2, 3-4, 5-7, and 8. The chronology that I present for Parion, meanwhile, is tentative, but the issues as a whole seem to be posthumous, in the same style and with similar metrology to Byzantion’s and Chalkedon’s emissions (some of which also bear a  $\phi$  monogram) of the 260s BCE.

After presenting these chronologies, I will briefly examine the metrology of these issues before calculating the quantity of coinage produced using Esty’s (2011) formulae in conjunction with Howgego’s average production estimate. Overall, the approximate production of the  $\phi$  emissions is rather low, ranging between 30 talents at lowest (Lysimacheia obverse estimate) and 300 talents at highest (Kios reverse estimate). The huge disparity between obverse and reverse production estimates for Lysimacheia and Kios may indicate as-yet-discovered die links between these philo emissions and others (as is known for Lysimacheia but as yet unknown for Kios), whereas the similar ratios for Lampsakos and Parion indicate a more standard minting rate

despite both mints' many shared styles, dies, and monograms with other mints of the Hellespont or Bosphoros workshop.

Key to the philos of all four of these *poleis* is the delta-xi (ϡ) series (T49 and T50 especially), which share obverses with remarkably similar styles – perhaps the work of the same engravers – as nearly all ϡ obverses in all three lifetime *poleis* and even some of Parion's posthumous obverses as well. The Lampsakene ϡ emissions seem to have been minted continuously and simultaneously throughout the lifetime philo emissions. Far from being replaced outright by Amphipolis and Pella, then, it seems Lampsakos may have maintained a certain preeminence until Lysimachos' death in 281.

## 2.1 Methodology

Of the 125 coins presented in this study, most new (that is, unlisted in previous works by Thompson, Seyrig, Marinescu) specimens were found in auction catalogs and auction websites, especially (but not limited to) those listed in AC Search and CoinArchives.<sup>1</sup> A major obstacle in this search was that these coins remain chronically misattributed. In many cases these misattributed coins are at least searchable using older attributions, especially those of Müller, but far too many were found accidentally while combing through other series and types. These cases usually arose from a blatant misreading of the monogram, misinterpretation of the symbols, or a general willingness to assign known types with established attributions to “uncertain mint” or “unpublished type.”

---

<sup>1</sup> Four new specimens were available from the digitized British Museum catalogue. My attempts to access the collections of other relevant museums (i.e. Copenhagen, Athens) were not successful. I hope to visit these collections in-person in the future.

When one searches for die links among these Lysimachi, a few defining characteristics are often most expedient. For the obverse, these include the shape of the flowing diadem behind the head, the particular curvature of the horn in relation to the ear, the shape and detail of the inner ear, and the locks of hair flowing down the neck. For the reverse, these include the shape and size of Nike's wing, the position of the monogram in relation to the letters in  $\Lambda\Sigma\text{IMAXOY}$ , the position of Athena's spear and shield boss in relation to letters in  $\text{BA}\Sigma\text{I}\Lambda\text{E}\Omega\Sigma$ , the position of the control symbol in exergue in relation to the throne, and the shape and curvature of Athena's trailing plume. Given the remarkable consistency between dies of similar style, especially at Kios, sometimes only one of these many characteristics may differ between otherwise seemingly identical dies.

## 2.2 Lysimacheia and Lampsakos

Issues 1-12 in this study, denoting the philoi of Lysimacheia and Lampsakos, are all die linked and in relatively straightforward chronology thanks to die-breaks present on later obverses. These correspond to Thompson 13 (Lysimacheia), 54, and 53. The first obverse in this study, obverse 1, appears in Thompson 11 specimens as well as an enigmatic coin from the ANS Photofiles with a race torch and an unknown, unclear monogram on its reverse.<sup>2</sup> Accompanying notes to the enigmatic photofile specimen ask: "Lysimachia – or Lampsacus?" The answer is neither. An identical type found on the market belongs to "Magnesia" (T115), and shares the same reverse with other specimens assigned to the Magnesia mint.<sup>3</sup> All of these T11 and T115

---

<sup>2</sup> T11 specimen: Plate 2.16, A. cn type 12078, in: Corpus Nummorum, <https://www.corpus-nummorum.eu/types/12078>. Unknown specimen: Plate 2.16, B. Munz&Med 2/12/1972 = ANS Photofile 20, Uncertain\_AR\_0297.

<sup>3</sup> T11 obverse, Magnesia reverse: Plate 2.19, Y. CNG E-Auction 267, Lot 48, 11/02/2011. Same Magnesia reverse, different obverse: Plate 2.19, Z. Heidelberger Münzhandlung Herbert Grün Auction 87, Lot 27, 11/14/2023.

specimens exhibit varied levels of die-wear, but all seem to represent a die-state more worn than those of early Lysimacheian philo issues (1-2) but earlier than the subsequent issues 3 onward. It is possible that both these T11s, T115s, and philo issues 1-2 were minted simultaneously (alternating between issues 1-2, the T11s, and the T115s) or subsequently (philo issues 1-2, then T11s, then T115s, then philo issues 3 onward). In either case, the assignment of the T115s to “Magnesia” is difficult to maintain.

Thompson identifies Magnesia as the original mint of two transferred mint officials, including  $\text{Ⲁ}$ . As she speculates,

$\text{Ⲁ}$  could have been moved from Magnesia to Lampsacus in the late [2]90s, and [another monogram] of Magnesia might have retired as a minting official c. 296 and been brought back into service to control the output of Pella some ten years later.<sup>4</sup>

The T115 reverses differ significantly from the style of nearly all other reverses in this study in that they are cramped, ill-organized, and generally rushed. The reverse of the T115 specimen which shares the T11/philo obverse also shows signs of die-rust, and thus extended wear and tear, on the throne. Other T115s are die linked to T113, 114, and 116, including T114s which feature the unambiguously Magnesian maeander symbol in the reverse exergue. Such factors do not align well with the rest of the coins from the “Hellespont workshop”, but the middling die-wear on the obverse diminishes the probability that the coin was minted very far (geographically or temporally) from the T11s and the philo issues. One possible solution is that this “Magnesia” mint was in fact part of the Hellespont workshop, and thus that the Hellespont workshop includes a vastly wider array of assigned mints, styles, and engravers than previously thought.

---

<sup>4</sup> Thompson (1968), 167.

Another possible solution to the problems posed by this “Magnesia” specimen is that the mint was transferred from Magnesia to the Hellespont workshop. As Thompson says,

In 287 the Magnesians apparently supported Demetrius but Lysimachus did not close the royal mint after the rebellious city had been recaptured in 286. A few of the thirty-three obverse dies known for tetradrachms are of the late style associated with the period between 286 and 281.<sup>5</sup>

T115 and T116 are the last assigned issues of Magnesia. It may be, then, that the enigmatic T115 specimen represents the dislocation of this mint in 287 BCE (the same date assigned for the Lysimacheian and Lampsakene *philos*), wherein the otherwise typical quality of the reverses suffered, and the remaining “Magnesian” dies were subsumed into and utilized by the Hellespont workshop.

In the figures below, each specimen number (first column) corresponds to the same number in the plates (see Plate 2.1-2.15). Each obverse and reverse are numbered by die. If two specimens share the same obverse, those specimens are die-linked (thus all of issues 1-6 share an obverse die link, obverse no.1).

### Issue 1

Obverse: Diademed head of Alexander right, with Ammon horn curved behind ear, ends of diadem ribbons flowing up and down. Perikreis.

Reverse: Athena Nikephoros enthroned left, with left arm leaning on shield with lion's head. Behind, transverse spear with thin spearhead down. Nike with upturned wing crowning the

---

<sup>5</sup> Thompson (1968), 174.

king's name. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ to right, ΛΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ to left, arranged vertically. ♂ monogram engraved over erased ♀ monogram inner left side Athena's knee, ΣΟ monogram in exergue.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
1	1	1	17.02g	29mm	12h	CNG Mail Bid Sale 84, Lot 156, 05/05/2010

Figure 2.1: Issue 1

### Issue 2 (T13)

Obverse: as previous.

Reverse: as previous, but ♂ monogram engraved over erased ♀ monogram outer left.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
2	1	2	17.10g	27mm	11h	Nomos 13, Lot 157, 10/07/2016

Figure 2.2: Issue 2

### Issue 3 (T13)

Obverse: as previous.

Reverse: as previous, but ♂ monogram outer left. Thompson 13.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
3	1	3	17.09g	29mm	11h	New York, ANS 1944.100.45274 = Thompson (1968), 13
4	1	3	17.09g			Stack's Bowers Jan 2019 NYINC Auction, Lot 42050, 01/11/2019
5	1	3	17.06g			London, British Museum 1928,0701.5
6	1	3	16.79g	30mm	12h	CNG E-Auction 220, Lot 65, 10/14/2009

Figure 2.3: Issue 3

### Issue 4

Obverse: as previous.

Reverse: Athena Nikephoros enthroned left, with left arm leaning on shield with lion's head. Behind, transverse spear with broad spearhead down. Nike with downturned wing crowning the king's name. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ to right, ΛΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ to left, arranged vertically. Ϙ monogram inner left side Athena's knee, lion's head outer left.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
7	1	4	17.06g	31mm	9h	Roma Numismatics E-Sale 57, Lot 344, 05/30/2019

Figure 2.4: Issue 4

### Issue 5

Obverse: as previous.

Reverse: as previous, but Nike with upturned wing, lion's head in exergue.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
8	1	5	17.01g			Noble Numismatics 127, Lot 4137, 08/30/2021
9	1	5	17.31g	30mm	12h	Leu Numismatik Web Auction 19, Lot 209, 02/26/2022
10	1	5	16.97g			Meydancikkale Hoard 2591
11	1	5	16.82g	31mm	11h	Roma Numismatics E-Sale 84, Lot 586, 06/16/2021
12	1	5	17.02g	29mm	3h	CNG E-Auction 352, Lot 32, 06/03/2015
13	1	5	17.06g	30mm		Numismatik Naumann 102, Lot 102, 05/02/2021
14	1	5	16.91g	29mm		Numismatik Naumann 99, Lot 37, 02/07/2021
15	1	5	16.92g			Künker 153, Lot 8206, 03/14/2009
16	1	5	17.07g	27mm	10h	CNG E-Auction 211, Lot 175, 06/03/2009

Figure 2.5: Issue 5

### Issue 6

Obverse: as previous.

Reverse: Athena Nikephoros enthroned left, with left arm leaning on shield with lion's head. Behind, transverse spear with broad spearhead down. Nike with upturned wing crowning the king's name. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ to right, ΛΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ to left, arranged vertically. ϕ monogram inner left side Athena's knee, swirling volute on throne.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
17	1	6	17.03g	28mm	3h	Heritage Auction 3089, Lot 32048, 01/21/2021

Figure 2.6: Issue 6

Issues 1-6 are assigned to Lysimacheia. All specimens use the same obverse which exhibits a few instances of die-wear, including: deterioration and “filling in” of the lowest flowing diadem below the neck (compare no.1 with no.17); deterioration of the divot within the leftmost hair curl on the Ammon's horn; radiate erosion lines within and without the *perlkreis*; general deterioration of the diadem ribbons; deterioration of the *perlkreis*, especially near the 3 o'clock position. The issues and specimens have been ordered via all of these factors.

Issues 2-3 are Thompson 13s. Issues 4-5 feature the lion's head similar to Thompson 11. Our first two issues, issues 1 and 2, feature a ϕ monogram over an erased ⚡. This addition is surprising, since ⚡ types are thus far assigned only to Magnesia (T103-104) and Lampsakos (T49-52). This may indicate that issues 1-2 in fact belong to Lampsakos, in which case the die was transferred to Lysimacheia between issues 2 and 3 and then back to Lampsakos between issues 6 and 7. Alternatively, all of these “Lysimacheia” specimens may have been minted in Lampsakos. Such reattributions, however, are difficult. There are no known delta-xis that would match the type erased in issues 1 and 2 – the ΣΟ monogram appears nowhere else, ⚡ never appears unaccompanied by other controls (crescent, herm, etc.) that would have also needed to be erased, and ⚡ furthermore appears in inner left in all but one type (T103, with a phi inner left).



In other words, there is no surviving evidence that the erased-over delta-xi dies of issues 1 and 2 were ever used prior to erasure. For this reason, in combination with the obverse links to T11s, it seems simplest to attribute issues 1-2 to Lysimacheia.

Another difference between issues 1-3 and others is the spearhead. In issues 4-6 and all Lampsakene philos, the spearhead is broad and defined with a central rib, sometimes attached to the shaft by a short perpendicular line (see no.28). Issues 1-3, however, feature a continuous line with the perceived “spearhead” designated only by the perpendicular line. In specimens with die-wear, it is unclear whether there is a spearhead at all. At Parion the spearhead will vary similarly.

Some auction catalogs variously identify the shield’s boss as either a lion, the symbol of Lysimachos and his capital, or the gorgoneion, the typical symbol seen on Athena’s shield.<sup>6</sup> On reverses 4-5, it is clearly a lion, but on reverses 2-3 it is difficult to tell. In this case, reverse 1 (no.1) is a good example, stylistically in-between 4-5 and 2-3, which allows us to see how the snout may appear elongated and the mane somewhat flattened while still depicting a lion. All other reverses in this study also seem to have lions.

The final Lysimacheia issue features no control other than the philo monogram. It also features an interesting stylistic addition: a swirling volute on the throne. The volute is far more typical of later posthumous styles, such as at Chalkedon, Kios, and Parion in the 260s BCE.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> The lion symbol is most commonly associated with Lysimachos’ supposed victory over a lion, as reported in Paus. 1.9.5. In a paper session during SCS (January 2024), Meuss (2024) pointed to the lion protome on Argead coins as a general prototype in the coinage of the diadochi. In the same session, Qin (2024) drew parallels between the leonine imagery of Lysimacheia and Cardia, Lysimacheia’s predecessor prior to its founding and synoikism.

<sup>7</sup> Chalkedon: Plate 2.16, C. Auktionhaus H.D. Rauch 79, lot 2128. At Chalkedon, as in this example, the volute is eventually detached from the throne edge altogether. Kios: Plate 2.16, D. CNG Mail Bid Sale 82, lot 360. Parion: see below, issues 20-21, 23-32.

Lifetime throne volutes are rarely attested and rarely so pronounced as in issue 6.<sup>8</sup> This issue may be our earliest example.

Issue 7 (T54)

Obverse: as previous.

Reverse: Athena Nikephoros enthroned left, with left arm leaning on shield with lion's head.

Behind, transverse spear with broad spearhead down. Nike with downturned wing crowning the king's name. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ to right, ΛΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ to left, arranged vertically. ⚭ monogram inner left side Athena's knee, crescent left in exergue. Thompson 54a.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
18	1	7	15.59g	29mm	10h	ANS 1944.100.77515 = Thompson (1968), 54a

Figure 2.7: Issue 7

Issue 8 (T54)

Obverse: Diademed head of Alexander right, with wider Ammon horn tucked behind ear, ends of diadem ribbons flowing up and down. Perlkreis.

Reverse: as previous.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
19	2	7				Auktionshaus H. D. Rauch E-Auction 40, Lot 78, 09/23/2022

Figure 2.8: Issue 8

---

<sup>8</sup> One example of a lifetime throne volute is on a Lampsakene T51 delta-xi: Plate 2.16, E. Roma Numismatics 22, lot 269. Marinescu (1996), 366, believes some of these supposed lifetime Lampsakene Lysimachi are in fact posthumous, such as a specific T58 (M monogram with herm outer left).

### Issue 9 (T54)

Obverse: Diademed head of Alexander right, with Ammon horn curled overtop ear helix, limp diadem ribbons. Perlkreis.

Reverse: as previous.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
20	3	7	17.15g			Heidelberger Münzhandlung Herbert Grün e.K. 65, Lot 82, 05/12/2015
21	3	7	16.66g			London, British Museum TC, p107.9.Lys
22	3	8				“Hesperia XXI” ANS Photofile 35, Lampsakos 0607 <sup>9</sup>

Figure 2.9: Issue 9

### Issue 10 (T54)

Obverse: as previous, with die-break progressively flattening lip.

Reverse: as previous, but ♂ monogram engraved over erased ♀ monogram.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
23	3	9	17.00g	29mm	1h	Leu Numismatik Web Auction 16, Lot 298, 05/22/2021
24	3	9	16.48g			Paris, SNG France 2534
25	3	9	17.05g	31mm		Bucephalus Numismatic 15, Lot 37, 02/10/2023
26	3	9	16.99g	29mm		Numismatik Lanz München 138, Lot 212, 11/26/2007
27	3	9	16.98g	29mm	12h	CNG Mail Bid Sale 84, Lot 163, 05/05/2010
28	3	10	17.00g	29mm	12h	Leu Numismatik Web Auction 19, Lot 217, 02/26/2022
29	3	11	16.69g	30mm	1h	Savoca Numismatics London 2nd Silver Auction Lot 30, 08/18/2019
30	3	11	17.11g			Künker 193, Lot 120, 09/26/2011

<sup>9</sup> The ANS Lysimachi Photofiles (B1-5), now digitized by CNG, were graciously provided to me by David Hill. Designations given on the photofile cards are provided (i.e. “Seyrig cast 123”) along with the file name in the zip folder (i.e. Kios\_123).

31	3	11	15.96g			Tauler & Fau Subastas 137, Lot 2025, 12/18/2023
32	3	11	16.99g	32mm	12h	CNG E-Auction 243, Lot 30, 10/27/2010
33	3	11	17.06g	30mm	12h	New York, ANS 1944.100.45400 = Armenak 773 = Thompson (1968), 54b
34	3	11	17.18g			Stephen Album Rare Coins 44, Lot 25, 09/15/2022
35	3	11	17.02g	33mm	12h	Roma Numismatics E-Sale 86, Lot 454, 07/08/2021
36	3	11	16.62g	29mm	12h	CNG E-Auction 233, Lot 120, 05/26/2010

Figure 2.10: Issue 10

### Issue 11 (T53)

Obverse: as previous, with die-break on lip.

Reverse: Athena Nikephoros enthroned left, with left arm leaning on shield with lion's head.

Behind, transverse spear with broad spearhead down. Nike with downturned wing crowning the king's name. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ to right, ΑΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ to left, arranged vertically. ϙ monogram inner left aside Athena's knee, herm left in outer left.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
37	3	12	17.11g	32mm		Auktionen Meister & Sonntag 3, Lot 31, 10/06/2005

Figure 2.11: Issue 11

### Issue 12 (T53)

Obverse: as previous.

Reverse: Athena Nikephoros enthroned left, with left arm leaning on shield with lion's head.

Behind, transverse spear with broad spearhead down. Nike with downturned wing crowning the king's name. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ to right, ΑΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ to left, arranged vertically. ϙ monogram engraved over erased ⚭ monogram inner left above Athena's knee, herm outer left.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
38	3	13	17.07g	30mm	1h	Heritage Auction 3082, Lot 33036, 01/21/2020
39	3	13	16.89g	31mm	1h	New York, ANS 1944.100.77516 = Thompson (1968), 53
40	3	13	17.10g	31mm		Aeternitas Numismatics GAM889

Figure 2.12: Issue 12

Thompson 54a (no.18) is still the only known specimen of its type, as is the new obverse 2 (no.19). Though the former of course came from Lysimacheia, the latter finds stylistic parallels in some Lampsakene delta-axis.<sup>10</sup> But all other Lampsakene philos (no.20-40) use the same obverse, obverse 3, which sustained a die-break on the lip allowing for relative dating. This obverse features a “limp” diadem, a feature which only rarely appears in other obverses, likely by the same engraver, among delta-axis (T49, T50) and mu-gammas (T55).<sup>11</sup> Curiously, there is a limp-diadem obverse die link between a T49 and multiple T55s.<sup>12</sup> Unfortunately, I have not been able to find obverse 3 among any of these other limp-diadem specimens.

The most striking aspect of the Lampsakene philos is that four separate reverses (reverses 9-11, 13) feature philos engraved over erased delta-axis. Because of the broken lip on obverse, we know that all of these were struck after the initial two philo reverses (reverses 7-8). The placement of no.37, the only other Lampsakene philo that is not engraved over erased delta-axis, is more tentative. I have taken the chronology of T54s (in which “original” philos are placed before specimens with philo engraved over erased delta-axis) as a guideline for placing issue 12

<sup>10</sup> Such as some T49s: Plate 2.16, F. CNG E-Auction 500, Lot 126.

<sup>11</sup> T50 limp diadem: Plate 2.16, G. CNG E-Auction 487, Lot 80.

<sup>12</sup> T49: Plate 2.16, H. Roma Numismatics E-Sale 84, Lot 599. T55a: Plate 2.17, I. CNG 85, Lot 234. T55b: Plate 2.17, J. Leu Numismatik Web Auction 4, Lot 99.

before 13, but at Lysimacheia, the progression was the opposite (issues 1-2 featured philo engraved over erased delta-xi, while subsequent issues were original).

Why do we see ‘Philo’ engraving over erased delta-xis in six of the thirteen total reverses of Lysimacheia and Lampsakos? Moreover, in the cases of the T54s and possibly T53s, why engrave over erased delta-xis after having already begun minting with new, original dies? Though the absence of evidence certainly is not the evidence of absence, it is worth noting that I was unable to find any of the ‘original’ dies among the many hundreds of Lampsakos delta-xi specimens recorded on online auction catalogs and among ANS archives. There are many dies that come tantalizingly close, almost certainly the work of the same engraver.<sup>13</sup> But once again there is no evidence that the original reverses of issues 10 or 12 were used prior to erasure.

Far from the chronology sketched by Thompson in which the productive eta-rhos and delta-xis give way to the limited local emissions of T53s onwards, it appears that the delta-xis of Lampsakos continued into the late 280s, minting simultaneously with the limited emissions of T53-T61.<sup>14</sup> T53-T55, and most likely T56-61, represent sporadic and isolated emissions scattered throughout the delta-xi lifespan, taking just a few of the myriad obverses and reverses from Delta-xi’s vast supply likely for specific and time-sensitive purposes. In the case of the Lysimacheian and Lampsakene philos, it may have been more expedient to erase and engrave over yet-unused reverse dies than to commission brand new ones. The purpose of the philo emissions at both Lysimacheia and Lampsakos will be explored in Section 2.7 and in Chapter 3.

---

<sup>13</sup> T49 similar to rev. 9: Plate 2.17, K. Ira & Larry Goldberg 109, Lot 2016. T49 similar to rev. 10: Plate 2.17, L. Leu Numismatik Web Auction 8, Lot 138. T49 similar to rev. 11: Plate 2.17, M. Davissons E-Auction 1, Lot 10.

<sup>14</sup> Marinescu (1996), 366, believes that some “later” Lampsakene Lysimachi, in particular a T55 (mu-gamma), might be by the same engraver as one in his Bosphoros workshop in the 260s BCE.

## 2.3 Kios

Kios is the most straightforward of the *poleis* examined in this study. This is in large part due to the framework provided by Marinescu (2017), but it is also due to the relative isolation of the mint when compared to the many links among the Lysimachi at our former two *poleis* and the many stylistic comparisons between Parion and its contemporaries, all a consequence of being part of the wider Hellespont/Bosporos workshop. The principle stylistic similarity the Kios philos share is with, unsurprisingly, the Lampsakene delta-xis.<sup>15</sup> Newell interpreted this similarity as a one-way influence from Kios to Lampsakos, with its artistic obverse dies “immediately copied at the principal mint of the kingdom, namely Lampsacus. Imitation is indeed the sincerest form of flattery.”<sup>16</sup> In the wider context of the Hellespont workshop, direction of influence cannot necessarily be ascertained. In any case, it is clear that the same engraver(s) produced some delta-xis and all Kios lifetime issues.<sup>17</sup>

Because this study is focused on the Kios philos, Marinescu issues M1-2 are not featured. Marinescu was unable to find links between his issues M1-2, M3-4, M5-7, and M8. Of the thirteen new specimens in this study, none provided such links, though one new die combination links Marinescu 3.6 and 3.7. There are also two new reverses (rev.19 and rev.21) with one new

---

<sup>15</sup> T50: Plate 2.17, N. Künker 312, Lot 2180. T49: Plate 2.17, O. Morton & Eden 124, Lot 226. Another T49: Plate 2.17, P. Solidus Numismatik 127, Lot 21. Coins N and O (Plate 2.17) are good illustrations of a common occurrence at Lampsakos: the same obverse is used for two different issues. Notice also that the T50 has a small volute on throne, while the T49 does not.

