

NOTAE NUMISMATICAE

ZAPISKI NUMIZMATYCZNE



Tom XIX

MUZEUM NARODOWE W KRAKOWIE
SEKCJA NUMIZMATYCZNA
KOMISJI ARCHEOLOGICZNEJ PAN
ODDZIAŁ W KRAKOWIE

Kraków 2024

NOTAE NUMISMATICAE

ZAPISKI NUMIZMATYCZNE

Tom XIX

MUZEUM NARODOWE W KRAKOWIE
SEKCJA NUMIZMATYCZNA
KOMISJI ARCHEOLOGICZNEJ PAN
ODDZIAŁ W KRAKOWIE

Kraków 2024

Komitet naukowy / Scientific Committee:

Prof. Peter van Alfen, Prof. Michael Alram, Prof. Aleksander Bursche, Prof. François de Callatay, Dr Karsten Dahmen, Prof. Georges Depeyrot, Dr Haim Gitler, Prof. Wiesław Kaczanowicz, Elżbieta Korczyńska, Prof. Katerini Liampi, Prof. Andrew Meadows, Prof. Mariusz Mielczarek, Dr Hab. Jiří Militký, Prof. Janusz A. Ostrowski, Prof. Maciej Salamon, Prof. Bernhard Weissner

Redakcja / Editorial Board:

Redaktor / Editor in Chief – Jarosław Bodzek

Zastępca