<sup>16</sup> Newell (1941), chVIII, 7.

<sup>17</sup> With the possible exception of Marinescu issue 8 (issue 19 in this study), which may be posthumous.

type (rev.21). Five specimens attested in Marinescu were not available to me. Of these, only no.78 presents a die combination otherwise not plated in this study.<sup>18</sup>

Issue 13 (M3)

Obverse: Diademed head of Alexander right, with Ammon horn curled overtop ear helix, ends of diadem ribbons flowing up in a simple curve. Perlkreis.

Reverse: Athena Nikephoros enthroned left, with left arm leaning on shield with lion's head. Behind, transverse spear with broad spearhead down. Nike with upturned wing crowning the king's name. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ to right, ΑΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ to left, arranged vertically. ϙ monogram outer left, ΠΥ monogram inner left aside Athena's shin, club between throne and exergue, grain ear left in exergue. Marinescu issue M3.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
41	4	14	17.12g	30mm	12h	Berlin, Münzkabinett 18203055 = Marinescu 3.4.1
42	4	15	16.84g			London, British Museum 1898,0602.110 = Marinescu 3.5.1
43	4	15	14.12g			Bruun Rasmussen, Online Auction 2349, 12/10/2023
44	4	15	17.11g	31mm	11h	New York, ANS 1944.100.45705 = Marinescu 3.5.2
45	4	15				ANS photofile of Seyrig cast 147-25, Kios 61 = Marinescu 3.5.3
<b>*46</b>	4	16	17.09g		12h	Marinescu 3.6.1 = Istanbul, Archaeological Museums (ANS Cast)
47	4	16	16.54g	28mm	12h	Bertolami Fine Arts 24, Lot 319, 06/22/2016 = Marinescu 3.6.2
48	4	17	17.07g	29mm	11h	Nomos Obolos Web Auction 16, Lot 623, 10/11/2020

<sup>18</sup> All five were apparently casts at the ANS, but I was not able to access them during my visit (December 2023). To denote that I haven't seen them myself, these specimens are in bold and have an asterisk; no.78 is underlined and has an asterisk because it is the only die combination otherwise not plated in this study.



49	4	17	17.06g			Heidelberger Münzhandlung 65, Lot 92, 06/24/2010
50	5	17	17.18g			ANS Photofile of Seyrig cast 117-3, Kios_061 = Glasgow, Hunterian Museum = Marinescu 3.7.1

Figure 2.13: Issue 13

Issue 14 (M4)

Obverse: as previous.

Reverse: as previous, but ΠE monogram inner left aside Athena's shin. Marinescu issue M4, Thompson 182.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
51	5	18	16.77g	29mm	11h	New York, ANS 0000.999.45726 = Marinescu 4.8.1
52	5	19	17.13g			Künker eLive Auction 39, Lot 63, 04/05/2016
53	5	19	17.09g	28mm	11h	Leu Numismatik Web Auction 16, Lot 328, 05/22/2021
54	5	20	17.08g			ANS Photofile cast 80-3, Kios_061 = Paris, BnF Fonds general 185 = Marinescu 4.9.1
55	5	20	17.06g		11h	CNG Mail Bid Sale 82, Lot 359, 09/16/2009
56	6	20	16.94g			London, British Museum 1896,0703.76 = Marinescu 4.10.1
57	6	20				ANS photofile of Seyrig cast 147-1, Kios_061 = Marinescu 4.10.2

Figure 2.14: Issue 14

Issue 15

Obverse: as previous.

Reverse: as previous, but grain ear left and club right in exergue. Not in Marinescu.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
58	6	21	17.02g	30mm	12h	CNG E-Auction 549, Lot 39, 11/01/2023

Figure 2.15: Issue 15

### Issue 16 (M5)

Obverse: as previous.

Reverse: Athena Nikephoros enthroned left, with left arm leaning on shield with lion's head.

Behind, transverse spear with broad spearhead down. Nike with upturned wing crowning the king's name. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ to right, ΑΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ to left, arranged vertically. ♂ monogram outer left, ΠΑΡΕ monogram inner left aside Athena's shin, ΜΕ monogram inner left above Athena's knee, club left in exergue. Marinescu issue M5, Thompson 184.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
59	7	22	17.19g	29mm	1h	New York, ANS 1944.100.77577 = Marinescu 5.11.1
60	7	22	17.11g		12h	ANS Photofile 18, Kios_015 = Paris, BnF R1997 = Marinescu 5.11.2
61	7	23	16.58g			ANS Photofile 1862, Kios_017 = SNG Fitzwilliam 1862 = Marinescu 5.12.1
62	7	23	17.10g	29mm	2h	Leu Numismatik Web Auction 3, Lot 138, 02/25/2018
63	7	23				ANS Photofile of Seyrig casts 121-11, Kios_061

Figure 2.16: Issue 16

### Issue 17 (M6)

Obverse: as previous.

Reverse: as previous, but ΓΑΘ or ΓΛΘ monogram inner left aside Athena's shin. Marinescu issue M6, Thompson 185.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
64	7	24	16.86g	32mm	1h	New York, ANS 1951.140.5 = Marinescu 6.13.1
65	7	24	16.96g			Numismatik Lanz München 149, Lot 92, 06/24/2010 = Marinescu 6.13.2

*66	7	24				Marinescu 6.13.3 = ANS Cast (Unknown Provenance)
67	7	24	17.20g	29mm	2h	Leu Numismatik Web Auction 16, Lot 329, 05/22/2021
68	7	25	16.26g	29mm	1h	New York, ANS 1944.100.77579 = Marinescu 6.14.1
69	7	25	16.67g			ANS Photofile 238, Kios_021 = Münz Zentrum Köln 44, Lot 238 = Marinescu 6.14.2
70	7	25	16.94g	30mm		Numismatik Naumann 78, Lot 50, 06/02/2019
71	7	26				ANS Photofile of Seyrig cast 121-10, Kios_063 = Athens, Numismatic Museum = Marinescu 6.15.1
72	7	26	16.62g	29mm	12h	London, British Museum 1935,0619.13 = Marinescu 6.15.2

Figure 2.17: Issue 17

### Issue 18

Obverse: as previous.

Reverse: as previous, but MOE monogram inner left side Athena's shin. Marinescu issue M7, Thompson 183b.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
73	7	27	17.00g	30mm	12h	New York, ANS 1944.100.77578 = Marinescu 7.16.1
*74	7	27	16.80g			Marinescu 7.16.2 = Paris, BnF R1995
75	7	27	17.18g			Auktionshaus H. D. Rauch Summer Auction 2007, Lot 119, 09/11/2007 = Marinescu 7.16.3
76	7	27	17.22g	30mm	12h	Roma Numismatics E-Sale 88, Lot 363, 09/09/2021
77	7	28				ANS photofile of Seyrig cast 121-12, Kios_063 = Marinescu 7.17.1
*78	7	28	16.91g	30mm	12h	Marinescu 7.17.2 = "US Commerce (2013)"

Figure 2.18: Issue 18

Issue 19

Obverse: Diademed head of Alexander right, with Ammon horn curled under ear helix, ends of diadem ribbons flowing up and behind neck under chin. Perikreis.

Reverse: Athena Nikephoros enthroned left, with left arm leaning on shield with lion's head.

Behind, transverse spear with shortened spearhead down. Nike with upturned wing crowning the king's name. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ to right, ΑΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ to left, arranged vertically. ♂ monogram outer left, ME monogram inner left aside Athena's shin, MOEN monogram inner left above Athena's knee, club left in exergue. Marinescu issue M8, Thompson 183a.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
<u>*79</u>	8	29				Marinescu 8.18.1 = "ANS Cast labeled 'Hague', now likely in Leiden but unconfirmed"
80	8	30	17.10g	30mm	2h	New York, ANS 1944.100.45706 = Marinescu 8.19.1
81	8	30	17.01g			London, British Museum 1911,0704.175 = Marinescu, 8.19.2 = ANS photofile of Seyrig casts 147-3
82	8	30	16.91g			ANS Photofile 1709, Kios_013 = Naville V, 1709 = Marinescu 8.19.3
83	8	30	17.15g	30mm	2h	CNG E-Auction 496, Lot 33, 07/21/2021
84	9	30				ANS Photofile 1264, Kios_007 = J Schulman 78, 4/1928, 1264 = Marinescu 8.20.1
85	9	30				ANS Photofile 93, Kios_009 = Vinchon 2/24/1971, 93 = Marinescu 8.20.2

Figure 2.19: Issue 19

The new additions do not alter much of Marinescu's interpretation of the Kian philos. The new issue 15 provides a neat bridge between M4, with the ear of grain in exergue, to M5, with the club in exergue. Another potential continuity may be found in issue 17. The secondary monogram may signify a combination of either ΓΑΘ or ΓΛΘ; if it is the former, this monogram may denote the same word or name as denoted by the numerous ΑΓ-monogram issues which

immediately follow the Kian philos.<sup>19</sup> One new specimen, no.62, features an obverse with a countermark of Chalkedon. This countermark dates to ca. 240-220 BCE, and is one of the only known instances of a Kian Lysimachos coin traveling north (or into the Propontis at all) rather than southeast, as the hoard evidence suggests.<sup>20</sup> Metrology, too, is consistent with previous specimens, as shown in Section 2.5.

## 2.4 Parion

The Parion issues (20-32) are defined by stylistic and metrological similarities with posthumous Lysimachi of Byzantion and Chalkedon of the 260s and 250s BCE. These stylistic similarities help establish chronology to a certain extent, but in some cases I have had to forgo the exact corresponding order at Byzantion or Chalkedon in favor of an order that presents a more logical evolution of types and symbols. Such ‘logical evolution’ is based on the assumption that Parion, unlike the preceding Hellespont workshop, minted in a standard order (not simultaneously) and a second assumption that types and symbols would not oscillate randomly between each other. Thus the issues bearing a grain ear (issues 20-22, 24) are grouped together before the issues bearing a thyrsus (issues 23, 25-32). The philo issues of Kios serve as a model for these assumptions. With these assumptions in mind, the internal chronology presented here must remain tentative, especially since there are very few die links between issues.

---

<sup>19</sup> M Issues 9-12. Names with “Agath-” roots, such as Agathokles, are tempting readings.

<sup>20</sup> Countermark: Thompson 'Büyükkçekmece', head countermark II. Coin no.7 in Stancomb (2007), 27. For its relationship to hoard evidence, see Chapter 3, Section 3.3.

### Issue 20

Obverse: Diademed head of Alexander right, with broad Ammon horn tucked behind ear, ends of diadem ribbons curling up.

Reverse: Athena Nikephoros enthroned left, with left arm leaning on shield with large (lion's head?) boss. Behind, transverse spear with spearhead up. Nike with upturned wing crowning the king's name. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ to right, ΑΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ to left, arranged vertically. Grain ear outer left, ♂ monogram inner left aside Athena's knee, small volute on throne.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
86	10	31	17.18g			Gerhard Hirsch Nachfolger 306, Lot 1603, 02/12/2015

Figure 2.20: Issue 20

### Issue 21 (S14)

Obverse: Diademed head of Alexander right, with Ammon horn tucked behind ear, ends of diadem ribbons flowing up and left. Seyrig 14.

Reverse: as previous, but shield with lion's head. Seyrig 14.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
87	11	32	15.54g	32mm	12h	CNG E-Auction 489, Lot 63, 04/07/2021
88	11	32	16.87g	31mm	11h	CNG E-Auction 400, Lot 15, 06/28/2017
89	11	32	17.12g	30mm		SH86314
90	11	32	16.46g	30mm	12h	CNG E-Auction 487, Lot 85, 03/10/2021
91	11	32	15.85g	29mm	11h	New York, ANS 1944.100.81660 = Seyrig (1958), 14 = ANS Photofile of Seyrig cast 161-10, Parion_0019

Figure 2.21: Issue 21

### Issue 22 (S13).

Obverse: as previous, but ends of diadem ribbons curling up and back. Seyrig 13.

Reverse: Athena Nikephoros enthroned left, with left arm leaning on shield with (lion's head?) boss. Behind, transverse spear with spearhead up. Nike with upturned wing crowning the king's name. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ to right, ΑΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ to left, arranged vertically. Grain ear outer left, ☉ monogram inner left aside Athena's knee. Seyrig 13.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
92	12	33	17.06g			Stack's Bowers Jan 2022 NYINC Auction, Lot 4216 = Seyrig (1958), 13 = ANS Photofile of Seyrig casts 163-12, Parion_0019

Figure 2.22: Issue 22

### Issue 23 (S9)

Obverse: as previous, but ends of diadem ribbons flowing up and down. Seyrig 9.

Reverse: Athena Nikephoros enthroned left, with left arm leaning on shield with lion's head. Behind, transverse spear with spearhead up. Nike with upturned wing crowning the king's name. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ to right, ΑΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ to left, arranged vertically. Thyrsus outer left, ☉ monogram inner left aside Athena's knee, small volute on throne.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
93	13	34	16.80g	31mm		Numismatik Naumann 78, Lot 52, 06/02/2019
94	13	34	17.06g			London, British Museum 1898,0602.102
95	13	34	16.70g		12h	Meydancikkale Hoard, 2681
96	13	35				Federal Coin Exchange 8/17/1954 = ANS photofile 2320, Lampsakos 0605
97	13	35				Munzhandlung Basil 3/15/1938 = ANS Photofile 175, Parion_0015 = Seyrig (1958), 9

Figure 2.23: Issue 23

### Issue 24 (S12)

Obverse: as previous. Seyrig 12.

Reverse: Athena Nikephoros enthroned left, with left arm leaning on shield with lion's head. Behind, transverse spear with spearhead down. Nike with upturned wing crowning the king's name. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ to right, ΛΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ to left, arranged vertically. Large grain ear outer left, ΠΥΟ monogram inner left above Athena's knee, volute on throne.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
98	14	36				ANS Photofile of Seyrig cast 201-11, Parion_0021 = Seyrig (1958), 12
99	14	36	17.19g	32mm	11h	Heritage Auctions 3067, Lot 33098, 09/06/2018

Figure 2.24: Issue 24

### Issue 25 (S11)

Obverse: as previous.

Reverse: Athena Nikephoros enthroned left, with left arm leaning on shield with lion's head. Behind, transverse spear with spearhead down. Nike with small downturned wing crowning the king's name. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ to right, ΛΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ to left, arranged vertically. Thyrsus outer right, Ϙ monogram in exergue, volute on throne.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
100	14	37	16.83g	31mm	1h	CNG E-Auction 342, Lot 105, 01/14/2015
101	14	37	16.96g	30mm		Bucephalus Numismatic Gold Auction 7, Lot 39, 09/30/2022
102	14	37	16.83g	30mm		Heritage Auctions 419, Lot 51019, 09/15/2006
103	14	37	16.95g	30mm	12h	New York, ANS 1944.100.81659 = Seyrig (1958), 11 = ANS Photofile of Seyrig cast 161-11, Parion 0021

Figure 2.25: Issue 25

### Issue 26 (S9b)

Obverse: as previous.



Reverse: as previous, but thyrsus outer left, ♂ monogram inner left aside Athena's knee.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
104	14	38	16.33g	32mm	11h	CNG E-Auction 325, Lot 122, 04/23/2014
105	14	38	16.82g			London, British Museum 1852,1231.3
106	14	38	16.85g			Meydancikkale Hoard 2682

Figure 2.26: Issue 26

Issue 27 (S10)

Obverse: Diademed head of Alexander right, with Ammon horn curled overtop ear helix, ends of diadem ribbons curling up and back. Seyrig 10.

Reverse: as previous.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
107	15	39	17.00g			Sotheby 4/22/1970 = ANS Photofile 381, Parion_0013
108	15	40	17.04g	32mm	12h	New York, ANS 1944.100.81658 = Seyrig (1958), 10 = ANS Photofile of Seyrig cast 161-12, Parion 0021
109	15	40	16.50g			Hess Divo AG 11, Lot 343, 10/22/2008
110	15	40	16.95g	30mm	12h	Nomos 17, Lot 81, 10/26/2018
111	15	40	16.91g			CNG Triton VII, Lot 172, 01/12/2004
112	15	40	16.51g			Astarte S.A. XIX, Lot 773, 05/06/2006

Figure 2.27: Issue 27

Issue 28 (S15)

Obverse: as previous. Seyrig 15.

Reverse: Athena Nikephoros enthroned left, with left arm leaning on shield with lion's head.

Behind, transverse spear with spearhead down. Nike with small downturned wing crowning the king's name. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ to right, ΑΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ to left, arranged vertically. ♂ monogram outer left, grape bunch inner left aside Athena's knee, volute on throne. Seyrig 15.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
113	16	41				ANS Photofile of Seyrig cast 201-12, Parion_0021 = Seyrig (1958), 15
114	16	41	17.05g			Meydancikkale Hoard 2683
115	16	41	16.77g			Paris, SNG France 5, 2561
116	16	41	16.98g	30mm	11h	Heritage Auctions 3064, Lot 30067, 04/20/2018

Figure 2.28: Issue 28

### Issue 29

Obverse: as previous.

Reverse: Athena Nikephoros enthroned left, with left arm leaning on shield with lion's head.

Behind, transverse spear with thin spearhead down. Nike with small downturned wing crowning the king's name. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ to right, ΑΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ to left, arranged vertically. Thyrsus outer left, ϙ monogram in exergue, volute on throne.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
117	17	42	16.59g			Kölner Münzkabinett 119, Lot 20, 10/06/2023
118	17	42	17.01g			Gorny & Mosch Giessener Münzhandlung 170, Lot 1208, 10/13/2008
119	17	42	15.88g	30mm	12h	New York, ANS 1951.140.9

Figure 2.29: Issue 29

### Issue 30

Obverse: as previous.

Reverse: as previous, but ΔΡ monogram in exergue, ΟΕ monogram on throne (forming volute).

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
120	17	43	16.80g			CNG Mail Bid Sale 67, Lot 506, 09/22/2004
121	17	43				G. Hirsch 6/24/1966 = ANS Photofile 134, Parion_0017

Figure 2.30: Issue 30

### Issue 31

Obverse: as previous.

Reverse: Athena Nikephoros enthroned left, with left arm leaning on shield with lion's head.

Behind, transverse spear with thin spearhead down. Nike with small downturned wing crowning the king's name. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ to right, ΑΥΣΙΜΑΧΟΥ to left, arranged vertically. Thyrsus outer left, ΔΡ monogram in exergue, volute on throne.

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
122	17	44	17.09g	30mm	12h	Nomos 22, Lot 81, 06/22/2021
123	17	44	17.00g	31mm	12h	Leu Numismatik Web Auction 26, Lot 519, 07/08/2023
124	17	44		29mm	1h	Heritage Auctions 232316, Lot 63042, 04/19/2023

Figure 2.31: Issue 31

### Issue 32

Obverse: as previous, but ends of diadem ribbons flowing back.

Reverse: as previous, but ϙ monogram in exergue (engraved over erased ΔΡ?).

No.	Obv.	Rev.	Weight	Diameter	Axis	Location
125	18	44=45 <sup>21</sup>	16.78g	31mm	12h	Roma Numismatics E-Sale 41, Lot 207, 12/02/2017

Figure 2.32: Issue 32

The first Parion specimen, no.85 (obv.10), strongly resembles Chalkedon issues dated by Marinescu ca.260-245 BCE.<sup>22</sup> Many of these Chalkedon specimens bear a grain ear (a common

---

<sup>21</sup> Same reverse as rev.44 but with new monogram.

<sup>22</sup> Such as Marinescu (1996) Chalkedon issue 18, no.44: Plate 2.18, Q. Gorny & Mosch 255, Lot 3100.

symbol of Chalkedon), a Nike with similarly upturned wing, and either a ΦΑ or seemingly a Ϟ monogram.<sup>23</sup> Marinescu refers to these coins as the work of “Engraver B”,

“easily distinguished by its exceptionally fine Alexander head with well-balanced features, idealized countenance and a straight ‘classicizing’ nose, long undulating locks some of which terminate in elegantly rounded loops, and a more massive horn with a pronounced curvature.”<sup>24</sup>

Another stylistic parallel is found in issues 23-26 (obv.13-14), which strongly resemble obverses from Byzantion of the late 260s.<sup>25</sup> As Marinescu notes, these obverses are “‘nearly identical’ to one coupled with a reverse generally attributed to Lampsacus.”<sup>26</sup> This style is indeed found on Lampsakene eta-rhos and delta-xis alike – the latter of which share nearly identical reverses with the aforementioned Kios-style delta-xis (Plate 2.17, N, O, P).<sup>27</sup> Marinescu elsewhere demonstrates that engravers of the Bosphoros workshop sometimes used earlier coins as prototypes.<sup>28</sup> In this case, it seems the engravers of issues 23-26 and similar obverses at Byzantion and Chalkedon in the late 260s used a delta-xi from the 280s as a prototype.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> ΦΑ above. ΦΛ Marinescu (1996) Chalkedon issue 18, no.43: Plate 2.18, R. Heritage 3101, Lot 35082. See also Marinescu (1996) Byzantion issue 41, no.105, O35 R100.

<sup>24</sup> Marinescu (1996), 341.

<sup>25</sup> Müller 60, 01/20/89, 61 = Marinescu (1996) Byzantion issue 11, O16: Plate 2.18, S.

<sup>26</sup> Marinescu (1996), 45.

<sup>27</sup> Eta-rho T47: Plate 2.18, T. Auktionshaus H.D. Rauch 88, Lot 59.

Delta-xi T49 reverse similar to Kios-style delta-xis: Plate 2.18, U. CNG E-Auction 247, Lot 24. Note also Plate 2.16, E (a T51).

<sup>28</sup> Marinescu (1996), 357-8.

<sup>29</sup> Perhaps this delta-xi T49 with nearly identical flowing diadems and locks of hair: Plate 2.18, V. Schulman 5/17/1938, 1338 = ANS photofile 1338, Lampsakos\_0479.

Such stylistic similarities with other Bosphoros workshop mints and the lack of many die links might indicate that some of these issues do not belong to Parion at all. In his forthcoming publication, Marinescu assigns the issues bearing the grain ear (Seyrigs 12-14, issues 20-22 and 24 in this study) to Chalkedon.<sup>30</sup> In that case, the Parion *philos* would begin with issue 23, and the obverse of issue 24-25 would have been transferred from Chalkedon to Parion. For now, I have maintained the Parion attribution for all of these issues on the grounds that the issue 23 thyrsus reverses fit stylistically well with the grain ear reverses of issues 20-22. In particular, one might compare the similar Nike wing curvature, spearhead pointing upward, and rendering of  $\Phi$ , all of which differ from Chalkedon (Plate 2.18, Q and R). Either way, Parion seems to begin with an obverse that is extremely similar to styles from the Bosphoros workshop.

What of the thyrsus *philos*? Marinescu leaves open the possibility that the rest of the Parion *philos* may also belong to Chalkedon, especially considering the obverse die link between S12 and S11 (issues 24-25). These thyrsus issues (23, 25-32) more likely belong to Parion since the final obverse in the study, obverse 18, is also attested on “lifetime”  $\text{P}$ -bearing Parion Lysimachi.<sup>31</sup> Of course, it is also possible that those  $\text{P}$  Lysimachi in fact also belong to Chalkedon or Byzantion, which after all contain multiple issues with the same exact monogram, although none contain a thyrsus, Parion’s typical symbol.<sup>32</sup>

As implied by the position of no.125, it appears that the “lifetime” Parion Lysimachi in fact postdate Parion’s *philos*. The reasons for this are threefold. Firstly, the “lifetime” Parion

---

<sup>30</sup> “This attribution is made by virtue of stylistic similarities as well as the presence of the grain stalk on them.” Marinescu, *per litteras*, 1/16/2024.

<sup>31</sup> The specimen is a Seyrig 3: Plate 2.18, W. Heritage 232207, Lot 63067.

<sup>32</sup> For instance, Chalkedon issue 21, O19/R49 (IIAP): Plate 2.18, X. CGB 38, Lot 197.

reverses share the same volute on throne that is far more common in posthumous Bosphoros workshop reverses (though not unattested among lifetimes, as noted above). Secondly, the “lifetime” Parions do not appear in hoards until the Meydancikkale hoard, dated 235 BCE.<sup>33</sup> In this hoard the single “lifetime” issue is outnumbered by three posthumous Parion philos (nos. 94, 105, and 113 in this study). Outside the Meydancikkale hoard, “lifetime” Parions only appear once by 185 BCE at the earliest, whereas the posthumous Parion philos appear plentifully as early as 230 BCE.<sup>34</sup> Most importantly, the metrology of the “lifetime” Parions matches more closely with later posthumous emissions of the 260s-250s, as shown in the next section.

## 2.5 Metrology

The metrology of the lifetime philos is consistent with other lifetime issues: the peak distribution is 17.00-17.09g for Lysimacheia and Lampsakos and 17.10-17.19g for Kios. The Parion philos, weighing most often between 16.80g-17.09g, match best with posthumous Lysimachi of the 270s and 260s.<sup>35</sup> I also measured the metrology of “lifetime” Parion Lysimachi. For this measurement, I counted only specimens that specifically fit Seyrig types 1-8 (see Appendix 2.A), ignoring the many other specimens which contain the  $\text{P}$  monogram but without a thyrus, serpent, or altar to confirm the attribution. These “lifetime” emissions, peaking in distribution between 16.80-16.99g, are most metrologically similar to late posthumous issues of the late 250s BCE.<sup>36</sup> Given

---

<sup>33</sup> Davesne et al. (1989).

<sup>34</sup> Lifetime Parion in *IGCH* 1772, dated 185-160 BCE. Parion philos in *IGCH* 1529 (230 BCE), 1370 (225 BCE), 1532 (210 BCE), 1535 (210-200 BCE), 1450 (190 BCE).

<sup>35</sup> See Marinescu (2017), 215, and Marinescu (1996), 326.

<sup>36</sup> See Marinescu (2017), 215, and Marinescu (1996), 326.

the low number of specimens, however, forming opinions based on metrology alone will not suffice.

Weight	Lysimacheia	Lampsakos	Kios	Parion	"Lifetime" PARs
>17.20	1		2		
17.10-9	1	5	<b>10</b>	2	
17.00-9	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	
16.90-9	<b>3</b>	3	5	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
16.80-9	1	1	3	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>
16.70-9	1		1	4	1
16.60-9		3	2		
16.50-9			2	3	1
16.40-9		1		1	
16.30-9				1	
16.20-9			1		
16.10-9					
16.00-9					
<15.99		2		3	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>14</b>

Figure 2.33: Metrology

## 2.6 Predicted Production

Approximately how many coins were minted within these issues? Before using W. Esty's formulae in conjunction with C. Howgego's estimated average production, it is first necessary to recognize that these estimates may have diminished accuracy due to the proclivity towards shared dies between philo- and non-philos-Lysimachi. As such, the number may be somewhat lower than estimated.

First, we must find the estimated coverage of the sample. The formula for doing so is  $C_{est} = 1 - (d_1 / n)$ . In the formula,  $n$  represents "the sample size (the number of coins)" and  $d_1$  represents "the number of dies observed exactly 1 time."<sup>37</sup> These dies include both reverses and

<sup>37</sup> Esty (2011), 44.

obverses. Figure 2.34 shows the estimated coverage for the four *poleis* of this study. An additional column estimates coverage for Lysimacheia and Lampsakos combined, since the die link of obv.1 (otherwise counted as a singleton in Lampsakos) may skew results. Overall, the estimated coverage is rather low for Lysimacheia and Lampsakos, middling for Parion, and high for Kios. With only a few dies left from Kios and Parion to be found, the possibility of finding further links between problematic issues may be greatly diminished. Such a high estimated coverage, then, may indicate that there are no such links to be found, and thus that these emissions were either separated by time or belong to different mints entirely, such as Chalkedon in the case of Parion.

	Lys. + Lamp. (issues 1-12)	Lysimacheia (issues 1-6)	Lampsakos (issues 7-12)	Kios (issues 13-19)	Parion (issues 20- 32)
$n$	40	17	23	45	40
$d_1$	8	4	5	4	7
$C_{est} = 1 - (d_1 / n)$ .	$1 - (8 / 40)$	$1 - (4 / 17)$	$1 - (5 / 23)$	$1 - (4 / 45)$	$1 - (7 / 40)$
$C_{est} =$	0.8	0.764705882	0.782608695	0.911111111	0.825
Estimated Coverage	80.00%	76.47%	78.26%	91.11%	82.50%

Figure 2.34: Estimated Coverage

With the estimated coverage established, we may now calculate the original number of dies using the formula  $e_p = (d / C_{est}) (1 + [d_1 / pd])$ . In the formula,  $d$  represents “the number of different dies observed”,  $d_1$  represents the number of singletons, and  $p$ , the parameter, should equal 1.<sup>38</sup> Figures 2.35 and 2.36 show the estimated number of obverse and reverse dies

<sup>38</sup> Esty (2011), 44 argues that  $p$  should equal 1 rather than the previously-established parameter  $p = 2$ : “An overwhelming majority of data sets do not fit the  $p = 2$  model. In contrast, the  $p = 1$  model, which is simply the famous ‘exponential’ or ‘geometric’ model of failure time, fits most data sets quite well.”



respectively. The results for Lysimacheia are not surprising. The formula estimates there is only one obverse and thirteen reverses. Since there are only six attested Lysimacheian reverses ( $d$ ) and the formula estimates thirteen total, that means there may be seven Lysimacheian reverses unaccounted for. Using the same logic, there are perhaps three obverses and six reverses not yet found from the Lampsakene philos. All but perhaps one of Kios' estimated obverses have been found, whereas a further six reverses are perhaps unaccounted for. Parion, meanwhile, is perhaps missing six obverses and eight reverses.

	Lys. + Lamp. (issues 1-12)	Lysimacheia (issues 1-6)	Lampsakos (issues 7-12)	Kios (issues 13-19)	Parion (issues 20- 32)
$d$	3	1	3	6	9
$C_{est}$	0.8	0.764705882	0.782608696	0.911111111	0.825
$d_l$	1	0	2	0	3
$e_p = (d / C_{est}) (1 + [d_l / pd])$	(3 / 0.8) (1+(1/3))	(1 / 0.765) (1+(0/1))	(3 / 0.783) (1+(2/3))	(6 / 0.911) (1+(0/6))	(9 / 0.825) (1+(3/9))
$e_p =$	5	1.307692308	6.388888889	6.585365854	14.54545455
Estimated number of dies:	6.25	1.31	6.39	6.6	14.55

Figure 2.35: Estimated Number of Obverse Dies

	Lys. + Lamp. (issues 1-12)	Lysimacheia (issues 1-6)	Lampsakos (issues 7-12)	Kios (issues 13-19)	Parion (issues 20- 32)
$d$	13	6	7	17	15
$C_{est}$	0.8	0.764705882	0.782608696	0.911111111	0.825
$d_l$	7	4	3	4	4
$e_p = (d / C_{est}) (1 + [d_l / pd])$	(13 / 0.8) (1+(7/13))	(6 / 0.765) (1+(4/6))	(7 / 0.783) (1+(3/7))	(17 / 0.911) (1+(4/17))	(15 / 0.825) (1+(4/15))
$e_p =$	25	13.07692308	12.77777778	23.04878049	23.03030303
Estimated number of dies:	25	13.08	12.78	23.01	23.03

Figure 2.36: Estimated Number of Reverse Dies

With these estimated numbers of dies, we may use Howgego's average production to calculate the total number of coins produced for each of these philo emissions. Howgego's

estimates are between 23,000 and 47,000 coins per obverse die and between 11,000 and 28,000 coins per reverse die.<sup>39</sup> These estimates are based on an inscription featuring the treasurers' accounts for the coinage of the Delphic amphictyony, dated ca. 338-333 BCE.<sup>40</sup> Although that date is relatively close to the philo emissions of the 280s and 270s-260s, the inscription of the Delphic amphictyony records Aeginetic silver staters rather than Attic tetradrachms, and so we must be cautious in assuming the exact same rate of die use. Figure 2.37 shows the estimated minimum and maximum total production for each of the four philo mints.

	Lys. + Lamp. (issues 1-12)	Lysimacheia (issues 1-6)	Lampsakos (issues 7-12)	Kios (issues 13-19)	Parion (issues 20- 32)
Est. obverse dies	6.25	1.31	6.39	6.6	14.55
Est. reverse dies	25	13.08	12.78	23.01	23.03
Minimum est. (obv)	143750	30130	146970	151800	334650
Maximum est. (obv)	293750	61570	300330	310200	683850
Minimum est. (rev)	275000	143880	140580	253110	253330
Maximum est. (rev)	700000	366240	357840	644280	644840

Figure 2.37: Estimated Total Production

Lysimacheia's great disparity between obverse and reverse estimated outputs should not be surprising. Obverse 1 was used extensively both before issues 1-6 (in T11 and 115) and after

<sup>39</sup> Howgego (1995), 32.

<sup>40</sup> These are the so-called "ἀπουσία accounts", *Fouilles de Delphes* III 5.49, column I, ll. 5-55. For the initial interpretation of the inscription's estimates, see Raven (1950), 1-22, modified by Kinns (1983), 1-22, whose figures are between 23,333 and 47,250 coins per obverse die and between 11,053 and 27,563 per reverse die. As Kinns says on page 19, "These results are not of course universally applicable—in other series dies will have been cut in higher or lower relief, under-used or over-used, or prepared with less skill—but they do represent the firmest evidence that we have for die output in the Greek world."

(for Lampsakos issue 7). Its tenure for the Lysimacheia philos was cut short, and the reduced estimate reflects this. The obverse estimate for the combined Lysimacheia and Lampsakos emissions is, predictably, about the same as the Lampsakene obverse estimate. In the same vein, however, we should expect the Lysimacheia reverse estimate to be lower, especially since there are two instances of singleton reverses featuring philos engraved over erased delta-xi monograms. Since the reverse estimate is substantially higher than the obverse estimate, it may be that the “original” delta-xi reverses were indeed used extensively prior to erasure by philo. We should therefore expect to find these delta-xi reverses somewhere on the market or in hoards, despite the fact that this type (delta-xi inner or outer left with ΣO or otherwise alone) is entirely unattested. Alternatively, these reverses may have been simply discarded before their typical lifetime use, perhaps after “Philo” was transferred from Lysimacheia to Lampsakos.

Surprisingly, Lampsakos shows a relatively equal ratio of obverse and reverse estimates. This might indicate that the production of coins and the lifetime of individual obverses and reverses was all relatively standard. In other words, despite the shared dies and the instances of philos engraved over erased delta-xis, there is no indication based on these estimates that either obverses or reverses were being used with shortened lifespans. On the one hand, this is another sign that the “original” delta-xi dies were not used prior to being erased and engraved over with  $\phi$ . If they were, we would expect a far higher estimate for reverse production compared to the obverse estimate. On the other hand, since we know that obv.1 (T13=T54a) was in fact used extensively before Lampsakos and since we know that obv.3 was used so extensively as to produce the die-break on the lip, it may be that the obverse estimate itself should be lower (and the reverse estimate, by comparison, should appear higher), diminishing this potential disparity

and again opening up the possibility that the delta-xi “originals” were used prior to erasure. Since we are working with such a small number of specimens, either conclusion must remain tentative.

Kios exhibits a surprisingly huge disparity between the estimated obverse and reverse output. The reverse output estimate is substantially higher, again indicating either that the reverses were used longer than is typical (of which there is no evidence since there are no substantial die-breaks or die-wear on the reverses) or that the reverses were used at a standard rate while the obverses were used either prior to their introduction or taken or discarded before their full lifetimes at Kios. Only some of that disparity may be explained by the hypothetical die link connecting the first Kios philo obverse (obv.4 in this study, or Marinescu obv.2) and the previous non-philos Marinescu issues 1-2 (and likewise for the last Kios obverse and the subsequent non-philos issues). Otherwise, it seems likely, based on such a huge disparity, that these obverses were either discarded prior to the end of their natural lifetime or were used elsewhere – perhaps among the Lampsakene delta-xis which share the same style. Unfortunately, I was unable to find any die link to indicate that this was the case.

Parion’s ratio of obverse and reverse production is relatively equal, with the reverse estimate slightly lower. Since there is no evidence of heavy die-wear on the reverses, the reverses were probably used at a standard rate while the obverses may have been slightly worn prior to their introduction to Parion. This pattern would be logical if the singleton obverses such as obv.10 and obv.14 did indeed come from Chalkedon. A potential die link between these issues and others from Chalkedon may exist, then, yet to be found. It is worth noting that of the three singleton obverses, one (obv.18) is confirmed to have been used in other issues (in this case, Parion  $\overline{\text{P}}$ s) while the other two are grain stalk philos. All of this could be taken as further evidence that Marinescu’s attribution of the grain-stalk Parion philos to Chalkedon is correct, but

it still does not explain the obverse die link (obv.14) between the grain-stalk S12s and the thyrus S11s.

We may also approximate the possible length of time for production, as Marinescu does for Kios, using a “conservative obverse lifetime of 3 to 5 months.”<sup>41</sup> Figure 2.38 shows the estimated number of months for each philo mint, assuming continuous activity at a standard rather than accelerated pace.<sup>42</sup> Lysimacheia and Lampsakos combined are estimated to have minted somewhere between nine and fifteen months. Alone, Lysimacheia is estimated to have minted for a short four months. Since we know that Lampsakos’ obv.1 was extensively used earlier, its estimate should trend towards its minimum of nine months. Kios’ estimate of 18 to 30 months (ca. 1.5 to 2.5 years) agrees with Marinescu’s estimate of total lifetime production (including the non-philo issues M1-M2) of 2 to 3 years. Parion’s estimate is the longest at 27 to 45 months (ca. 2 to 4 years), though again the minimum may be preferable due to the possibility of obverse wear from previous use at Chalkedon.

	Lys. + Lamp. (issues 1-12)	Lysimacheia (issues 1-6)	Lampsakos (issues 7-12)	Kios (issues 13-19)	Parion (issues 20- 32)
Number of obverses	3	1	3	6	9
Minimum Timespan	9 months	3 months	9 months	18 months	27 months
Maximum Timespan	15 months	5 months	15 months	30 months	45 months

Figure 2.38: Estimated Timespan of Production

<sup>41</sup> Marinescu (2017), 216.

<sup>42</sup> See also Callataÿ (1995), 301-302.

The low total production estimates by themselves, as discussed in chapter 3, diminish but do not rule out the possibility that these emissions were for grand, expensive, and long-term purposes such as a navy. Triremes cost about one talent per month to operate in the late 5th century and mid-4th century, while by 200 BCE the cost had increased to 10,000 Rhodian drachmas (1.32 Attic talents) per month.<sup>43</sup> Figures 2.39 and 2.40 show the number of triremes supported by the philo emissions for six months, one year, and the estimated timespans above. Since inflation was certainly not steady over time or space, the tables produce a lower estimate with 1.32 Attic talents and a higher estimate with 1 Attic talent per trireme per month in the early through middle 3rd century BCE.<sup>44</sup> These two figures provide a minimum and maximum estimated number of triremes supported. Combined (Lysimacheia + Lampsakos, Kios, Parion), these emissions could have supported between 21 at least and 47 triremes at most (between 21-36 if triremes cost 1.32 talents per month, between 28-47 if 1 talent per month). There are limitations to this estimate. Firstly, the average estimated timespans above may be longer than in actuality due to the fact that some obverses were more worn or, in the case of obv.1, counted twice, though the combination of Lysimacheia and Lampsakos may account for this. Secondly, the great disparity between obverse and reverse total production estimates is again on display, with Kios' estimate double and Lysimacheia's estimate almost sextuple for reverses compared to obverses. The combination of these two factors means that the high estimates of 32 and 43

---

<sup>43</sup> 1500 Attic tetradrachms (average 17.2g) make one talent. Trireme costs: Thucydides 6.8 and 6.31; Demosthenes 51.15 and 21.155; *I.Cret.* III.iii.3A, ll. 68-73. = *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 581.70. Since Rhodian-standard drachms were around 3.4g (compared to the Attic drachm of 4.3g), 10,000 Rhodian drachms (34,000g) = around 1977 Attic tetradrachms, or roughly 1.32 Attic talents. But the inscription requires a caveat: firstly, as a treaty imposed by Rhodes upon the defeated Hierapytnians, the 10,000 drachms per month may represent a deliberate overestimation of the necessary amount requisite to maintain a trireme for one month. The treaty does not list how much the Rhodians paid to support their triremes in other circumstances. For discussion, see Gabrielson (1997), 100, note 94.

<sup>44</sup> For inflation in the ancient world, see Bagnall (1985), 53-55; Loomis (1998), 240-250; Scheidel (2002).

triremes from Lysimacheia ought to be discarded. Thirdly, these estimates only account for the cost of crewing these triremes based on Thucydides (late 5th century), Demosthenes (mid-4th century), and the aforementioned inscription from Hierapytna (late 3rd/early 2nd century). The 1 or 1.32 talents would not cover the cost of building, equipping, or maintenance in shipsheds, though of course the same emissions might account for all of these and other requirements.

	Lys. + Lamp. (issues 1-12)	Lysimacheia (issues 1-6)	Lampsakos (issues 7-12)	Kios (issues 13-19)	Parion (issues 20- 32)
Obv est. average	218750	45850	223650	231000	509250
Rev. est. average	487500	255060	249210	448695	449085
Obv. est. avg. in talents	145.83	30.57	149.1	154	339.5
Rev. est. avg. in talents	325	170.04	166.14	299.13	299.39
Number of triremes for six months (obv)	18.41	3.86	18.83	19.44	42.87
Number of triremes for one year (obv)	9.21	1.93	9.41	9.72	21.43
<b>Number of triremes for avg. estimated timespan of production</b>	<b>9.21</b>	<b>5.79</b>	<b>9.41</b>	<b>4.86</b>	<b>7.14</b>
Number of triremes for six months (rev)	41.04	21.47	20.98	37.77	37.8
Number of triremes for one year (rev)	20.52	10.73	10.49	18.88	18.9
<b>Number of triremes for avg. estimated timespan of production</b>	<b>20.52</b>	<b>32.2</b>	<b>10.49</b>	<b>9.44</b>	<b>6.3</b>

Figure 2.39: Estimated Triremes Supported at 1.32 Talents per Trireme

	Lys. + Lamp. (issues 1-12)	Lysimacheia (issues 1-6)	Lampsakos (issues 7-12)	Kios (issues 13-19)	Parion (issues 20- 32)
Obv. est. average	218750	45850	223650	231000	509250
Rev. est. average	487500	255060	249210	448695	449085
Obv. est. avg. in talents	145.83	30.57	149.1	154	339.5
Rev. est. avg. in talents	325	170.04	166.14	299.13	299.39
Number of triremes for six months (obv)	24.31	5.09	24.85	25.67	56.58
Number of triremes for one year (obv)	12.15	2.55	12.43	12.83	28.29
<b>Number of triremes for avg. estimated timespan of production</b>	<b>12.15</b>	<b>7.64</b>	<b>12.43</b>	<b>6.42</b>	<b>9.43</b>
Number of triremes for six months (rev)	54.17	28.34	27.69	49.86	49.9
Number of triremes for one year (rev)	27.08	14.17	13.85	24.93	24.95
<b>Number of triremes for avg. estimated timespan of production</b>	<b>27.08</b>	<b>42.51</b>	<b>13.85</b>	<b>12.46</b>	<b>8.32</b>

Figure 2.40: Estimated Triremes Supported at 1 Talent per Trireme

How substantial is a force of between 14 and 39 triremes? At first glance, the fleets of the early Hellenistic *poleis* and diadochi seem massive: At its apogee prior to the Lamian war, Athens possessed 360 triremes, 50 quadriremes, and 7 quinqueremes, though it had the manpower to mobilize only 200 triremes and 40 quadriremes.<sup>45</sup> According to Diodorus, the admiral Kleitos

<sup>45</sup> *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1629.783-812. On Athenian inability to utilize all of their ships, see Bosworth (2003), 14.



commanded 240 ships against the Athenians in 322 BCE.<sup>46</sup> In 318 BCE, Kassander's entire fleet combined with those of Antigonos numbered 130.<sup>47</sup> Demetrios in 306 BCE commanded a fleet of 110 triremes, 10 quinqueremes, 10 *hexereis*, and 7 *heptereis*.<sup>48</sup> Two years later he led 330 ships against Kassander.<sup>49</sup> In 294 BCE, Demetrios commanded a fleet of 300 ships, while the fleet of Ptolemy sent against him numbered only 150 ships.<sup>50</sup> By 289/8 BCE, Demetrios had amassed a fleet of 500 ships, divided between the ports of Peiraeus, Corinth, Chalcis, and Pella.<sup>51</sup> This last example, however, introduces a pattern of naval organization repeated in the Nesiotic League of the late 3rd century BCE, wherein ships and their associated costs were split among the many *poleis* of the league.<sup>52</sup> In this context, a contribution of between 14 and 32 triremes could prove sizable when multiplied across the many *poleis* of Lysimachos's empire (or, in the case of Parion, between 6 and 8 triremes to the fleet of the Northern League). As will be noted in Chapter 3, Heracleia Pontica had made a contribution of similar size to the fleet stationed at Lysimacheia in 281 BCE. It is possible that the Kios *philos* served a similar purpose, as did Parion to the Northern League. But what of the Lysimacheian and Lampsakene *philos*, which were minted for a clearly specialized purpose amidst the numerous delta-xi emissions? For these

---

<sup>46</sup> D.S. 18.15.8. The word is *naus*, generic "ship."

<sup>47</sup> D.S. 18.72.2. Polyaeus 4.6.8.

<sup>48</sup> D.S. 20.47.1-2, 20.50.1-3.

<sup>49</sup> Plut. *Demetrios* 23.1.

<sup>50</sup> Plut. *Demetrios* 33.7-8.

<sup>51</sup> Plut. *Demetrios* 43.3-4.

<sup>52</sup> Referring to *IG XII(5)* 918, Gabrielson (1997), 57-61, elaborates: "Each island (including Rhodes) supplied a naval contingent, the crews to man it, and the captains to command and finance the ships, but both the military leadership and the naval muscle were Rhodian."

and all of the philo Lysimachi, it may be useful to look at the wider historical context. Chapter 3, then, will explore the relationship between Lysimachos and the *poleis* of his empire, in search of the purpose of the philo Lysimachi.

# **Chapter 3: The Philo Lysimachi in Context**

This chapter will explore the relationship between Lysimachos and Lampsakos, Parion, Kios, and his capital Lysimacheia, from his assignment to Thrace in 323 BCE, through his abortive occupation of Lampsakos in 302, the collapse of his empire following his death in 281, and the continued relevance of his posthumous coinage as a symbol of Propontic protection.<sup>1</sup> In this historical context, it becomes immediately apparent that Thompson's chronologies for both the Lampsakene Alexanders and Lysimachi are flawed. Far from producing a steady output throughout the chaotic years following Alexander's death, it seems that Lampsakos was compelled to mint by various diadochi in order to fund their armies and especially their navies.

What was the purpose of the philo Lysimachi? In the case of Kios, the philos seem to align in purpose with the delta-xi emissions of Lampsakos and the vast emissions at Amphipolis: all were minted to fund a fleet. Parion's philos (in addition to the posthumous Lysimachi of Kios) may have served a similar purpose of protecting the Propontis, but in the form of tribute to Galatians in Asia Minor. The purpose of the Lysimacheian and Lampsakene philos is more obscure, though undoubtedly specialized and sporadic.

## **3.1 Lysimachos, Satrap of Thrace, 323-302 BCE.**

Upon Alexander's death in 323 BCE, the regent Perdikkas apportioned Thrace and the western Pontic coasts to Lysimachos.<sup>2</sup> Justin reports that this assignment was based on his military merit.<sup>3</sup> If so, Lysimachos was immediately given the chance to test that basis in his suppression

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix 3.A for a succinct summary of the contents of this chapter.

<sup>2</sup> Just. *Epit.* 13.4.16, D.S. 18.3.1.

<sup>3</sup> Just. *Epit.* 15.3.15-16. *Cum inter successores eius provinciae dividerentur, ferocissimae gentes quasi omnium fortissimo adsignatae sunt.*

of a revolt by the Thracian king Seuthes in the same year. Lysimachos' activities in the Hellespont, then, were minimal during this period.<sup>4</sup> Instead, the governor assigned to Lesser Phrygia, and thus to Lampsakos and Parion, was the general Leonnatos.<sup>5</sup> According to Le Rider, however, Parion continued minting its autonomous coinage, consisting of silver hemidrachms bearing a gorgoneion as well as bronzes with the Parion altar on the reverse, perhaps down to ca.300 BCE.<sup>6</sup>

Kios, meanwhile, remained independent under the Bithynian king Mithridates II, who had ruled there since 337/6 BCE.<sup>7</sup> If any diadoch lay claim to the city in 323, it would have been Antigonos, who was assigned to Greater Phrygia. But Antigonos did not control the city until after 318 at earliest.<sup>8</sup> By 302 BCE, at least, Mithridates II is described as “subject to Antigonos.”<sup>9</sup> Yet Kios, unlike Lampsakos throughout this period, minted no Alexanders, Antigonid or otherwise. Instead, its autonomous, Persian-standard silver drachms, hemidrachms, and quarter-drachms, bearing Apollo on the obverse and a prow on the reverse, continued until 315 BCE at latest.<sup>10</sup> Many of these silver issues also contain a grain ear to the right of the prow. Kios may also have minted its bronze “Mithras” issues during this time, lasting perhaps as late as

---

<sup>4</sup> D.S. 18.14.2-4 for their first (but not final) battle. Diodorus does not mention Seuthes again until 313 (D.S. 19. 73. 8).

<sup>5</sup> D.S. 18.3.1.

<sup>6</sup> Le Rider (1963), 53–55. See Plate 3.1. Silver hemidrachms: Künker Auction 402, Lot 683, 03/14/2024. Bronzes: Leu Numismatik Web Auction 27, Lot 1131, 09/09/2023. See also Chapter 1, Section 1.2.

<sup>7</sup> D.S. 16.90.2.

<sup>8</sup> 318: see discussion below. D.S. 19.40.2.

<sup>9</sup> Subject to Antigonos: D.S. 20.111.4. ὑπήκοος Ἀντιγόνῳ. Diodorus translation is that of Geer (1947).

<sup>10</sup> See Plate 3.1: CNG E-Auction 545, Lot 175, 08/30/2023. See also Corsten (1985), 31; Le Rider (1963), 32–39.

ca. 300 BCE. Their reverses include a kantharos with two grape vines surrounded by a grain wreath, which emphasizes the importance of viticulture and the Propontic grain trade for this region.<sup>11</sup>

Thompson argues that, prior to Leonnatus' assignment in 323 BCE, Lampsakos was an important royal Alexandrine mint whose output began around 329, and in 325/4 through 324/3 (her "Series V") was primarily for the purpose of reimbursing mercenaries returning home from the east.<sup>12</sup> Series V marks the peak production of Lampsakene Alexanders. Thompson's subsequent chronology, however, is flawed, as will be discussed below.

Leonnatus' term in Lesser Phrygia was short. Less than a year after arriving at his post, he left to aid Antipater in the Lamian War.<sup>13</sup> Instead, he died, and the troops he brought joined Antipater's own.<sup>14</sup> No diadach is recorded in the Hellespont for another year until 322/1 BCE, when Antipater's enemy Eumenes was sent to prevent Antipater and Craterus from crossing into Asia.<sup>15</sup> While there, he "marshalled his army, which had previously been deficient in that branch," perhaps drawing troops from Lampsakos and Parion among others.<sup>16</sup> In any case, he was not successful in preventing Antipater and Craterus from crossing. Lund speculates that

---

<sup>11</sup> See Plate 3.1: Nomos Obolos Web Auction 20, Lot 12, 10/03/2021. *SNG* Copenhagen 380, 382, 334; *SNG* von Aulock 7004.

<sup>12</sup> Thompson (1991), 39.

<sup>13</sup> D.S. 18.14.4-5.

<sup>14</sup> Battle of Melitaea, 322 BCE: D.S. 18.15.1-4; Arrian, *FGrH*, 156 F 9.

<sup>15</sup> D.S. 18.25.6.

<sup>16</sup> ἐκόσμησε τὴν στρατιάν, ἐλλειπή καθεστῶσαν κατὰ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος. D.S. 18.29.3. See also Arrian, *FGrH*, 156 F 9.26-27; Justin, 13. 8. 1-9; Plu. *Eum.*, 4-7; Nepos, *Eumenes*, 3-4. It is dated 321/0 by the Parian Marble, and probably took place early in the summer of 321.

Lysimachos, their ally at the time, allowed or even aided the crossing.<sup>17</sup> Eumenes, with his Hellespontine troops, defeated and killed Craterus probably in early summer 321 in open battle somewhere near the Hellespont.<sup>18</sup> In the aftermath, the defeated troops were allowed to “go for food to certain villages [κώμαις] that lay near.”<sup>19</sup> Considering the use of the word κώμαις rather than πόλις or ἄστυ, it is unlikely (though possible) that these included Lampsakos and Parion. While in the Troad, Eumenes also took “the royal herds of horse that were pasturing about Mount Ida.”<sup>20</sup> He then departed the area permanently to winter at Celaenae in upper Phrygia (winter 321/0), leaving the Hellespont once again without an overall ruler.

If Thompson is to be believed, Lampsakos continued minting alongside its neighbor Abydos uninterrupted amidst the chaos of 323-321 BCE.<sup>21</sup> In fact, Series VI, dated 323/2-322/1 BCE, contains the highest number of staters (but no tetradrachms) of any Lampsakene Alexander issue. It seems, then, that neither Leonnatus nor Eumenes attempted or were able to stop the production. But if Series V with its numerous tetradrachms was produced for returning mercenaries, what was the purpose of Series VI, which consisted of posthumous Philip II staters and Alexander drachms? Thompson implies a purpose independent of the diadochi at least in regard to the similarly chaotic period in 302 BCE. She posits that “Lysimachus during his brief

---

<sup>17</sup> Lund (1992), 54: “When Antipater got involved in conflicts outside Europe, the value of Lysimachus’ friendship became clear. In 322 BC, when Antipater and Craterus marched on Asia for war against Perdikkas, it is probable that a short-cut through Thrace greatly eased the journey.”

<sup>18</sup> D.S. 18.30-32. Anson (2004), 106-110, rejects placement of this battle by ancient historians in favor of a location somewhere “in western Phrygia.”

<sup>19</sup> D.S. 18.32.3. δεξαμένων δὲ τὰς διαλύσεις τῶν Μακεδόνων καὶ δόντων τὰς διὰ τῶν ὄρκων πίστεις ἔλαβον ἔξουσίαν ἐν τισὶ κώμαις πλησίον κειμέναις ἐπισιτίσασθαι.

<sup>20</sup> Plu. *Eum.* 8. Ἐπεὶ δὲ Εὐμένης τοῖς βασιλικοῖς ἵπποφορβίοις περὶ τὴν Ἰδὴν νεμομένοις ἐπιτυχῶν καὶ λαβῶν ἵππους ὄσων ἔχρηξε τοῖς ἐπιμεληταῖς τὴν γραφὴν ἔπεμψε.

<sup>21</sup> Abydos: Thompson (1991), 63-65.

occupation of Lampsacus did not interfere with a coinage begun by Antigonus. Both men would have realized the importance of abundant financial reserves as they prepared for the impending struggle which ended at Ipsus.”<sup>22</sup> She makes no comment, however, on the issues minted under Leonnatus, Eumenes, or the general Arrhidaeos.

Series V and VI were likely minted in relatively close succession, as implied by a die link between drachms (coins no. 127, 82) and one drachm which has the Series VI ΑΓ monogram engraved over an erased Series V ΔΟ monogram (128a). As Thompson says, “Series V, VI, and IX are disproportionately large and almost certainly each extended over several years; the other issues are in all probability annual although in the case of the first four, production may have been limited to less than a full year.”<sup>23</sup> According to Thompson, “Series V and VI in very fresh condition were included in the crucial Asia Minor 1964 Hoard [*IGCH* 1437], securely dated to ca. 321 B.C.”<sup>24</sup> In this context, it seems most logical that Series VI was minted in 322 and early 321 under the control of Eumenes, and indeed this is the latest of the Lampsakene series present in the *IGCH* 1437 (dated 321 BCE), whose findspot in Anatolia may correspond with Eumenes’ Phrygian campaigns in the subsequent years.

Within less than a year after Eumenes’ departure (321 BCE), the next satrap over Lampsakos and Parion, the general Arrhidaeos, was assigned at the treaty of Triparadeisos.<sup>25</sup> His rule lasted until 319 BCE. Thompson dates Series VII and VIII, which are drastically smaller

---

<sup>22</sup> Thompson (1991), 39.

<sup>23</sup> Thompson (1991), 39.

<sup>24</sup> Thompson (1991), 38-39.

<sup>25</sup> D.S. 18.39.5.

issues, to these two years. During those two years, Arrhidaeos made himself an enemy of the Hellespontine cities when he attempted to garrison them. Some evidently capitulated, while others, notably Kyzikos, resisted.<sup>26</sup> Antigonos then intervened, and Arrhidaeos fled to take refuge in Kios, then ruled by Mithridates II.<sup>27</sup>

From 319 BCE until 302 BCE, then, both Lampsakos and Parion were at least nominally included within Antigonos' domain. In 319, too – presumably after the flight of Arrhidaeos, though the sources do not make it clear – the Hellespont served as a crucial meeting point for allies of Cassander, who was attempting to wrest control of Greece from Polyperchon. Fleeing Macedon, Cassander went first to the Chersonese (under Lysimachos), arrived at the Hellespont, and then “sailed across into Asia to Antigonos.”<sup>28</sup> Lampsakos seems a likely meeting place, but nearby Abydos would also have sufficed. In any case, Cassander received “thirty-five warships and four thousand soldiers” from Antigonos before setting off and taking the Piraeus in 318 BCE.<sup>29</sup> If these warships were financed locally, Lampsakos is once again a likely candidate; if not, then perhaps Antigonos had raised the navy elsewhere.

Even after Cassander's departure, allied forces continued to amass at the Hellespont, such that his rival Polyperchon sent an admiral, Kleitos, “with the whole fleet, ordering him to lie in wait in the region of the Hellespont and block the forces that were being brought across from

---

<sup>26</sup> D.S. 18.51.1-7, 18.52.1.

<sup>27</sup> D.S. 18.72.1-2.

<sup>28</sup> D.S. 18.54.

<sup>29</sup> D.S. 18.68.1.



Asia into Europe.”<sup>30</sup> Evidently, neither Antigonos nor Lysimachos exerted total control over the Hellespont. Kleitos was successful in sailing through the straits and “won the allegiance (προσαγαγομένου) of the cities of the Propontis,” as well as successfully retrieving the general Arrhidaeos and his army from Kios, whom Mithridates II may have fed and supplied for the past year.<sup>31</sup> Whatever loyalty Kleitos gained was not to last long. Cassander’s subordinate Nikanor sailed with the entire fleet (including those ships given to them by Antigonos) through the Hellespont to battle with Kleitos near Chalkedon in summer 318.<sup>32</sup> Though he lost, Antigonos appeared not far behind and quickly avenged the loss in another battle the next day.<sup>33</sup> Kleitos fled, but was captured thereafter by soldiers of Lysimachos in Thrace.<sup>34</sup> According to Diodorus, Nikanor appears to have stayed in the Propontis another year before returning with the fleet to the Piraeus in 317 BCE.

Lampsakene minting during this period, however, did not remain steady. Thompson assigns Series IX – the most productive in terms of drachms and second-most for staters – to 319/8 BCE through 318/7 BCE, with no apparent pause during its loyalty to Kleitos. This seems unlikely. It is more probable that Series IX, whose control “reminded Newell of the buckle for a sword belt,” corresponds with the amassing of naval forces under Antigonos for Cassander in

---

<sup>30</sup> D.S. 18.72.1-2. καὶ Κλεῖτον μὲν τὸν ναύαρχον μετὰ τοῦ στόλου παντὸς ἐξέπεμψε, προστάξας ἐφεδρεῦειν τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον τόποις καὶ κωλύειν τὰς ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας διαβιβαζομένας δυνάμεις εἰς τὴν Εὐρώπην.

<sup>31</sup> D.S. 18.72.3. τούτου δὲ πλεύσαντος ἐπὶ τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον καὶ προσαγαγομένου τὰς ἐν τῇ Προποντίδι πόλεις. The relationship between Arrhidaeos and Mithridates II is unclear, but it seems unlikely that the former could have stayed in Kios for a full year with no support from the city’s dynast.

<sup>32</sup> D.S. 18.72.3-4.

<sup>33</sup> D.S. 18.72.5-8; Polyæn. 4.4.8.

<sup>34</sup> D.S. 18.72.9.

319/8, ending upon Kleitos' arrival.<sup>35</sup> It may have resumed after Antigonos and Nikanor reasserted control.

After this series, however, Thompson proposes a six-year interval without coinage. Her reasoning is that “after the death of Philip III... no strong central authority existed to formulate fiscal policy until Antigonos succeeded in establishing his control of Asia Minor ca. 311 B.C.”<sup>36</sup> She places the same long interval in Abydos despite pointing out the die linkage between the two series she separates.<sup>37</sup> The fundamental reasoning is flawed. Philip III was hardly a “strong central authority” outside propaganda, and his death at the hands of Olympias in 317 BCE did not put an end to the need for coinage, though it did perhaps mark the end of posthumous Philip II minting in favor of Alexanders or other designs. If the purpose of Lampsakene Philips and Alexanders was indeed “financial reserves” for ruling diadochi, why would Antigonos allow the city to stop minting in 317 BCE?

The year 318/7 BCE, however, does mark the probable date in which Kios' autonomy (and thus its autonomous coinage) came to an end. Although Mithridates II had spent the past year supplying Arrhidaeos at Kios and is described doing so as “an enemy of Antigonos”, just one year later in 316 BCE a certain Mithridates is reported fighting on the side of Antigonos at

---

<sup>35</sup> Thompson (1991), 25.

<sup>36</sup> Thompson (1991), 39.

<sup>37</sup> Thompson (1991), 64.

Gabiene.<sup>38</sup> After the battle near Byzantium, then, Antigonos must have made Kios subject and taken either King Mithridates II or, more likely, his nephew Mithridates III, along with him.<sup>39</sup>

The years 317 BCE and 316 BCE, then, mark a short period of peace under Antigonos for the Hellespont and Kios. The historians do not report any fighting in Thrace under Lysimachos during this time either. In 315 BCE, however, Lysimachos, Cassander, and Ptolemy declared war against their former ally Antigonos. Crucial to their demands was that Hellespontine Phrygia be given to Lysimachos.<sup>40</sup> In response, Antigonos sent an army under his nephew Ptolemaeos to first campaign in Cappadocia against the general Asclepiodorus sent by Cassander, then to campaign in Bithynia against king Zipoetes, and finally to prevent any crossings at the Hellespont.<sup>41</sup> Had Asclepiodorus crossed to Asia through the Hellespont, the Pontus, or some other route? The Hellespont route seems less likely, as it was in fall 315 BCE the base of at least 120 recently constructed Antigonid ships, which would have opposed him.<sup>42</sup> At any rate, this time Antigonos' subordinate was seemingly successful on all counts. He defeated the general sent by Cassander, defeated the Bithynian king Zipoetes, and no further crossing is recorded.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> D.S. 18.72.1-2. ἐχθρὸν δ' ὄντα τοῖς περὶ Ἀντίγονον.

<sup>39</sup> D.S. 19.40.2. The episode is somewhat problematic. Corsten (1985), 33, laments: "Ob diese Notiz sich auf Mithradates II oder III bezieht, kann man wohl nicht mit Sicherheit entscheiden." Despite Corsten's apprehension, the younger Mithridates III seems more likely due to another story in which Demetrios, his coeval and apparent friend, warned him to flee Antigonos' court (see below, Section 3.2). App. *Mithr.* 2.9 also identifies the Mithridates at Gabiene with Mithridates III.

<sup>40</sup> Third Diadoch War. D.S. 19.57.1.

<sup>41</sup> D.S. 19.57.4-5.

<sup>42</sup> See below, D.S. 19.62.7-8.

<sup>43</sup> As pointed out by Anson (2006), 232, Cassander's general Asclepiodorus must have crossed into Cappadocia sometime in fall 315, months before the allies' ultimatum and formal start of the war. See also Wheatley (1998).

Remaining attacks by the allies against Antigonos were isolated to Ionia and then Cyprus, not the Hellespont.<sup>44</sup>

Interestingly, it seems that whatever navy Antigonos possessed back in 317 had since disappeared, with some ships stationed in the Hellespont and others taken back to Greece by Nikanor and owned by Cassander himself by 315 BCE. Instead, Antigonos found that “his enemies then ruled the sea with many ships, but that he had, altogether, not even a few.”<sup>45</sup> He was forced to spend time in Phoenicia building a brand new fleet from scratch. It took the better part of the year to complete these ships, and when the first of these were just being finished, “forty ships under the command of Themison came to Antigonos from the Hellespont, and likewise Dioscorides put in with eighty vessels from the Hellespont and Rhodes.”<sup>46</sup> Many of these ships may have been Lampsakene.

If Thompson’s assertion that there was no Lampsakene minting during this period is correct, then it would seem that the Lampsakene Alexander issues under Antigonos had nothing to do with building up a navy or army. But Thompson’s dating is unsure at best. As she says, “in the absence of die linkage there can be no absolute certainty that the sequence of Series X-XIII is correct.”<sup>47</sup> Despite her proposed chronological gap, among some drachms of the numerous KI issue (Series X) and the subsequent Series XI “there is a revival of the spread-lap Zeus of the

---

<sup>44</sup> D.S. 19.60.2-4.

<sup>45</sup> D.S. 19.58.1. συνέβαινε γὰρ τοὺς μὲν πολεμίους τότε θαλασσοκρατεῖν ναῦς πολλὰς ἔχοντας, αὐτῷ δὲ τὸ παράπαν οὐδ’ ὀλίγας εἶναι.

<sup>46</sup> D.S. 19.62.7-8. κατὰ τοῦτον δὲ τὸν καιρὸν πρὸς Ἀντίγονον κατέπλευσαν ἐξ Ἑλλησπόντου ναῦς τεσσαράκοντα Θεμισῶνος ναυαρχοῦντος· ὁμοίως δὲ ἐξ Ἑλλησπόντου καὶ Ῥόδου κατήγαγε σκάφη Διοσκουρίδης ὀγδοήκοντα. Translation is Geer 1947.

<sup>47</sup> Thompson (1991), 36.

early coinage.”<sup>48</sup> These two series are also unique as “they alone use [NO monogram] as a secondary control.”<sup>49</sup> Rather than representing a ‘revival,’ it seems more likely that these two series correlate to another amassing of Antigonid naval forces at the Hellespont in 316-315. This explanation also aligns better with the die link between the two Abydos series Thompson separates.<sup>50</sup>

Lysimachos is conspicuously absent from the fighting in 315 BCE through 314 BCE. Lund posits that Lysimachos played a solely defensive role, and in winter 314-313 BCE “proved his effectiveness as an obstacle to Antigonid attack on Macedon, securing the Hellespont against Antigonos.”<sup>51</sup> Lund’s evidence, from Diodorus, only proves that he was active near the northern Pontus, not the Hellespont. In fact, it seems unlikely that Lysimachos had a navy at all. In mid-313 BCE, Antigonos induced the western Pontic *poleis* to rebel against Lysimachos, and sent a fleet under Lycon through the Hellespont to aid them.<sup>52</sup> The fleet sailed through unabated, and Lysimachos spent the remainder of 313 BCE and 312 BCE quelling the revolts.<sup>53</sup> When Antigonos sought to make “peace in the Hellespontine region”, he did so with Cassander.<sup>54</sup> Although they were able to agree about Greece, the Hellespont remained contentious, such that Antigonos himself arrived there in winter 313 BCE, distributing his

---

<sup>48</sup> Thompson (1991), 36.

<sup>49</sup> Thompson (1991), 36.

<sup>50</sup> Thompson (1991), 64.

<sup>51</sup> Lund (1992), 60.

<sup>52</sup> D.S. 19.73.6.

<sup>53</sup> Lysimachos would not finish mopping up the last of the rebels until 310: D.S. 20.25.1.

<sup>54</sup> D.S. 19.75.6. εἰρήνης περὶ τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον.

soldiers among the cities of the Propontis.<sup>55</sup> Cassander, not confident in the protection of Lysimachos since the latter was preoccupied with quelling the revolts, returned to a defensive position in Macedon.<sup>56</sup> It is unclear whether Cassander's activity in the "Hellespontine region" was limited to the Chersonese or included the Troad. On the whole, it seems Lampsakos and perhaps Parion remained firmly under Antigonid control throughout the wars of 315 to 312, though Cassander's presence in the region until 313 may have hampered minting.

Thus, the Hellespont, and Kios as well, had avoided any direct conflict in the Third Diadoch War.<sup>57</sup> In 311 BCE, Antigonos sent out many letters to the cities of the Troad and elsewhere declaring his truce with the diadochi and his championship of the freedom of the Greeks. It is likely that Lampsakos and Parion received letters similar to that recorded at Skepsis.<sup>58</sup> For Lampsakos and Parion, that peace was briefly broken when Phoenix of Tenedos, Antigonos' governor of Hellespontine Phrygia, rebelled. Phoenix had been left as governor by Ptolemaeos, likely in 315 BCE as part of the effort to secure the area.<sup>59</sup> Phoenix was not mentioned when the admiral Lycon passed through in 313 BCE.<sup>60</sup> The rebellion in 310 BCE was

---

<sup>55</sup> D.S. 19.77.7.

<sup>56</sup> D.S. 19.77.6.

<sup>57</sup> Peace was made in summer 311: D.S. 19.105.1.

<sup>58</sup> Harding (1985), no.132. In these letters, Cassander and Lysimachos are always mentioned by Antigonos as a matched set, which perhaps attests to their close collaboration in military and fiscal matters.

<sup>59</sup> See above. D.S. 19.57.4-5. Phoenix of Tenedos was last seen in 321 in the service of Eumenes at the Hellespont, and only reappears when he revolts in 310. Whether he followed Eumenes into Asia until the latter's death in 316 (and then returned to Hellespontine Phrygia) or simply stayed in the area from 321 onwards is unknown.

<sup>60</sup> See above. D.S. 19.57.4-5.

put down swiftly by Antigonos' son Philip.<sup>61</sup> From then until 302 BCE, Lampsakos, Parion, and Kios would all seemingly be at peace and away from any front lines.

As noted above, the year 310 also marks the date that Thompson believes Lampsakos resumed minting, after Antigonos had succeeded in “establishing his control of Asia Minor.”<sup>62</sup> According to Thompson, Lampsakos would continue minting smaller issues from 310 down to 302/1 BCE, when the 303/2-302/1 Pegasus issues mark one final spike in production. Given the relative peace of the Hellespont region from 315 to 302 and the more probable dating of Series X and XI to 316-315, it seems more likely that the subsequent issues (Series XII-XVII) were minted sporadically over these years of relative peace, perhaps as needed to support the Antigonid navy. But we can be more specific. Series XII and XIII, consisting almost entirely of drachms with a few staters and tetradrachms, likely corresponds to 313, when Antigonos sent a fleet under Lycon and then wintered among the cities of the Propontis. Regarding Series XIV through XVII, Thompson notes that

“There seem to have been two emissions with Mouse in control. The first [Series XIV] consisted of a few staters with a modest output of drachms, all with secondary controls. After it ended, Herm [Series XV] was in charge of the new issue, but for some reason his tenure was short lived and Mouse [Series XVI] was called back into service. The obverse die of Herm and one from Mouse's earlier emission were still usable and these, together with a few new dies, produced a small coinage of drachms alone. One of the new dies carried over to Bird on Branch [Series XVII], an issue which terminated abruptly. Production was definitely winding down; there was no need for secondary controls after the first Mouse striking.”<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> D.S. 20.19.2-5.

<sup>62</sup> Thompson (1991), 39.

<sup>63</sup> Thompson (1991), 36.

The ‘some reason’ undefined by Thompson may represent the brief rebellion by Phoenix of Tenedos in 310. If so, it appears that the extended gap in Lampsakene production should be placed not between 317-310 as Thompson believes, but rather between 310-302. It is tempting to interpret this gap as a punishment or loss of trust for siding with Phoenix, though Antigoniid interests during 310-302 were elsewhere, as discussed below. There may simply have been no need for Antigoniid minting during this period of relative peace in the region. But given the extreme paucity of these series (especially the Herm and Bird series, represented by only one unique drachm specimen each), any conclusions must remain tentative.

Lysimachos, meanwhile, had finally stamped out the last resistance against him in 310, and set about consolidating once more in Thrace.<sup>64</sup> In 309 BCE, he founded his capital Lysimacheia on the northeast neck of the Chersonese, taking settlers from nearby Cardia.<sup>65</sup> The location of his capital was strategically ideal. Firstly, its position at the narrowest and flattest point between the Gulf of Melas and the Propontis meant that, if forced, Lysimachos could funnel resources and men between the Aegean and the Propontis while bypassing the Hellespont strait entirely.<sup>66</sup> Looking towards the future, however, its position on the Hellespont would remain central once his empire expanded into Asia Minor to the south and east and into Macedon to the west. Despite the foundation in 309 BCE, Thompson believes Lysimachos would not mint his own coinage until 306/5 BCE, after assuming the royal title.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> D.S. 20.25.1.

<sup>65</sup> D.S. 20.29.1. Paus. 1.9.8.

<sup>66</sup> As noted by Arslan (2017), 82.

<sup>67</sup> Thompson (1968), 168.



For our cities of Lampsakos, Parion, Kios, and now Lysimacheia, the years of 308 BCE through 303 BCE are relatively quiet. Lampsakos likely minted no coinage, while Kios, still under Mithridates II as vassal, minted nothing save perhaps the Mithras bronzes. In 307 BCE Antigonos and Demetrios were the first diadochi to assume the royal diadem, though this change does not seem to be reflected in their coinage overall. In 305 BCE Cassander and Lysimachos followed suit, and it was now that Thompson says Lysimachos minted his first coinage at Lysimacheia (T1-4).<sup>68</sup> These were small silver tetrobols and bronzes, with Philip II-type obverses and reverses that feature ΛΥ and lion-foreparts below the typical horseman.<sup>69</sup> Lysimachos-types were not introduced until well after Ipsos.

What was the purpose of these initial Lysimacheian issues? Thompson seems to assume, based on their assigned date, that they were commemorative. Other options are possible. If the purpose of these coins was for the local economy, as such small denominations often are, one would expect their minting to begin when Lysimachos founded the city in 309 BCE.<sup>70</sup> As noted in Section 4 below, however, there are multiple known hoards with Lysimachos bronzes, particularly those of Lysimacheia, found concentrated in northern Thrace and the Danube (modern Bulgaria). If we accept Thompson's 306/5 date, the only other notable event recorded during this period for Lysimachos was Demetrios' siege of Rhodes. In 304, Lysimachos sent

---

<sup>68</sup> Thompson (1968), 168.

<sup>69</sup> See Chapter 2, footnote 6.

<sup>70</sup> On the role of small denominations, Meadows (2004), 12-13, summarizes: "fractional silver coins appear very often as money used in everyday transactions in the market place. These are the coins which may plausibly be called small change... as a whole, small coins tend not to travel far from their issuing cities." See also Kroll (1979), Kraay (1964), and Howgego (1995), 7-9.

80,000 measures of wheat and barley to support the city.<sup>71</sup> Triobols and bronzes, however, are too small to fuel a grain shipment of this quantity alone, though they may have supported it.

In the next year (303 BCE), Plutarch records an anecdote in which revelers of Demetrios, now in Greece, name the diadochi: Demetrios is King, Seleukos is Master of Elephants, Ptolemy is Admiral, and Lysimachos is Treasurer (γαζοφύλακος). Lysimachos, on hearing this report, was apparently furious due to the fact that “it was the general practice to have eunuchs for treasurers.”<sup>72</sup> But the supposed insult speaks to a larger truth of this period: Lysimachos was reliant on Cassander for funds. As Thompson posits, “it seems virtually certain that it was Cassander who supplied the bulk of Lysimachus’ monetary requirements right down to Ipsus and probably even later.”<sup>73</sup> Cassander and Lysimachos indeed appear as a matched set throughout the ancient historians and even in the contemporary Antigonid stelae, as noted above.<sup>74</sup> Lysimachos controlled no sizable mints from 323 BCE up until 302 BCE. Byzantion, the richest city within his nominal territory, was in fact autonomous and would never mint lifetime Lysimachi.<sup>75</sup> If Lysimachos was able to capitalize on the grain trade during this period as implied by his donation to Rhodes, it would seem any and all revenues were being funneled directly into his coffers without being minted under his name. Though Thrace contained abundant wood for

---

<sup>71</sup> This may be compared to the 300,000 measures from Ptolemy and 10,000 from Cassander: D.S. 20.96.1-3.

<sup>72</sup> Plu. *Demetr.* 25.5. ἐπιεικῶς γὰρ εἰώθεισαν εὐνούχους ἔχειν γαζοφύλακας.

<sup>73</sup> Thompson (1968), 164.

<sup>74</sup> Harding (1985), 165, no.132. It may be that Cassander was buying grain or, in effect, buying protection from Thracians.

<sup>75</sup> Autonomous: D.S. 19.77.1-4. No Lysimachi: Marinescu (1996).

shipbuilding, ships were expensive to maintain, precluding the ability to build a large navy.<sup>76</sup> Yet the rich and gold-abundant cities of the Troad lay just across the straits; Lysimachos would have to pass through one final financial hurdle to gain access to them.

### **3.2 Lysimachos, King of the Hellespont, 302-288/7.**

Cassander, Seleukos, Ptolemy, and Lysimachos' declaration of war against Antigonos in 302 BCE was nominally in defense of Cassander, but Lysimachos had much to gain.<sup>77</sup> This time he would not be hampered by Thracian rebels. In fact, it seems that he had spent the preceding years making overtures to the cities of Lampsakos, Parion, and perhaps Mithridates II at Kios. The former two are especially noted by Diodorus as coming over to him voluntarily, while Sigeum and Abydos instead resisted.<sup>78</sup> Sigeum quickly capitulated and Lysimachos installed a garrison there, whereas Lampsakos and Parion he apparently "left free."<sup>79</sup> Cassander, as usual, was quick to support Lysimachos by sending a portion of his army under Prepelaus.<sup>80</sup> On his arrival, Lysimachos sent him to take Aeolis and Ionia, especially Ephesos, while Lysimachos himself besieged Abydos.<sup>81</sup>

Both Lysimachos and Prepelaus faced the same problem: neither had a navy nor funds.

Lysimachos was forced to abandon his siege of Abydos after soldiers sent by Demetrios "arrived

---

<sup>76</sup> For the costs of maintaining ships, see Th. 6.8 and 6.31; D. 51.15 and 21.155. For timber and shipbuilding, see Karathanasis (2019), 707-726.

<sup>77</sup> D.S. 20.106.1-5.

<sup>78</sup> D.S. 20.107.2-4.

<sup>79</sup> D.S. 20.107.2. ἀφῆκεν ἐλευθέρους.

<sup>80</sup> D.S. 20.107.1.

<sup>81</sup> D.S. 20.107.3.

by sea,” and instead decided to “[win] over Hellespontine Phrygia” and thence move into Upper Phrygia in order to besiege Synnada, “which possessed a great royal treasure.”<sup>82</sup> Prepelaus took Ephesos and promptly “burned all the ships in the harbour, since the enemy controlled the sea,” yet was nonetheless unable to take Erythrae and Clazomenae “since reinforcements came by sea.”<sup>83</sup> He therefore went to Sardis, another site with a rich royal treasury. Both Lysimachian forces, then, went in search for new funds after proving ineffective without a navy. Another similar incident repeated in late winter, when Cassander’s general Pleistarchus was unable to cross the Pontus to aid Lysimachos “since he did not have ships enough for transporting his soldiers.”<sup>84</sup> Pleistarchus was forced to stay that winter in Odessos on the west Black Sea coast.

It is during this period that Lampsakos likely minted its final, enigmatic Series XVIII. These bear a winged horse (pegasus, according to Thompson), Lampakos’ traditional mint mark, for the first time since its pre-Alexander autonomy. This series is die-linked with the first Lampsakene Lysimachi.<sup>85</sup> As Thompson says, Lysimachos

“could have held Lampsacus for no longer than five or six months. He may at that time have started the Pegasus coinage which continued to be struck after his forced retreat. On the other hand, it seems more likely that Lysimachus during his brief occupation of Lampsacus did not interfere with a coinage begun by Antigonus.”<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> D.S. 20.107.3-4. ἐπεὶ δὲ κατὰ θάλατταν ἦλθε τοῖς πολιορκουμένοις στρατιωτῶν πλῆθος παρὰ Δημητρίου τὸ δυνάμενον τὴν ἀσφάλειαν παρέχεσθαι τῇ πόλει, ταύτης μὲν τῆς ἐπιβολῆς ἀπέστη, τὴν δ’ ἐφ’ Ἑλλησπόντῳ Φρυγίαν προσαγαγόμενος καὶ Σύνναδα πόλιν ἔχουσαν ἀποσκευὰς μεγάλας βασιλικὰς ἐπολιόρκησεν.

<sup>83</sup> D.S. 20.107.4-5. τὰς δὲ ναῦς τὰς ἐν τῷ λιμένι πάσας ἐνέπρησε διὰ τὸ θαλασσοκρατεῖν τοὺς πολεμίους. ... Ἐρυθραίοις δὲ καὶ Κλαζομενίοις ἐλθούσης κατὰ θάλατταν βοηθείας τὰς μὲν πόλεις ἐλεῖν οὐκ ἠδυνήθη.

<sup>84</sup> D.S. 20.112.3-4. οὐκ ἔχων δ’ ἰκανὰ πόρια πρὸς τὴν τῶν στρατιωτῶν διάβασιν τριχῆ διεμέρισε τὴν δύναμιν.

<sup>85</sup> See above, Chapter 1, Section 1.2.

<sup>86</sup> Thompson (1991), 39.

It is tempting to read the returning winged-horse symbol as indicative of Lysimachian involvement, who after all was ostensibly freeing the city. If the winged-horse series was the impetus of Lysimachos, however, it would appear either that Demetrios paid it no mind when he regained the city that winter, or that the winged horse coinage could have paused upon Demetrios' return and resumed shortly after Ipsos. In the chronology thus far presented, there remains to be explained the continuity of controls (NO, ΠΠ, ME) between the earlier Antigonid series of 315-310 BCE and the Lysimachian Series XVIII in 302. Luckily, Thompson has already provided an answer: such controls

“are closely connected with Lampsacus and it may be assumed that they are now civic symbols, indicative of the minting authority, rather than magistrates' markings.”<sup>87</sup>

But this chronology must remain tentative, since the final contemporary series at Abydos, which remained thoroughly Antigonid until after Ipsos, are also die-linked to the first Lysimachi there. It may be that Series XVIII was not minted until after Ipsos as well.

In any case, Lysimachos himself did not remain in Lampsakos for long. After taking Synnada in Greater Phrygia and some other cities “that held the royal wealth,” Lysimachos was bested by Antigonos in a few skirmishes and promptly retreated to make his winter quarters “throughout the plain of Salonia,” receiving supplies from nearby Heracleia.<sup>88</sup> Contrary to Diodorus, Lysimachos did not leave Lampsakos ungarrisoned. When Demetrios approached the Hellespont in late autumn 302, he found Lampsakos garrisoned by disgruntled Autariatae

---

<sup>87</sup> Thompson (1991), 37.

<sup>88</sup> Royal wealth: D.S. 20.107.3-4. τῶν ἐχόντων τὰ βασιλικά χρήματα. Salonia: D.S. 20.109.7. παραπλησίως δὲ καὶ Λυσιμάχος διεῖλε τὴν δύναμιν εἰς χειμασίαν ἐν τῷ καλουμένῳ Σαλονίας πεδίῳ.

mercenaries.<sup>89</sup> Sources differ on their fate. Polyaeus states that the five-thousand Autariaetae lost a battle against Demetrios outside Lampsakos, but were then executed after somehow returning to Lysimachos.<sup>90</sup> Lund attempts to connect this battle with a “sea-battle” recorded in a Lampsakene inscription dated around this period.<sup>91</sup> Diodorus, meanwhile, reports that two-thousand Autariaetae and eight hundred Lycians and Pamphylians deserted Lysimachos for Antigonos in the same winter 302 BCE.<sup>92</sup> Antigonos promptly “gave them the pay which they said was due them from Lysimachus [and] also honoured them with gifts.”<sup>93</sup> The lack of pay given to these mercenaries may be another indication that Series XVIII was not minted until after Ipsos. Either way, the mercenaries stationed at Lampsakos were no longer of use.

Another ally lost that winter was Mithridates II. After advancing through the Hellespont with his fleet, Demetrios encamped for the winter near Chalkedon.<sup>94</sup> Either while on his way there or after arriving in Chalkedon, Demetrios had his agents assassinate Mithridates II in Kios. Though ostensibly subject to Antigonos, Mithridates II “appeared to be shifting his allegiance to Cassander,” and so he was removed.<sup>95</sup> Who, if anyone, was in control of Kios afterwards?

---

<sup>89</sup> D.S. 20.110.3.

<sup>90</sup> Polyaeus. 4.12.1.

<sup>91</sup> Lund (1992), 76. *IG XII 354 = I.Lampsakos*, 1978, no. 1, line 12. See also Daux (1928), 46, and Cary (1930), 253–4. If Lund is correct, one wonders how these Autariaetae obtained enough ships for a “sea-battle” (ναυμαχία) when Lysimachos himself could not. Alternatively, the inscription may be dated to one of many other naval battles during this time period, as mentioned above.

<sup>92</sup> D.S. 20.113.3. Diodorus does not give a location for their garrison.

<sup>93</sup> D.S. 20.113.4. τούτοις μὲν οὖν Ἀντίγονος φιλανθρώπως προσενεχθεὶς τοὺς τε μισθοὺς ἔδωκεν, οὓς ἔφασαν ὀφείλεσθαι παρὰ Λυσιμάχου, καὶ δωρεαῖς ἐτίμησε.

<sup>94</sup> D.S. 20.111.3.

<sup>95</sup> D.S. 20.111.4. Περὶ δὲ τούτους τοὺς χρόνους καὶ Μιθριδάτης, ὑπήκοος ὢν Ἀντιγόνῳ καὶ δόξας ἀφίστασθαι πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Κάσανδρον, ἀνηρέθη περὶ Κίον τῆς Μυσίας, ἄρξας αὐτῆς καὶ Μυρλείας ἔτη τριάκοντα καὶ πέντε.

Diodorus reports that Mithridates II's nephew, Mithridates III (the future Mithridates I of Pontus), "inherit[ed] the kingdom," a possibility made more plausible by the latter's supposed friendship with Demetrios but less plausible by a similar story reported by Plutarch in which Antigonos attempted, unsuccessfully, to have Mithridates III assassinated.<sup>96</sup> In any case, Mithridates III was certainly not in control of Kios by 297 BCE, when he made the fortress of Kimiata (some 240 miles east) his new capital.<sup>97</sup> Corsten believes that Kios came under Lysimachian control immediately after Ipsos, with Mithridates III on the run elsewhere.<sup>98</sup>

Following the battle of Ipsos in 301 BCE, Lysimachos finally received much of Asia Minor, including Lampsakos and Parion.<sup>99</sup> As noted above, Lysimachos perpetuated the mints at Lampsakos and Abydos, now with his own types. At Lampsakos, however, Lysimachos minted with special purpose and speed. As noted in Chapter 1, Thompson demonstrates that the early Lampsakene Lysimachi were minted in two separate workshops. As she says, this "elaborate pattern of mint activity... indicates that [Lampsakene] pre-eminence began immediately after Ipsus."<sup>100</sup> Such immediate increase in production indicates a special purpose beyond mere consolidation.

---

<sup>96</sup> D.S. 20.111.4. τὴν δὲ δυναστείαν διαδεξάμενος Μιθριδάτης πολλοὺς προσεκτήσατο, τῆς δὲ Καππαδοκίας καὶ Παφλαγονίας ἤρξεν ἕτη τριάκοντα ἕξ. For Demetrios' friendship and Antigonos' failed assassination, see Plu. *Demetr.* 4.4.

<sup>97</sup> See Coşkun (2022); McGing (1986).

<sup>98</sup> Corsten (1985), 34, following Seyrig (1958), 615. Coşkun (2022) also agrees. Bosworth and Whealtes (1998) believe Mithridates III occupied Kimiata as early as 314 BCE.

<sup>99</sup> Seyrig (1958), 605, wrongly believes that Parion remained under Demetrios until 295/4.

<sup>100</sup> Thompson (1991), 37-38.

One probable purpose for increased production is a navy. The need for a navy had plagued Lysimachos and his Cassandrian allies throughout the Ipsos campaigns, and in fact this requirement continued to plague him immediately afterwards: throughout 301 BCE and 300 BCE, Demetrios continually raided the Thracian Chersonese from his bases in Ionia and Greece. Lysimachos would not regain the Ionian cities until 297 BCE.<sup>101</sup> Plutarch goes out of his way to say that the other diadochi did not aid Lysimachos in defending against these attacks.<sup>102</sup> If Lysimachos was to protect his newfound holdings and profit from the grain trade therein, he would need his own navy.

The grain trade also gave Lysimachos a diplomatic tool. In 299/8 BCE, Lysimachos was praised for giving “a gift of ten thousand Attic medimnoi of wheat” in addition to a huge yardarm and mast for the Panathenaic *peplos* – perhaps a sign of his newfound naval ambitions.<sup>103</sup> The Athenian who convinced him to do so, a comic poet named Philippides, is also mentioned in Plutarch as a staunch critic of Demetrios and the Athenians who supported him.<sup>104</sup> Pausanias records a statue of Lysimachos at Athens placed at the entrance to the *odeon* among those of Alexander, Philip II, Pyrrhos, and various Ptolemies, the last of whom

“had their honours bestowed upon them out of genuine respect and because they were benefactors, but it was rather the sycophancy of the people that gave them to Philip and

---

<sup>101</sup> Raids: Plu. *Demetr.* 31.1-2. Ionian cities in 297: Plu. *Demetr.* 35.3.

<sup>102</sup> Plu. *Demetr.* 31.2.

<sup>103</sup> Burstein (1985), 13-15, no.11.

<sup>104</sup> Plu. *Demetr.* 12.5 and 26.3.



Alexander, since they set up a statue to Lysimachus also not so much out of goodwill as because they thought to serve their immediate ends.”<sup>105</sup>

In this case, it seems that the ‘immediate ends’ sought by the Athenians were grain shipments, which at least earned Lysimachos a position of honor in his own time.

Diplomacy was not Lysimachos’ only focus, however. In 297/6 BCE, while Lysimachos himself was capturing the last of the Ionian cities, he sent his generals to fight King Zipoetes in Bithynia.<sup>106</sup> The campaign went poorly: Zipoetes apparently killed one of his generals and expelled another. The status of Kios in this period is unknown. Corsten, as noted above, believes that Kios had been under Lysimachian dominion since 301. These campaigns against Zipoetes may have been in defense of the city, but whether his generals temporarily lost Kios to the Bithynian king is unknown. Marinescu, Thompson, and Newell all believe that Lysimachos did not gain Kios until nearly a decade later in 289/8 BCE, but they provide no sources for this claim. The absence of immediate minting at Kios (assuming Marinescu or Thompson’s minting dates are roughly correct) does not preclude Lysimachian control.

The period between Ipsos and 287 BCE is rife with numismatic difficulties. Between our four cities, Lysimacheia appears the simplest in regards to its coinage and chronology.

Thompson dates the Alexander drachms (T5-7) to 301/0-297/6 BCE, contemporary with the initial Lysimachi in Lampsakos of 301/0-297/6 BCE (T32-38). She places the transition from Alexander to Lysimachos types in 297/6 BCE for both cities and indeed all contemporary mints

---

<sup>105</sup> Paus. 1.9.4. τοῖς μὲν οὖν ἀπ’ Αἰγύπτου τιμῆ τε ἀληθεῖ καὶ εὐεργέταις οὖσι γεγόνασιν αἱ δωρεαί, Φιλίππῳ δὲ καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ κολακεῖα μᾶλλον ἐς αὐτοὺς τοῦ πλήθους, ἐπεὶ καὶ Λυσίμαχον οὐκ εὐνοία τοσοῦτον ὡς ἐς τὰ παρόντα χρήσιμον νομίζοντες ἀνέθηκαν. For the statue’s location “Before the entrance of the theatre which they call the Odeum,” see Paus. 1.8.6. Τοῦ θεάτρου δὲ ὃ καλοῦσιν Ὡιδεῖον ἀνδριάντες πρὸ τῆς ἐσόδου βασιλέων εἰσὶν Αἰγυπτίων. On Pausanias’ reliability (or lack thereof) in his use of local, oral sources, see Pretzler (2005).

<sup>106</sup> Memn. *FGrH* 434 F 1.12.5.

within his empire. Thompson does not provide a historical context for the 297/6 BCE transition, but as noted above, the date marks the capture of the final Ionian cities loyal to Demetrios and thus the consolidation of Asia Minor. It is also the year of Cassander's death, and thus the end of any remaining fiscal support from Macedon.<sup>107</sup>

With Cassander dead, kingship over Macedon, and thus access to the productive mines at Amphipolis, lay contested between his two sons Alexander and Antipater. The latter was Lysimachos' son-in-law and claimed the Macedonian throne until 294 BCE, when Demetrios invaded at the behest of Antipater's brother and rival Alexander. Through clever maneuvering, Demetrios took over Macedon himself.<sup>108</sup> Lysimachos, however, was once again occupied in Thrace, this time by invasions of the Getae.<sup>109</sup> Two years later in 292 BCE, Lysimachos was defeated in battle and captured by the Thracian king Dromichaetes, who released him on good but perhaps humiliating terms the next spring.<sup>110</sup>

Thompson, Newell, and Marinescu all believe that Lysimachos took both Kios and Heracleia in 289 BCE, but none provide a source. Our only source for the dating of Heracleia is Justin, who says that Lysimachos annexed the city after taking Macedon in 285/4 BCE.<sup>111</sup> Certainly Lysimachos himself campaigned in the area at some point between 301 BCE and 285/4

---

<sup>107</sup> Plu. *Demetr.* 36.1. Just. *Epit.* 15.4.24. and 16.1.1.

<sup>108</sup> Just. *Epit.* 16.1.7-19.

<sup>109</sup> Plu. *Pyrrh.* 6.3.

<sup>110</sup> D.S. fragments 21.12.1-6.; Paus. 1.9.6.; Plu. *Demetr.* 39.3 and 52.4.

<sup>111</sup> Just. *Epit.* 16.3.1.

BCE, as Strabo reports that Lysimachos razed the nearby city of Astacus to the ground.<sup>112</sup> In any case, Thompson believes that Kios began minting Lysimachi around 288 BCE; Marinescu, meanwhile, opts for a period of three years some time between ca.285-275 BCE.<sup>113</sup> It is during the years surrounding 289 (from 293 until 287), too, just prior to the war against Demetrios, that Thompson believes “well over half” of all obverse dies for tetradrachms at Lampsakos were used.<sup>114</sup> This last belief is ill-informed, however, as Chapter 2 has shown that the delta-xi emissions lasted throughout the 280s.

Throughout 289/8, Plutarch reports that Demetrios amassed a great army and fleet in preparation for retaking Asia.<sup>115</sup> This fleet of 500 ships was divided between the ports of Peiraeus, Corinth, Chalcis, and Pella.<sup>116</sup> In 288, a coalition of Seleukos, Ptolemy, Lysimachos, and also Pyrrhos attacked first.<sup>117</sup> Demetrios decided his most pressing assailant was Lysimachos. Sources differ on what happened next: Pausanias says that Demetrios defeated Lysimachos at Amphipolis, but Pyrrhos snuck into Macedon from the west and forced Demetrios to flee.<sup>118</sup> Polyaeus reports no battle, but says that Lysimachos took Amphipolis “by the treachery of Andragathus.”<sup>119</sup> Plutarch omits any battle, but says that Demetrios’ own troops

---

<sup>112</sup> Str. 12.2.

<sup>113</sup> Thompson (1968), 178.

<sup>114</sup> Thompson (1968), 171.

<sup>115</sup> Plu. *Demetr.* 43.2-5.

<sup>116</sup> Plut. *Demeter.* 43.3-4.

<sup>117</sup> Just. *Epit.* 16.2.1-2. Plu. *Demetr.* 44.1.

<sup>118</sup> Paus. 1.10.2.

<sup>119</sup> Polyaeus. 4.12.2. Λυσίμαχος Ἀμφιπόλεως κρατήσας Ἀνδραγάθου προδόντος...

threatened to desert to Lysimachos, forcing him to retreat back to Macedon; there, his troops deserted to Pyrrhos anyways.<sup>120</sup> One way or the other, Pyrrhos received Pella while Lysimachos received eastern Macedon, including Amphipolis and its lucrative mines. If Lysimachos had any lingering fiscal issues by 288/7 BCE, the acquisition of Amphipolis ought to have alleviated them.

### **3.3 Lysimachos, King of Greece, Thrace, and Asia, 288-281.**

The acquisition of Amphipolis in 288/7 BCE marks a turning point for Lysimachian mints. As discussed above, Thompson believes that Lampsakene minting drastically declined as Amphipolis took its place.<sup>121</sup> As shown in Chapter 2, we now know that Lampsakos continued minting the numerous delta-xi issues (T49-52) throughout the 280s. It was sometime during this period (288-281) that Philo minted his issues at Lysimacheia (T13) and then Lampsakos (T53-54). Nearly half of these issues used reverse dies borrowed from Delta-xi's stores. As discussed in Chapter 1, Thompson attributes this sudden change and the die-link between Lysimacheia T13 and Lampsakos T54 to an earthquake that Justin claims to have damaged the former city in 287.<sup>122</sup> In the absence of a better explanation, 288/7 may remain the tentative date for the Philo emissions.

Though defeated, it seems Demetrios retained much of his huge fleet. After a year using the Piraeus as a base, Demetrios in 287/6 BCE sailed across the Aegean and once more took the

---

<sup>120</sup> Plu. *Demetr.* 44.3.

<sup>121</sup> Thompson (1968), 171 and 179.

<sup>122</sup> Just. *Epit.* 17.1.1-3.

cities of Ionia and Caria, beginning with Miletos.<sup>123</sup> As discussed in Chapter 2, this invasion may have been the impetus for the Lysimachian mint at Magnesia to flee to the Hellespont. After taking Sardis, however, Demetrios was forced into an uncharacteristic position. Lysimachos had immediately sent his son Agathocles with an army, but rather than retreat to his fleet, Demetrios fled inland into Phrygia and eventually Cilicia.<sup>124</sup> It seems Demetrios, then, was as wary of the sea as Lysimachos had been in 302/1, likely because of the Lysimachian navy. Lysimachos, meanwhile, grew wary of using some apparently vulnerable mints. Sardis, for instance, never minted Lysimachi again after its reincorporation, perhaps echoing Antigoniid treatment of Lampsakos in 310-302.<sup>125</sup>

In 285 BCE, Lysimachos completed his consolidation by taking Macedon from Pyrrhos.<sup>126</sup> In the following year, according to Justin, Lysimachos seized Heracleia Pontica.<sup>127</sup> Whether gained in 288 BCE (as according to Thompson) or 285 BCE, Heracleia proves crucial for determining the purpose of Lysimachian coinage. Thompson assigns just four issues to the city over six years.<sup>128</sup> This small emission may be compared to the Heracleian contribution to Lysimachos' fleet stationed at Lysimacheia just after his death in 281 BCE. Memnon of Heracleia records "some ships which had been sent from Heracleia, six-bankers and five-bankers

---

<sup>123</sup> Plu. *Demetr.* 46.3.

<sup>124</sup> Plu. *Demetr.* 46.4-47.2.

<sup>125</sup> Thompson (1968), 173

<sup>126</sup> Just. *Epit.* 16.3.1-2. Paus. 1.10.2.

<sup>127</sup> Just. *Epit.* 16.3.1-2.

<sup>128</sup> Thompson (1968), 178.

and transports and one eight-banker called the lion-bearer, of extraordinary size and beauty.”<sup>129</sup> The Lysimachian navy was sizable enough to win a battle against Demetrios’ son Antigonos.<sup>130</sup> As noted in Chapter 2, the philo emissions of Kios would have been able to support between five and twelve triremes for about two years, while the Lysimacheian and Lampsakene philos could support between nine and twenty-seven over about one year.<sup>131</sup> These are substantial contributions, but only for short timespans. The estimated timespan might be lengthened if one considers the fact that many of these ships would not be active for the whole year, but the estimated number of ships ought also to be tempered by the fact that the Lysimachian navy, to judge by the Herakleian example and examples of other Hellenistic kings, was composed primarily of the more expensive *penteres* (five-bankers) and *hexeres* (six-bankers).

If Amphipolis and Delta-xi in Lampsakos minted for the fleet, why assign someone like Philo to mint his own emissions using Delta-xi’s equipment and dies? It seems more likely that Philo and other mint officials from Lampsakos T53-61 were minting for sporadic, specialized purposes. The first possibility is the army. Although the navy was too expensive for small mints over long periods of time, these outputs could have paid at least in part for the mercenaries and soldiers under Lysimachos and his son Agathocles’ command. The second possibility, however, is equally prevalent in the ancient sources and indeed appears on the iconography of the coins themselves: grain. Though Lysimachos had no fleet and few mints when compared to Cassander

---

<sup>129</sup> Memn. *FGrH* 434 F 1.8.4-5. ἦσαν δ’ ἐν αὐταῖς ἄλλαι τε καὶ τῆς Ἡρακλείας αἱ μετάπεμπτοι, ἐξήρεις τε καὶ πεντήρεις καὶ ἄφρακτοι, καὶ ὀκτῆρης μία ἢ λεοντοφόρος καλουμένη, μεγέθους ἕνεκα καὶ κάλλους ἦκουσα εἰς θαῦμα.

<sup>130</sup> Memn. *FGrH* 434 F 1.8.1-3.

<sup>131</sup> The total of all lifetime philo emissions (Lysimacheia, Lampsakos, Kios) could have supported between fourteen and thirty-nine triremes during their estimated minting timespans.

in 304, he had eight times the amount of grain in his contribution to Rhodes. When he wished to extend his influence in Athens in 299/8, he donated a single ceremonial yardarm and mast for the Panathenaic peplos in addition to ten thousand Attic medimnoi of wheat. The grain trade was the lifeblood of the Propontic cities before Lysimachos, and it would continue to be so after his death in 281 BCE.<sup>132</sup>

Purpose may also be gleaned from the location of contemporary hoards. Figures 3.1 and 3.2 show maps of known hoards with a *terminus ante quem* of 270 BCE or earlier that contain Lysimachi. Figure 2 includes only hoards with known Lampsakene Lysimachi. Ten hoards dated prior to 281 BCE contain Lysimachi.<sup>133</sup> Half of these are in Thrace. As shown in Figure 1, Thrace (especially around the Danube) demonstrates a concentration of Lysimachos bronzes, including two instances (*CH* 6.22, dated c.295 BCE, and *CH* 9.140, dated c.290-270 BCE) of bronzes with types specific to Lysimacheia itself. Those two hoards indicate that Lysimacheia's bronze issues were not merely for local use. Instead, it is possible they were either utilized by troops while fighting in the region, or perhaps were connected with the grain trade along the Danube. Three hoards dated prior to 281 were from Greece, all of which contain drachms.

---

<sup>132</sup> On the Classical and Hellenistic grain trade, see Moreno (2007), 144-208, preceded by Semple (1921). For further Hellenistic continuity, see Preteux (2020).

<sup>133</sup> *IGCH* 842 (Aytos, Bulgaria, dated 300 BCE): one unattributed Lysimachos bronze; *IGCH* 843 (Mesembria, Bulgaria, dated 300 BCE): two unattributed Lysimachos drachms. *CH* 7.60 (Thrace, dated 300 BCE): three unattributed Lysimachos drachms. *CH* 7.61 (Denizli, Turkey, dated 300 BCE): three unattributed Lysimachos drachms. *IGCH* 137 (Megara, dated 295 BCE): four Lysimachos drachms of Colophon; *CH* 6.22 (Sliven, Bulgaria, c.295 BCE): one Lysimachos bronze with types of Philip II bearing ΛΥ and lion forepart. *IGCH* 849 (Blagun, Bulgaria, dated 290 BCE): two Lampsakene Lysimachos-type drachms and one unattributed Lysimachos drachm. *CH* 8.221 ("Turkey?", dated c.305-281 BCE): over one hundred unattributed Lysimachos tetradrachms. *CH* 8.260 (Poteidaia, Greece, dated "before 281 BCE"): two unattributed Lysimachos drachms. *CH* 10.54 (Corfu, Greece, dated "late 4th-early 3rd century BCE"): one Lysimachos drachm of Ephesos. One hoard, *CH* 10.265 or the "Seleucus I Hoard" (Unknown findspot, probably Asia Minor?) is dated precisely to 281 BCE in the lead-up or aftermath of Korupedion: many Lysimachos drachms of Amphipolis, one of Lysimacheia, six of Lampsakos, eleven of Colophon, many others unattributed.

A multitude of hoards containing Lysimachi have been dated to circa 280 BCE. Of these, many are located in Asia Minor, including the Armenak hoard (*IGCH* 1423, Cilicia).<sup>134</sup> Thrace and southern Greece only have three hoards in total with Lampsakene Lysimachi, which are much more common in hoards of northern Greece, Macedon, and Asia Minor.

---

<sup>134</sup> Asia Minor: Armenak Hoard (1423), *IGCH* 1401 (Phrygia), 1402 (Phrygia), 1292 (Caria), 1293 (Lydia), 1424 (Cilicia), 1446 (“Anatolia”); *CH* 1.56 (“Turkey”), 3.33 (Karalar, Turkey), 8.267 (Denizli, Turkey), 8.275 (Asia Minor), 9.474 (Dandiri, Turkey), 9.475 (Mugla, Turkey), and 9.480 (Yilanli, Turkey). Greece and Macedon: *IGCH* 443 (Macedonia), 444 (Thessaloniki), 446 (Macedonia), 448 (North Macedonia), 144 (Ambracia, Epiros), 138 (Arcadia), 141 (Thessaly), 146 (Thessaly), and 148 (Thessaly); *CH* 3.32 (Peloponnese), 6.23 (Myron, Thessaly), 8.261 (Nea Potideia), 8.276 (Poteidaia), and 9.146 (Furka, Macedonia). Thrace: *IGCH* 850 (Bersin, Bulgaria), 449 (Vedea, Romania), 851 (Slava Rusa, Romania), 852 (Radoslavovo, Bulgaria), 853 (Malko Topolovo, Bulgaria), 855 (Borovets, Bulgaria); *CH* 2.65 (Batasani, Romania), 9.145 (Dragoevo, Bulgaria), and 10.69 (Dragoevo, Bulgaria).





Figure 3.1: Lysimachi Hoard Distribution Excluding Attested Lampsakene Lysimachi, *terminus ante quem* 270 BCE.<sup>135</sup>

*Key to figure. Color: denotes largest denomination present – Brown (bronzes), light gray (drachms), dark gray (tetradrachms), gold (staters).*

*Shape: denotes number of coins and provenance – star (few Lysimachi, no Lampsakos), empty circle (many Lysimachi, no Lampsakos).*

<sup>135</sup> This interactive map is available to view on Google Maps: [https://www.google.com/maps/d/edit?mid=1mTUh-aR5xBy\\_3-1eE8P5t9pQcVEJsGM&usp=sharing](https://www.google.com/maps/d/edit?mid=1mTUh-aR5xBy_3-1eE8P5t9pQcVEJsGM&usp=sharing).



Figure 3.2: Hoard Distribution of Lampsakene Lysimachi, *terminus ante quem* 270 BCE.<sup>136</sup>

*Key to figure. Color: denotes largest denomination present – Brown (bronzes), light gray (drachms), dark gray (tetradrachms), gold (staters).*

*Shape: denotes number of coins and provenance – Small square (few Lysimachi, including Lampsakos), large square (many Lysimachi, including Lampsakos).*

This hoard distribution does not match the Pontic grain trade. If the purpose of the Lysimachian mints, especially those outside Lampsakos, was to stimulate or protect the grain trade, one would expect distribution along that route: from the Black Sea coasts, through the

<sup>136</sup> This map only includes hoards with *attributed* Lampsakene Lysimachi. It is worth noting that many of the hoards in Figure 1 may have included Lampsakene specimens, especially those which are simply marked “Lysimachos” with no further attribution.

Propontis, and into the hungry *poleis* of coastal Greece and the Aegean such as Athens. Instead, distribution is mostly in Asia Minor, Thrace, northern Greece, and penetrating into Epiros. There is also the aforementioned absence of Lampsakene Lysimachi in Thrace, where smaller denominations seem to dominate. Lampsakene tetradrachms instead dominate in northern Greece and Asia Minor.

Taken as a whole, the hoard evidence supports a military purpose. If the purpose of Lampsakene Lysimachi was military and especially naval, one would expect distribution in the places that the navy and army was active from 301 BCE onwards: first Ionia and Bithynia, then perhaps the coasts along Thrace, especially Amphipolis, Ionia again followed by Cilicia, then Macedon and Epiros before the final battle in Phrygia. For the most part this is the case, with four exceptions in southern Greece (only one of which, in Asea, contains a single Lampsakene tetradrachm). The radically inland Thracian hoards may be explained by Lysimachos' operations against the Getae and Dromichaetes just a few years prior to many of these hoards' estimated burials (only one of which contain Lampsakene Lysimachi). The inland Anatolia hoards may be connected with Agathocles' pursuit of Demetrios in 286 BCE or with the battle of Korupedion itself in 281 BCE. Notably, none of the Lampsakene Lysimachi in any of the hoards are reported to be T53-54s (ϕ), nor are any Lysimachi from Lysimacheia – in fact, all identified Kian Lysimachi in known hoards are posthumous save for three coins in the Armenak hoard, two of which are philos.<sup>137</sup> The Lampsakene Lysimachi that are present in hoards are unilaterally the eta-rhos (⊖) and delta-xis (⊕), which are more likely in my reconstruction to be associated with the fleet. The philo Lysimachi of Lampsakos and Lysimacheia, then, must have had a special

---

<sup>137</sup> Thompson (1986). Armenak hoard: coins nos.899 and 900.

purpose. Kios, however, seems to have minted in a similar manner and purpose as Heracleia Pontica – that is, for its own contributions to the fleet and military. One coin in this study, no.62, may provide further context. This specimen has a countermark on it belonging to Chalkedon and dated c. 240-220 BCE.<sup>138</sup> Regardless of its original purpose, then, this coin continued circulating in the Propontis long after Lysimachos' death.

What, then, was the purpose of the Lampsakene and Lysimacheian *philoi*? Any answer must be speculative. With the general fleet excluded and without any firm hoard evidence for these small and sporadic emissions, possibilities vary widely, including the grain trade, festivals, an isolated payment of mercenaries, the payment or bribe of important *philoi*, a donation or gift to an important *polis* like Athens, the emergency construction of a new fleet, or perhaps a bribe or tribute payment to threatening Thracians like Dromichaetes. It was for this latter purpose that some Lysimachi would continue to serve after the king's death at Korupedion in 281.

### **3.4 Lysimachos, Symbol of the Northern League, 281-255 BCE.**

The four cities of Lysimacheia, Lampsakos, Parion, and Kios did not fare equally after the death of their patron. Lysimacheia would serve as Lysimachos' final resting place, buried there by his Odrysian son Alexander.<sup>139</sup> Ptolemy Keraunos, after assassinating Seleukos I, would assume the diadem in Lysimachos' former capital, taking the fleet stationed in its harbors, as mentioned above. Without Lysimachos and his army, however, both Thrace and Greece were vulnerable. Almost immediately after his death, the Galatians arrived. Ptolemy Keraunos succeeded in

---

<sup>138</sup> Stancomb (2007): coin 7.

<sup>139</sup> Paus. 1.10.5.

defeating Antigonos Gonatas and installing himself on the Macedonian throne, but he was unable to defeat the Galatians in Greece.

Kios fared differently. Just after Korupedion in 281, Seleukos sent a governor, Aphrodisius, to Phrygia and “the upper parts of Pontus,” which included Herecleia Pontica and perhaps Kios.<sup>140</sup> The Seleukid governor “praised the other cities, but accused the Hereacleians of being hostile towards Seleucus.”<sup>141</sup> Kios, then, if counted among these cities of the “upper parts of the Pontus”, may have been initially amicable to the Seleukids. If so, its amiability did not last. By the next year (280/79), Heracleia had gathered its allies to form the anti-Seleukid Northern League, which included Mithridates III, Byzantion, Chalkedon, and perhaps Kios, in addition to Antigonos Gonatas and Nikomedes of Bithynia.<sup>142</sup>

The chronology of the ensuing period is not well defined. It is clear that much of what Seleukos gained after Korupedion was lost after his death. It took Antiochos “many wars [to recover] his father’s kingdom with difficulty, and even so not completely.”<sup>143</sup> None of the four cities of this study would mint for the Seleukids until the reign of Antiochos II in 261 at the earliest. In the meantime, it appears that independent *poleis* such as Byzantion and regional kings such as Nikomedes and Mithridates III were left to fill the power vacuum alongside two other kings: Antigonos Gonatas and Ptolemy II. The latter apparently controlled much land in Asia,

---

<sup>140</sup> Memn. *FGrH* 434 F 7.1. Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ Σέλευκος Ἀφροδίσιον πέμπει διοικητὴν εἰς τε τὰς ἐν Φρυγίαι πόλεις καὶ τὰς ὑπερκειμένας τοῦ Πόντου.

<sup>141</sup> Memn. *FGrH* 434 F 7.1. ὁ δὲ διαπραξάμενος ἃ ἐβούλετο καὶ ἐπανιών, τῶν μὲν ἄλλων πόλεων ἐν ἐπαίνοις ἦν, Ἡρακλεωτῶν δὲ κατηγορεῖ μὴ εὐνοικῶς ἔχειν τοῖς τοῦ Σελεύκου πράγμασιν.

<sup>142</sup> Memn. *FGrH* 434 F 7.2. Avram (2003), 1186. Marinescu (2017), 218-219.

<sup>143</sup> Memn. *FGrH* 434 F 7.2. Ὁ δὲ Σελεύκου Ἀντίοχος πολλοῖς πολέμοις, εἰ καὶ μόλις καὶ οὐδὲ πᾶσαν, ὅμως ἀνασωσάμενος τὴν πατρίαν ἀρχίην...

which he gave to Byzantium as a *peraea* sometime around 280/79-275/4.<sup>144</sup> This territory extended along the southern Mysian coast of the Propontis, from modern Yalova (south of Kios) to Trigleia (modern Tirilye, east of Kyzikos). Russel believes this gift was in order to support the new tribute imposed upon Byzantium by the Galatians at Tylys.<sup>145</sup>

The Galatian invasions dominate the scant historiography of the Propontis during this time period. Following their defeat in Greece, the Galatians turned to raiding and imposing tribute upon Byzantium.<sup>146</sup> In 278, Galatians under Lutarius and Leonorius captured Lysimacheia through subterfuge.<sup>147</sup> Antigonos Gonatas came to the city's aid, however, and defeated the Galatians at a site near the city.<sup>148</sup> According to Livy, some Galatians under Lonnorius once again attacked Byzantium, while others under Lutarius managed to commandeer “two decked ships and three light vessels from some Macedonians who, though ostensibly on a diplomatic mission, had really been sent by Antipater to spy on them.”<sup>149</sup> They used these ships to cross the Hellespont, which was apparently otherwise unprotected or unpatrolled.

---

<sup>144</sup> Dion. Byz. 41: territory in Asia (χώραν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας) as a gift by Ptolemy II Philadelphus, along with a large amount of grain, missiles, and money (καὶ σίτου πολλὰς μυριάδας καὶ βέλη καὶ χρήματα). Plb. 4.50.4 (τὴν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας χώραν), 4.50.9 (τῆς Μυσίας χώρας τῆς ὑπὸ Βυζαντίους ταπτομένης). See Avram (2003), 1204. Habicht (1970) believes the gift dates to 275/4 whilst Russel (2017), 106-7, argues for a date of 280/79.

<sup>145</sup> Russel (2017), 106-7.

<sup>146</sup> Livy 38.16.8; Paus. 10.23.1–10; Just. *Epit.* 24.6.1–8.14.

<sup>147</sup> Livy 38.16.1. Arslan (2017).

<sup>148</sup> Plb. 4.46; Diod. XXII. 9; Paus. X. 19–23; Just. *Epit.* 24.5; 25.1–2. For Gonatas' victory, the Byzantines erected statues at Olympia: *I.Byz* 4–6; Paus. 6.15.7.

<sup>149</sup> Livy 38.16.6. *Lutarius Macedonibus, per speciem legationis ab Antipatro ad speculandum missis, duas tectas naves et tres lembos adimit. iis alios atque alios dies noctesque travehendo intra paucos dies omnes copias traiecit.*

The Galatians at Byzantion did not fare so well. This time, Byzantion received ample monetary support from the allies of the Northern League.<sup>150</sup> Nikomedes assuaged these Galatians by allowing them to cross into Asia under his purview, agreeing to a treaty that allied them with the rest of the Northern League, including Kios.<sup>151</sup> The Galatians then entered into his service, fighting alongside Nikomedes against the Bithynian king Zipoetes. Using these forces, Nikomedes became the sole master of Bithynia.<sup>152</sup> Whether this domain included Kios is unclear.

It is in this new context that the posthumous Lysimachi flourished. Marinescu believes Byzantion first began minting Lysimachi around 270, around the same time that Kios minted its issues M9-19.<sup>153</sup> Marinescu interprets these issues as

undoubtedly intended as an overt anti-Seleucid message, with Nike crowning Lysimachus' name and Alexander's portrait providing a symbolic legitimacy to the coinage. Such coins may have been key in financing activities relating to limiting Seleucid encroachment into the area and possibly fostering a military relationship with the Gauls that were settled in the region during the reign of Nicomedes I.<sup>154</sup>

But as Russell says, the posthumous Lysimachi also “outlived any initial function they may have had as an anti-Seleucid gesture.”<sup>155</sup> In the context given above, it is tempting to interpret the posthumous Lysimachi not just in relation to the Seleukids but also in relation to the Galatians. Though many Galatians were now employed and settled by Nikomedes, others from their base at

---

<sup>150</sup> Memn. *FGrH* 434 F 11.2.

<sup>151</sup> Memn. *FGrH* 434 F 11.2.

<sup>152</sup> Livy 38.16.15. Str. 12.5.1-3. Paus. 1.4.5. Just. *Epit.* 25.2.

<sup>153</sup> Marinescu (2015), 387; Marinescu (2017).

<sup>154</sup> Marinescu (2017), 218.

<sup>155</sup> Russell (2017), 117.

Tylis still demanded tribute of Byzantion.<sup>156</sup> In combination with those discussed above, hoards of the mid-3rd century BCE attest to the popularity of Lysimachos tetradrachms in this region.<sup>157</sup> Even after his death, then, Lysimachos continued to protect the Hellespont and Bosphoros from Thracian invaders, who had developed a taste for his coinage either as mercenaries or as beneficiaries of the grain trade.<sup>158</sup>

If the posthumous Lysimachi of Kios were minted to aid Byzantion, one would expect those coins to be found around Byzantion, Tylis, and Thrace. Although we know from specimen no.62 (discussed above) that at least some lifetime Kian Lysimachi remained in the Propontis, the hoard evidence for the posthumous issues indicates a different direction. Nearly all known hoards with posthumous Kian Lysimachi were deposited in Anatolia, Syria, or Mesopotamia.<sup>159</sup> Rather than serving to protect Byzantion and the Northern League from the Galatians of Thrace, then, it may be that the posthumous Lysimachi of Kios were minted as tribute to those Galatians who had succeeded in crossing over and settling in the region that came to bear their name.

It is in this context that Parion began its own posthumous Lysimachi (S9-15, issues 20-32 in this study). The precise dating is unclear, but as noted in Chapter 2, the emission's metrology

---

<sup>156</sup> Plb. 4.46.1. Just. *Epit.* 25.1.

<sup>157</sup> CH 9.166 (Krecedin, c.270-260): six unattributed Lysimachos tetradrachms. CH 10.69 (Daeni Tulcea, Romania, mid-3rd cent BCE): Lysimachi of Lysimacheia (5), Kios (2), Byzantion, Chalcedon, and many unattributed. IGCH 869 (Plovdiv, Bulgaria, c.250-200 BCE): many drachms and tetradrachms of Lysimachos.

<sup>158</sup> Alexandrine issues of both Lampsakos (Price 1444-5) and Parion (Price 1458-66) are also dated to this period, c. 280-275 BCE. Though an in-depth study of these emissions is outside the scope of this thesis, these Parion Alexanders, if Price's dating is correct, would have been minted some ten years before the first Parian philos.

<sup>159</sup> Kios – Hoards in Anatolia: IGCH 1447, 1370, 1735, 1406, 1426, 1410, 1450. Hoards in Syria or Mesopotamia: IGCH 1529, 1532, 1768, 1769, 1772, 1804. Hoards in Ionia or Troad: IGCH 1299, 1302. Only one hoard with posthumous Lysimachi of Kios has been found near Byzantion: IGCH 867. The aforementioned CH 10.69 may be lifetime or posthumous.



matches that of Byzantion and Kios in the late 270s and 260s. Since the first Parion issue in this study strongly resembles those of Chalkedon of the late 260s, we may narrow the estimated date range to between ca. 265 and 260 for the Parion  $\text{P}\text{A}\text{P}$  emissions. The Parion  $\text{P}\text{A}\text{P}$  emissions, meanwhile, match the metrology of Byzantion and Kios of the 250s. As in the case of Kios, nearly all hoards containing Lysimachi of Parion were deposited in either Anatolia or Syria, again supporting an interpretation of these emissions as tribute to the Galatians in Asia Minor.<sup>160</sup>

Lysimacheia and especially Lampsakos' loyalties in this period remain unclear. Antiochos did not aid Lysimacheia or nearby Lampsakos when the Galatians attacked, but Antigonos Gonatas does not seem to have stayed in the area for long either. The Seleukids reacquired Lysimacheia at some point in the 270s or 260s, agreeing to a peace treaty dated sometime in the reign of Antiochos I (280-261) or early in the reign of Antiochos II Theos (261-246).<sup>161</sup> This treaty guarantees the city's autonomy and democracy ([ἐν αὐτονομίαι καὶ] ἐν δημοκρατίαι), and declares it ungarrisoned (ἀφρούρητον). It also declares that Antiochos will apparently "employ the harbors of the Lysimacheians as bases" to deliver troops in the event of invasion, again emphasizing the importance of Lysimacheia's naval capabilities.<sup>162</sup>

It is in the reign of Antiochos II that Lampsakos and Lysimacheia finally regain some semblance of their former numismatic primacy. Antiochos II minted extensively at both of these

---

<sup>160</sup> Parion – Hoards in Anatolia: *IGCH* 1370, 1450. Hoards in Syria: *IGCH* 1529, 1532, 1535, 1772. One hoard in Greece: *IGCH* 237.

<sup>161</sup> Burstein (1985), 29-30, no.22 = *IMT* Skam/NebTäler 173 = *I.Ilion* 45 = *SEG* 31.1056.

<sup>162</sup> *I.Ilion* 45, ll. 9-13. βοηθήσω καθότι συν- / [τέθειμαι] χρώμενος λιμέσι τοῖς Λυσιμα- / [χέων ὄρ]μητηρίοις. The extent of Seleukid naval presence at Lysimacheia in this treaty is unclear, but the word ὄρμητήριον is vivid.

*poleis*.<sup>163</sup> At Lysimacheia, he minted numerous tetradrachms bearing the lion head mintmark, while at Lampsakos “the first issued employ a portrait of Antiochus I that shows affinities to the deified Alexander on the coinage of Lysimachus.”<sup>164</sup> Lysimacheia would serve as the main Seleukid garrison in Europe until 191/0, and likely was used as a naval base of operations (ὀρμητήριον, as noted above) during Antiochos II’s campaigns against Thrace and Byzantion in the 250s.<sup>165</sup>

Marinescu speculates that the Kios issues M20-26, dated through stylistic comparison to Byzantion and Chalkedon between 260 and the late 250s (contemporary with Parion S1-8), increased in production “as aid to Byzantium which was under great stress from the tribute imposed by its neighboring Gauls as well as being besieged by Antiochos II sometimes around 255.”<sup>166</sup> It is possible that this latter war was the impetus for Parion’s  $\text{P}$  coinage as well. As noted above, however, hoard evidence suggests that both the posthumous Lysimachi of Parion and Kios were flowing southeast through Anatolia rather than northwest along the Propontis. Memnon reports that the war between Byzantion and Antiochos II, due to the substantial support in the form of triremes from the allies of the Northern League, “did not proceed beyond threats.”<sup>167</sup> Once again, the posthumous Lysimachi – whether from Parion and Kios or from Byzantion – served to protect the Propontis.

---

<sup>163</sup> *SC* 481-483, 484-486.

<sup>164</sup> Houghton and Lorber (2002), 145.

<sup>165</sup> Garrison until 191/0: Livy 36.33.6.

<sup>166</sup> Marinescu (2017), 218.

<sup>167</sup> Memn. *FGrH* 434 F 15.1. Βυζαντίους δὲ Ἀντιόχου πολεμοῦντος, τριήρεσι συνεμάχησαν μὲν οἱ Ἡρακλεῶται, καὶ τὸν πόλεμον παρεσκεύασαν μέχρις ἀπειλῶν προκόψαι. See Avram (2003), 1211.

What, then, was the overall purpose of the philo Lysimachi, both lifetime and posthumous? In the cases of Kios, the philos seem to align in purpose with the delta-xi emissions of Lampsakos and the vast emissions at Amphipolis: all were minted to fund a fleet. Parion's posthumous philos (in addition to the posthumous Lysimachi of Kios) may have served a similar purpose of protecting the Propontis, but in the form of tribute to Galatians in Asia Minor. The purpose of the Lysimacheian and Lampsakene philos is more obscure, though undoubtedly specialized and sporadic.

## Conclusion

The  $\phi$ -monogram Lysimachi comprise a comparatively small portion of the lifetime and posthumous emissions bearing Lysimachos' name. Yet these "philos" are highly illuminating. The monogram itself appears on the coinage of five Lysimachian mints (Lysimacheia, Lampsakos, Kios; Parion, Byzantion), and the obverses appear in numerous other issues (T11, T115, eta-rho issues, numerous delta-xi issues).

Through these philos, we may better understand broader patterns of Lysimachian mint organization. At the center of this organization is the Hellespont workshop, most likely located in Lampsakos. The most prolific mint official (or, at least, the most prolific monogram) within the Hellespont workshop was Delta-xi. The Lysimacheian and Lampsakene philos, along with other emissions such as the mu-gammas (T55), likely represent sporadic instances of other mint officials (i.e. "Philo") using previously-made dies from Delta-xi's reserves for special, limited emissions. Given the paucity of these emissions and their absence from hoard evidence, their purpose must remain obscure, though it is likely that they were not minted for the same purpose as the delta-xis (i.e. to fund the Lysimachian fleet).

Kios' philos, likely representing the same mint official, may have been simultaneous with or just subsequent to the Lampsakene delta-xis. Their purpose, based on the historical context provided in Chapter 3, was likely also to fund the Lysimachian fleet. After Lysimachos' death, Kios continued minting Lysimachi, but hoard evidence suggests these posthumous emissions were minted as tribute to the Galatians. By the time Parion minted its posthumous philos sometime in the 260s BCE – likely for the same tributary purpose as Kios' posthumous issues – the Hellespont workshop had transformed into Marinescu's Bosphoros workshop. Decades after

Lysimachos' death, then, the coins bearing his name retained their role as protection for the Propontis against Thracian and Seleukid invaders.

There is much, much more work to be done. Regarding the completion of this particular project, I was unable to access all of the relevant museum collections. There may be more philo Lysimachi waiting, then, in Copenhagen, Athens, and others. In the shorter term, the Parion  $\overline{\text{P}}$  emissions would also benefit from a die study, as would other *poleis* such as Heracleia Pontica which minted both lifetime and posthumous Lysimachi. The potential Lysimachian continuities in the first coinage of Antiochos II Theos may also prove enlightening, as might a detailed study of the Lampsakene and Parion Alexandrine issues (Price 1444-5 and 1458-66) dated by Price to c. 280-275 BCE, perhaps contemporary with or placed before the posthumous philos of Parion.

More work is also necessary to understand the full implications of multiple workshops (comprising the Hellespont workshop) minting simultaneously within Lampsakos. A full die study of the Magnesians Lysimachi may help clarify the enigmatic connection drawn between the T11s, T115s, and the early Lysimacheian philos, all of which share the same obverse. In the long term, a comprehensive catalogue of Lysimachi, much like the *SC*, would prove invaluable. Immediately relevant to the philo Lysimachi would be, of course, a die study of the numerous delta-xi or eta-rho series (and all Lampsakene Lysimachi), though Lysimachian numismatics would benefit greatly from similar die studies of Amphipolis and Pella. In the meantime, the die study presented in this thesis represents a small step towards the larger and more challenging puzzle that is the coinage of Lysimachos.

# Bibliography

- Aram, M., Bodzek, J., and Bursche, A. *Survey of Numismatic Research 2014-2020: Volume I & II*. International Numismatic Council. Warsaw; Krakow (2022).
- Anson, E. *Eumenes of Cardia: A Greek Among Macedonians*. Brill Academic Pub, 2004.
- Anson, Edward M. "The Chronology of the Third Diadoch War." *Phoenix* 60, no. 3/4 (2006), 226–35.
- Ashton, R., Ireland, S., and Hodges, R. *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. [Great Britain]. 5: Ashmolean museum, Oxford. 9: Bosphorus-Aeolis*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Pr., 2007.
- Arnold-Bucchi, C., "The Pergamene Mint under Lysimachos", in *Studies in Greek Numismatics in Memory of Martin Jessop Price*, ed. Ashton, R. and Hurter, S. (London 1998), 5-15.
- Arslan, Nurettin. "Surface surveys in the northern Troad and the identification of Çiğlitepe as ancient Arisbe." *Anatolian Studies* 67 (2017), 129-144.
- Aylward, William. "Security, *sunoikismos*, and *koinon* as determinants for Troad housing in Classical and Hellenistic times." In *Ancient Greek houses and households: chronological, regional, and social diversity*, Edited by Ault, Bradley Allen and Nevet, Lisa C., 36-53. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania State University Pr., 2005.
- Bagnall, R. (1985). *Currency and inflation in fourth century Egypt*. Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists. Chicago.
- Baldwin, Agnes. "The Gold Staters of Lampsakos." *American Journal of Numismatics (1897-1924)* 53 (1919), 1–76.
- Bosworth, Albert Brian and Wheatley, Pat V.. "The origins of the Pontic house." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 118 (1998), 155-164.
- "Why did Athens lose the Lamian War?" in Palagia and Tracy (eds.), *The Macedonians in Athens, 322-229 B.C.: Proceedings of an International Conference Held at the University of Athens, May 24-26, 2001*, 14-22. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2003.
- Burstein, Stanley M. ed. *The Hellenistic Age from the Battle of Ipsos to the Death of Kleopatra VII*. Translated Documents of Greece and Rome. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- "Lysimachus and the Greek cities of Asia Minor. The case of Miletus." *The Ancient World* III (1980), 73-79.
- Cahn, H.A. 1991. "Zum Alexanderbildnis der Lysimachos-Prägungen," in Noeske, H.-C. and Alföldi, M.R. (eds.), *Die Münze, Bild-Botschaft-Bedeutung. Festschrift für Maria R.-Alföldi* (Frankfurt am Main/New York), 84–98.

- Cary, M. “An Inscription from Lampsacus.” *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 50 (1930), 253–54.
- Cook, J. M. “Cities in and around the Troad.” *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 83 (1988), 7–19.
- Corsten, Thomas. *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, XXIX: Die Inschriften von Kios*. Bonn: Habelt, 1985.
- Coşkun, Altay. “Expansion und Dynastische Politik in Pontos: zwei neue Ären unter Pharnakes I.” *Historia* 71, no. 1 (2022), 2-26.
- Davesne, Alain, Le Rider, Georges, Cénival, Françoise de, Joannès, Catherine, Lemaire, André and Masson, Olivier. *Gülнар, II: Le trésor de Meydancikkale (Cilicie Trachée, 1980), 1: Texte*. Paris: Éd. Rech. sur les civilisations, 1989.  
 ----- *Gülнар, II: Le trésor de Meydancikkale (Cilicie Trachée, 1980), 2: Planches*. Paris: Éd. Rech. sur les civilisations, 1989.
- Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History, Volume IX: Books 18-19.65*. Translated by Russel M. Geer. Loeb Classical Library 377. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1947.
- Duyrat, F. and Blet-Lemarquand, M., “The Gold of Lysimachus. Elemental Analysis of the Collection of the Bibliothèque nationale de France using LA-ICP-MS,” Sheedy, K. A. and Davis, G. (eds), *Mines, Metals, and Money: Ancient World Studies in Science, Archaeology and History, Metallurgy in Numismatics 6* (London, 2020), 175–193.
- Ellis-Evans, Aneurin. “The Koinon of Athena Ilias and Its Coinage.” *American Journal of Numismatics (1989-)* 28 (2016), 105–58.  
 ----- “The late Hellenistic tetradrachms of Parion and Lampsakos.” *American Journal of Numismatics Ser. 2* 32 (2020), 93-125.  
 ----- “Memnon and Mentor of Rhodes in the Troad.” *The Numismatic Chronicle (1966-)* 178 (2018), 33–69.  
 ----- “Mytilene, Lampsakos, Chios and the Financing of the Spartan Fleet (406-404),” *NC* 176 (2016), 1–19.  
 ----- and van Alfen, P. G., “Preliminary Observations on the Archaic Silver Coinage of Lampsakos in its Regional Context,” in Tekin, O. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Second International Congress on the History of Money and Numismatics in the Mediterranean World, 5-8 January 2017, Antalya* (Istanbul, 2018), 41–51.
- Erim, K. T., and MacDonald, D. “A Hoard of Alexander Drachms from Aphrodisias.” *The Numismatic Chronicle (1966-)* 14 (1974), 174–76.
- Esty, W. “The Geometric Model for Estimating the Number of Dies,” in Callataÿ (ed.), *Quantifying Monetary Supplies in Greco-Roman Times* (Rome, 2011), 43-58.

- Evelpidis, R. H. and Hackens, Tony. *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. Grèce. Coll. R. H. Evelpidis, Athènes, I: Italie, Sicile, Thrace, 1 à 1126*. Louvain: Impr. orientaliste, 1970.
- Frisch, Peter. *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, III: Die Inschriften von Ilion*. Bonn: Habelt, 1975.
- *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, VI: Die Inschriften von Lampsakos*. Bonn: Habelt, 1978.
- *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, XXV: Die Inschriften von Parion*. Bonn: Habelt, 1983.
- Frolova, Nina A.. “Further to a problem of coinage of the Lysimachus type staters in Tyra.” In *XII. Internationaler Numismatischer Kongress Berlin 1997: Akten = proceedings = actes*, Edited by Kluge, B. and Weisser, B., 290-299. Berlin: Mann, 2000.
- Gabrielson, V. *The Naval Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes*. Aarhus University Press, 1997.
- Gray, V. J. “The Years 375 to 371 BC: A Case Study in the Reliability of Diodorus Siculus and Xenophon.” *The Classical Quarterly* 30, no. 2 (1980), 306–26.
- Hansen, M.H. and Heine Nielsen, T. *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis: an Investigation Conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre for the Danish National Research Foundation*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Pr., 2004.
- Harding, Phillip, ed. *From the End of the Peloponnesian War to the Battle of Ipsus*. Translated Documents of Greece and Rome. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Hau, Lisa Irene. “Diodorus Siculus.” In *Moral History from Herodotus to Diodorus Siculus*, 73–123. Edinburgh University Press, 2016.
- Healey, John F.. *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. Great Britain, VII: Manchester University Museum. The Raby and Güterbock collection*. London: Oxford University Pr., 1986.
- Hoover, Oliver D., Meadows, Andrew R. and Wartenberg Kagan, Ute. *Coin hoards. 10, Greek Hoards*. London: Royal Numismatic Society, 2010.
- Houghton, Arthur and Lorber, Catharine C. *Seleucid Coins: A Comprehensive Catalogue. 1: Seleucus I through Antiochus III*. New York: The American Numismatic Society, 2002.
- Howgego, Christopher. *Ancient History from Coins: Approaching the Ancient World*. London; New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Keleş, V., “Parion Sikkelerinin Sirkülasyonu Işığında Parion’un Bölgesel Konumu,” in Dörtlük, K., Tekin, O., and Boyraz Seyhan, R. (eds), *Proceedings: First International Congress of the Anatolian Monetary History and Numismatics, 25-28 February 2013, Antalya* (Istanbul, 2014), 333–344.



- Killen, S. *Parasema: Offizielle Symbole griechischer Poleis und Bundesstaaten. Archäologische Forschungen*, 36. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2017.
- “The Winged Horse Protome from Lampsacus and its Interpretations,” Tekin, O. (ed.), *Second International Congress on the History of Money and Numismatics in the Mediterranean World, 5–8 January 2017, Antalya, Proceedings* (Antalya, 2018), 53–64.
- Kinns, Philip. “The Amphictionic Coinage Reconsidered.” *The Numismatic Chronicle* (1966-) 143 (1983), 1–22.
- Körpe, Reyhan and Rose, Brian. “The Granicus River Valley Archaeological Survey Project 2006.” In *Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı 25*, edited by Fahriye Bayram, 323-332. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Döşim Basimevi, 2008
- Kosmetatou, Elizabeth. “Ilion, the Troad, and the Attalids.” *Ancient Society* 31 (2001), 107–32.
- Le Rider, Georges. *Deux trésors de monnaies grecques de la Propontide: (IV<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.C.)*. Bibl. archéol. & hist. de l'Inst. franç. d'Archéol. d'Istanbul; XVIII. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1963.
- Leaf, W., ed. *Strabo on the Troad, B. XIII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923.
- Loomis T. *Wages, Welfare Costs, and Inflation in Classical Athens*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998.
- Lorber, C. and Kovacs, F. “A Ptolemaic Mint at Soli: A Tale of Two Magistrates.” *Schweizer Münzblätter* 47 (1997), 92-99.
- Lund, Helen S. *Lysimachus: A Study in Early Hellenistic Kingship*. London; New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Mannsperger, Dietrich and Balluff, R.. *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. Deutschland : Münzsammlung der Universität Tübingen, II: Taurische Chersones-Korkyra (Nr. 731-1542)*. Berlin: Mann, 1982.
- Marinescu, Constantin Alexandru. The Lysimachi Coinage of Cius, Bithynia, in D. Boteva (ed.), *Ex Nummis Lux: Studies in Ancient Numismatics in Honour of Dimitar Draganov* (Sofia, 2017), 177–220.
- “Making and spending money along the Bosphorus: the Lysimachi coinages minted by Byzantium and Chalcedon and their socio-cultural context.” PhD diss. Columbia University, 1996.
- Matthaiou, Angelos P. “An Arbitration Concerning Lampsakos and Parion.” *Epigraphical Approaches to the Post-Classical Polis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, 56–68.
- Mathiesen, Hans Erik. *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum: The Fabricius Collection, Aarhus*

- University, Denmark, and the Royal Collection of Coins and Medals, Danish National Museum, Copenhagen.* Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1988.
- McGing, Brian C. “The Kings of Pontus. Some Problems of Identity and Date.” *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* CXXIX (1986), 248-259.
- Meuss, A. 2024. “Political and Cultural Continuity with Argead Prototypes in Early Hellenistic Royal Coinage.” Paper presented at *Society for Classical Studies 155th Annual Meeting, Chicago, January 4-7, 2024.*
- Mitchell, Stephen. “Archaeology in Asia Minor 1990-98.” *Archaeological Reports* 45 (1998-1999), 125-191, 142.
- Moreno, A. *Feeding the Democracy: The Athenian Grain Supply in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC.* Oxford Classical Monographs, 2007.
- Müller, Ludwig. *Die Münzen Des Thracischen Königs Lysimachus.* Copenhagen: 1858.
- Newell, Edward T.. *The Pergamene Mint Under Philetærus.* Numismatic Notes and Monographs; LXXVI. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1936.
- Nicolet, Hélène. *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. The Collection of the American Numismatic Society, France Bibliothèque Nationale, Cabinet des Médailles. Collection Jean et Marie Delepierre.* Paris: 1983.
- Oldfather, C.H., “General Introduction,” in *Diodorus of Sicily in Twelve Volumes,* Harvard University Press (1933).
- Oyarçin, K., “Parion Kazısı 2010-2014 Yılları Numismatik Çalışmaları,” in Başaran, C. and Keleş, V. (eds), *Parion Kazıları 10. Yıl Armağanı / Festschrift 10th year of Parion excavations* (Ankara, 2015), 133–139.
- Petac, E., “War and Peace. Symbolic Elements on the Early Lysimachus Type Staters from the West Pontic Cities. Spear and Herald Staff (Polybius, IV, 52),” *RCAN* 5 (2019), 299–307.  
 ----- “Who’s Who? Uranopolis and Lampsakos Again about Symbolic Elements on Early Lysimachus Type Staters,” *RCAN* 6 (2020), 355–367.
- Pillot, William. “Étude de cas d’une association religieuse supra-civique : le koinon d’Athéna Ilias.” In *Les associations culturelles en Grèce et en Asie Mineure aux époques hellénistique et impériale*, edited by Demaille, Julien and Labarre, Guy. Institut des Sciences et Techniques de l’Antiquité; 1523, 159-171. Besançon: Pr. Universitaires de Franche-Comté, 2021.
- Preteux, F. “Traders in Propontis in the Hellenistic Period. Epigraphical and Archaeological Evidences.” *Parion Studies III*, 2020.

- Pretzler, Maria. "Pausanias and Oral Tradition." *Classical Quarterly* N. S. 55, no. 1 (2005), 235-249.
- Price, Martin Jessop. *The Coinage in the Name of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaeus: A British Museum Catalogue*. Zürich: The Swiss Numismatic Society in association with British Museum Pr., 1991.
- Rhodes, Peter John and Lewis, David M.. *The Decrees of the Greek States*. New York: Oxford University Pr., 1997.
- Robinson, Edward. *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. III, The Lockett Collection, 2: Sicily-Thrace (Gold and Silver)*. London: Milford, 1939.
- Scheidel W (2002). "A Model of Demographic and Economic Change in Roman Egypt after the Antonine Plague." *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 15: 97-114.
- Schönert-Geiss, Edith. *Griechisches Münzwerk. Die Münzprägung von Byzantion, I: Autonome Zeit*. Dt. Akad. der Wiss. zu Berlin Schr. zur Gesch. & Kultur der Antike; II. Berlin: Akad.-Verl., 1970.
- Semple, E.C. "Geographic Factors in the Ancient Mediterranean Grain Trade." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 11 (1921), 47-74.
- Seyrig, H.. "Parion au 3<sup>e</sup> siècle avant notre ère." In *Centennial Publication of the American Numismatic Society*, Edited by Ingholt, H., 603-625. New York: Amer. Num. Soc., 1958.
- Springschitz, Leopoldine. *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. Österreich: Sammlung Dreer, Landesmuseum für Kärnten, Klagenfurt, III: Thracien-Macedonien, Päonien*. Buchr. des Landesmus. für Kärnten; 39. Klagenfurt: 1990.
- Stancob, W.M. "Some Countermarked and Overstruck Hellenistic Coins from the Region of the Thracian Bosphorus." *The Numismatic Chronicle* 167 (2007), 25-32.
- Stillwell, R., MacDonald, William Lloyd and McAllister, M. H.. *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*. Princeton: Princeton University Pr., 1976, 480.
- Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, IV, 2: Fitzwilliam Museum, Leake and General Collections: Sicily-Thrace*. Oxford: Oxford University Pr., 1947.
- Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. Italy, Milano VI, Civiche Raccolte Numismatiche, Part 3: Chersonesus Tauricus, Sarmatia, Thracia, Chersonesus Thraciae, Isole della Thracia*. Milan: 2000.
- Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. Sweden II: The Collection of the Royal Coin Cabinet National Museum of Monetary History Stockholm, 2: Thrace-Euboea*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell Intern., 1980.
- Taylor, Lloyd W. H. "The Anchor Alexanders of Babylon II." *American Journal of Numismatics*

(1989-) 34 (2022), 1–38.

- Tekin, O., *Balance Weights in the Aegean World. Classical and Hellenistic Periods* (Istanbul, 2016). Translated from: Ege Dünyasında Terazi Ağırlıkları. Klasik ve Hellenistik Dönemler (Istanbul, 2015).
- “More Coins of Agathocles, Son of Lysimachus: a Reattribution,” in Dörtlük, K., Tekin, O., and Boyraz Seyhan, R. (eds), *Proceedings: First International Congress of the Anatolian Monetary History and Numismatics, 25-28 February 2013, Antalya* (Istanbul, 2014), 559–574.
- “Some Hellenistic Weights in the Çanakkale Museum,” Özfırat, A. (ed.), *SCRIPTA. Arkeolojiyle Geçen Bir Yaşam İçin Yazular. Veli Sevin’e Armağan / Essays in Honour of Veli Sevin. A Life Immersed in Archaeology* (Istanbul, 2014), 375–380.
- “Three Weights of Lampsacus,” *Anatolia Antiqua* 22 (2014), 155–158.
- “Weights of Lysimachea from the Tekirdağ Museum and Various Collections,” *Anatolia Antiqua* 22 (2014), 145–153.
- “Weights of Lysimachia: Identification, Iconography and Dating,” Tekin, O. (ed.), *Second International Congress on the History of Money and Numismatics in the Mediterranean World, 5–8 January 2017, Antalya, Proceedings* (Antalya, 2018), 91–118.
- Thompson, M. and Bellinger, A. R.. “Greek Coins in the Yale Collection: IV: A Hoard of Alexander Drachms.” *YCIS* XIV (1955), 3-45.
- Thompson, M. *Alexander's Drachm Mints II: Lampsacus and Abydos*. New York, American Numismatic Society, 1991.
- “The Armenak Hoard (IGCH 1423).” *The American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* XXXI (1986), 63-105.
- “The Cavalla Hoard (IGCH 450).” *The American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* XXVI (1981), 33-49.
- “The Coinage of Proconnesus.” *Revue Numismatique* VII (1965), 30-35.
- “The Mints of Lysimachus.” In *Essays in Greek Coinage Presented to Stanley Robinson*, Edited by Kraay, Colin M. and Jenkins, Gilbert Kenneth., 163-182. Oxford: Clarendon Pr., 1968.
- *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. The Burton Y. Berry Collection, 1: Macedonia to Attica*. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1962.
- Wheatley, Pat. “The Chronology of the Third Diadoch War, 315-311 B. C.” *Phoenix* 52, no. 3/4 (1998), 257–81.
- Wilhelm, A. *Akademieschriften zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde* (1895–1951) 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1974)
- Qin, D. 2024. “Coping with Loss and Confusion: Copying Old Coins for a New Identity.” Paper presented at *Society for Classical Studies, Chicago, 2024*.

# Appendices

## Appendix 1.A: Possible Interpretations of ⚡ and ⚡ Monograms in the Lampsakene, Lysimacheian, and Kian Lysimachi

This list draws heavily from the arguments summarized in Callataÿ 2012.

<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Reasons Unlikely/Possible/Likely</b>	<b>Likelihood (unlikely, possible, likely)</b>
Eponymous Magistrate of the City	Multiple monograms present within Lampsakos simultaneously; ⚡ active for many years.	Unlikely
Magistrate in charge of [all] monetary affairs [of the city]	City-specific; Monograms transfer between cities; ⚡ active for many years.	Unlikely
Benefactors/Liturgists who provided metal the mint	Massive amounts of metal required for ⚡ emissions over many years.	Unlikely
Military Commanders “for whom the coins were primarily issued”	Monograms transfer between cities (Lysimacheia to Lampsakos to Kios)	Possible
Mint Master/Technician	Long-term, transferable between cities/mints	Likely
Engraver	Multiple engravers/styles are detectable across the same monograms.	Unlikely
“Various Subordinate Monetary Officers” or “Skilled Artisans”.	Transferable; “Would normally have stayed in office longer than the official delegate(s) of the central power.” <sup>168</sup>	Likely
The Mint (and/or City within which the mint is located)	Multiple monograms present within Lampsakos simultaneously; extensive die-links between these monograms.	Unlikely (possible for other Lysimachi monograms, such as ⚡).
<i>Officinae</i> (workshops functioning separately inside the same mint)	Monograms transfer between cities.	Unlikely

<sup>168</sup> Callataÿ 2012, p.49.

Source of the Struck Metal (i.e. mines).	Monograms appear across multiple metals (gold, silver, bronze), i.e. $\text{HP}$	Unlikely
Military Unit for Whom the Coins Were Made	Long-term; transferable; but $\text{P}$ present for seemingly different purposes. <sup>169</sup>	Possible
Mark of Value	Multiple monograms between coins of the same value	Unlikely
Year Within an Era	Multiple monograms simultaneously; $\text{A}$ active over many years.	Unlikely
Numerical device / “any numerical suite where A is used or 1, B for 2, etc.”	Multiple monograms simultaneously; $\text{A}$ active over many years.	Unlikely

---

<sup>169</sup> See Chapter 3, Section 3.

**Appendix 2.A: Weights of “Lifetime” Parion  $\text{P}$  specimens.**

No.	Weight	Location
1	15.75g	New York, ANS 1944.100.77550
2	16.88g	New York, ANS 1944.100.77551
3	16.72g	New York, ANS 1944.100.77552
4	16.86g	Meydancikkale Hoard, 2680
5	16.99g	CGB Live Auction 12/23, Lot 733077
6	16.95g	Gorny & Mosch 265, Lot 186
7	16.99g	Gorny & Mosch 142, Lot 1268
8	16.82g	Gemini XII, Lot 92
9	16.91g	Künker 67, Lot 233
10	16.85g	CNG E-Auction 547, Lot 95
11	16.58g	Freeman & Sear Mail Bid Sale 13, Lot 141
12	16.96g	Leu Numismatik Web Auction 3, Lot 139
13	16.80g	Leu Numismatik Web Auction 4, Lot 100

**Appendix 3.A: Comparative Chronology of Events in the Career of Lysimachos and the Cities of Lysimacheia, Lampsakos, Parion, and Kios, 325-242 BCE.**

The table is arranged by year according to the dates and chronologies argued in this chapter. For each year, the top row denotes general historical developments while the bottom row tracks corresponding numismatic emissions. Some events are merged across columns to denote that they apply to or took place in both or all of those *poleis*.

Year	Lysimachos / Lysimacheia	Lampsakos	Parion	Kios
325				King Mithridates II ruling since 337 BCE.
		Thompson (T.) Series V minted for returning mercenaries.	Parion continues autonomous minting.	Kios continues autonomous minting.
324				
		T. Series V.		
323	Lysimachos (L.) assigned to Thrace.	Leonnatos assigned to Hellespontine Phrygia, then departs for Lamian War.		Kios remains under Mithridates II.
		Minting paused.		
322	L. fights against Seuthes.	Leonnatos dies in Lamian War; Eumenes takes the Hellespont, marshalls troops there.		
		T. Series VI, highest number of staters.		
321		Eumenes defeats Craterus, then leaves for Phrygia. Triparadeisos: Arrhidaeos assigned to Hellespontine Phrygia.		
		T. Series VII / VIII.		
320				
		T. Series VII / VIII.		
319		Antigonos (A.) takes Hellespontine Phrygia. Allied army and navy of A. and Cassander (C.) gathers at the Hellespont.		Arrhidaeos flees to Kios.
		T. Series IX, highest # of drachms and second-highest of staters.		



318	Soldiers of L. capture Kleitos after his defeat.	C. departs; forces continue to amass at Hellespont; Kleitos wins over Hellespont and Propontis; Nikanor and A. defeat Kleitos near Byzantion.		Kleitos picks up Arrhidaeos from Kios; after Kleitos' defeat, A. takes Mithridates III as hostage.
		T. Series IX pauses (or ends) early 318.		Kian autonomous coinage likely ends.
317		Nikanor departs Propontis for Greece. Death of Philip III.		
		T. Series IX ends (if not before).		
316				Mithridates III fights at Gabiene.
		T. Series X, many drachms, some staters, last Alexandrine tetradrachms.		
315	L. demands Hellespontine Phrygia.	Ptolemaeos assigns Phoenix of Tenedos to protect the Hellespont. 120 ships sent to A. from the Hellespont.		Ptolemaeos campaigns in nearby Bithynia.
		T. Series X-XI.		
314		C. in Hellespontine region.		
		No minting.		
313	West-Pontic poleis revolt.	Antigonid fleet sails through Hellespont; C. flees to Macedon; A. winters among cities of Propontis.		
		T. Series XII-XIII: drachms and few staters.		
312		A. leaves Propontis after winter.		
		T. Series XIII ends.		
311		A. sends letters to Troad and elsewhere.		
		T. Series XIV: drachms and few staters.		
310	L. quells final rebels.	Phoenix of Tenedos rebels, put down by Philip.		
		Series XIV, XV (under Phoenix), XVI-XVII.		

309	L. founds Lysimacheia.			
		Minting pauses.		
308				
307		A. and Demetrios assume royal titles.		
306				
305	L. assumes royal title.			
	First coinage (T1-4): silver tetrobols and bronzes.			
304	L. donates 80,000 measures of wheat and barley to Rhodes.			
	T 1-4.			
303	L. insulted as “treasurer.”			
	T 1-4.			
302	Lampsakos and Parion welcome L.; L. departs, Demetrios takes back Propontis. Autariatae at Lampsakos capitulate. Demetrios winters near Chalcedon, L. winters in Bithynia.			Mithridates II assassinated in Kios.
	T 1-4.			Mithras bronzes cease (if not already).
301	Battle of Ipsos. L. takes Asia.			Kios loyalty unclear.
	T1-4 finish, T5 begins: Alexander drachms.	Series XVIII: “Pegasus” staters, highest number of drachms, continues into first Lysimachian series (T 32-33).	Parion’s autonomous coinage ceases (if not already).	
300	Demetrios continually raids Thracian Chersonese. <i>IGCH</i> 842 and 843 buried in Aytos and Mesembria.			
	T5.	T32-33.		
299	L. donates wheat to Athens.			

	T5 -> T6-7: Alexander drachms with L. legend.	T 32-33 -> T 34- 38: Alexander staters and drachms with L. legend.		
298				
	T6-7.	T 34-38.		
297	L. captures final Ionian cities. Cassander dies. Zibytes defeats L.'s generals in Bithynia.			Mithridates III captures nearby Kimiata.
	T 6-7 -> Early L. type (T 8-12) staters and tetradrachms.	T 34-38 -> Early L. type (T 39-52) few staters, many tetradrachms, few drachms.		
296				
	T 8-12.	T 39-52.		
295				
	T 8-12.	T 39-52.		
294	Demetrios takes Macedon; L. busy fighting in Thrace.			
	T 8-12.	T 39-52.		
293				
	T 8-12.	T 39-52. Production increases.		
292	L. captured by Dromichaetes.			
	T 8-12.	T 39-52.		
291	L. released in spring.			
	T 8-12.	T 39-52.		
290	<i>IGCH</i> 849, containing 2 Lampsakene L. drachms, buried near Blagun, Thrace.			
	T 8-12.	T 39-52.		
289				Lysimachos gains Kios (Marinescu, Thompson, Newell)
	T 8-12.	T 39-52.		
288	L., Seleukos, Ptolemy, and Pyrrhos declare war on Demetrios.			
	T 8-12; T 13 (⊕).	T 49-52 (⊕).		
287	L. gains Amphipolis; Earthquake in Lysimacheia.			
	Minting paused. ⊕ (T13) transferred from Lysimacheia to Lampsakos (T53-54).	T 49-52 (⊕). ⊕ mints T53-54 using borrowed ⊕ dies.		

286	Demetrios takes cities in Ionia and Lydia, swiftly expelled by Agathocles, who chases him into Phrygia and then Cilicia.			
		T49-52; T53-61 minted sporadically throughout.		
285	L. gains Pella.			
	Minting resumes (T 15-18).	T49-52; T53-61.		Kios begins minting (Marinescu): M 1-8 (ϕ tetradrachms).
284				
	T 15-18.	T49-52; T53-61.		M 1-8.
283	L. arbitrates between Priene and Samos (Ager no.26).			
	T 15-18.	T49-52; T53-61.		M 1-8.
282	Pergamon under Philetaerus joins Seleukos I.			
	T 15-18.	T49-52; T53-61.		M 1-8.
281	Korupedion in February. L. dies. Seleukos takes Asia Minor, then is killed in Europe. Ptolemy Keraunos crowned in Lysimacheia, taking the fleet for himself. Lysimacheia, Lampsakos, and Parion loyalties are unclear.			Kios gains independence.
	Minting ends.			M1-8 may continue until 275.
280	Ptolemy Keraunos killed by Galatians in Greece. Northern League formed.			
	Estimated deposit date of hoards with Lampsakene Lysimachi: <i>IGCH</i> 1423 (Armenak), 1424, 1446, 1292, 1293, 138, 443, 444, and 448. One hoard with other Lysimachi: <i>IGCH</i> 1401.			M1-8.
279	Galatians invade Thrace and the Bosphoros, imposing tribute upon Byzantion.		Ptolemy II gives land in Mysia to Byzantion extending from Triglia to modern Yalova.	
		Lampsakos mints autonomous Alexanders (Price 1444-5).	Parion mints autonomous Alexanders (Price 1458-66)	M1-8.
278	Galatians take Lysimacheia. Antigonos Gonatas defeats them and they flee towards Byzantion.		Treaty between Northern League, Nicomedes I, and Galatians at Byzantion. Nicomedes allows Galatians to cross into Asia.	
		Price 1444-5.	Price 1458-66.	M1-8.
277			Nikomedes is sole master of Bithynia.	
		Price 1444-5.	Price 1458-66.	M1-8.
276				

			Byzantion erects statues at Olympia in honor of Antigonos Gonatas.	
		Price 1444-5.	Price 1458-66.	M1-8.
275		Minting of Alexanders ends.	Minting of Alexanders ends.	M1-8 end, if not before.
274				
273				
272				
271	Ptolemy sends navy against Galatians in Pontus? (or 250?)			
270				Byzantion begins minting Lysimachi.
				Kios mints M issues 9-19 (sometime between 270-260).
269				M9-19.
268				M9-19.
267				M9-19.
266				Ariobarzanes succeeds Mithridates III as King of Pontus.
				M9-19.
265			Parion begins minting around this time (S9-15)	M9-19.
264			S9-15	M9-19.
263			S9-15	M9-19.

262	Lysimacheia and Lampsakos come under Seleukid rule sometime before 261.			
			S9-15	M9-19.
261	Antiochus II succeeds his father. He mints coinage at Lysimacheia and Lampsakos during his reign (261-246 BCE).			
	Lysimacheia SC 481-483	Lampsakos SC 484-486	S9-15	M9-19.
260				
	SC 481-483	SC 484-486	S9-15	M9-19 -> M20-26 sometime between 260-late 250s.
259				
	SC 481-483	SC 484-486	S9-15 -> S1-8	M20-26.
258				
	SC 481-483	SC 484-486	S1-8.	M20-26.
257				
	SC 481-483	SC 484-486	S1-8.	M20-26.
256				Mithridates "II" succeeds Ariobarzanes as King of Pontus.
	SC 481-483	SC 484-486	S1-8.	M20-26.
255	Antiochos II threatens Byzantion. Northern League + Ptolemy II support Byzantion with triremes and funds; Antiochos backs off.			
	SC 481-483	SC 484-486		M20-26. M20 possibly to support Byzantion.
254			S1-8.	
	SC 481-483	SC 484-486		M20-26.
253				Bithynian "Succession War".
	SC 481-483	SC 484-486	S1-8.	M20-26 -> M27-44 in late 250s-early 240s.
252				
	SC 481-483	SC 484-486	S1-8.	M27-44.
251				
	SC 481-483	SC 484-486	S1-8. Minting ends.	M27-44.
250				
	SC 481-483	SC 484-486		M27-44.
249				

	<i>SC 481-483</i>	<i>SC 484-486</i>		M27-44.
248				
	<i>SC 481-483</i>	<i>SC 484-486</i>		M27-44. Minting ends in Kios.
247				
	<i>SC 481-483</i>	<i>SC 484-486</i>		
246	Antiochos II dies. His son Seleukos II Kallinikos succeeds him.			
245				
244				
243	Some time before 242, Parion comes under Seleukid control.			
242	Antiochus Hierax rebels in Asia Minor. During his reign (242-227 BCE), Hierax mints at Lysimacheia, Lampsakos, and Parion.			
	<i>SC 857-859</i>	<i>SC 846-856</i>	<i>SC 835-839</i>	

# Plates

Plate 2.1. Lysimacheia new types (issue 1)





Plate 2.2. Lysimacheia new types, T13 (issues 1-5)

9



10



11



12



13



14



15



16



Plate 2.3. Lysimacheia T13, Lampsakos T54 (issues 6-10)

17



18



19



20



21



22



23



24



35

Plate 2.4. Lampsakos T54 (issue 10)

25



26



27



28



29



30



31



32



Plate 2.5. Lampsakos T54, T53 (issues 10-12)

33



34



35



36



37



38



39



40



Plate 2.6. Kios M3 (issue 13)

41



42



43



44



45



47



48



49



Plate 2.7. Kios M4 (issues 14-15)

50



51



52



53



54



55



56



57



Plate 2.8. Kios M5-M6 (issues 16-17)

58



59



60



61



18

62



63



64



65



Plate 2.9. Kios M6-M7 (issues 17-18)

67



68



69



70



238

71



72



73



75





Plate 2.10. Kios M7-M8 (issues 18-19)

76



77



80



81



82



1709

83



84



1264

85



93

Plate 2.11. Parion S14, S13, S9 (issues 20-23)

86



87



88



89



90



91



92



93



Plate 2.12. Parion S9, S12, S11 (issues 23-25)

94



95



96



97



98



99



100



101



Plate 2.13. Parion S11, S10a-S10b (issues 25-27)

102



103



104



105



106



107



108



109



Plate 2.14. Parion S10b, S15, new types (issues 27-29)

110



111



112



113



114



115



116



117



Plate 2.15. Parion new types (issues 29-32)

118



119



120



121



122



123



124



125



Plate 2.16.



Plate 2.17.





Plate 2.18.

Q



R



S



T



U



V



1338

W



X



© <http://www.egb.fr>

Plate 2.19

Y



Z



**Plate 3.1.**

AR Hemidrachm of Parion ca. 400-300 BCE.  
 Künker Auction 402, Lot 683, 03/14/2024.  
 Obv: ΠΑ/ΠΙ. Bull standing left, head right.  
 Rev: Facing gorgoneion.  
*BMC 22.*



AE of Parion ca. 350-300 BCE.  
 Leu Numismatik Web Auction 27, Lot 1131,  
 09/09/2023.  
 Obv: Bull butting right; above, bunch of grapes.  
 Rev: Π-A/P-I. Altar of Parion in three-quarters  
 perspective; Amphora in foreground.  
*BMC 40.*



AR Half siglos/hemidrachm of Kios ca.350-  
 315 BCE.  
 CNG E-Auction 545, Lot 175, 08/30/2023.  
 Obv: Laureate head of Apollo right.  
 Rev: A/ΘΗΝΟ/ΔΩΡΟΣ. Prow left; grain ear to  
 right.  
*HGC 7, 553.*



AE of Kios ca.350-300 BCE.  
 Nomos Obolos Web Auction 20, Lot 12,  
 10/03/2021.  
 Obv: Laureate head of Mithras right.  
 Rev: Kantharos with two grape vines extending  
 from the bowl; all within wreath.  
*SNG Copenhagen 382.*

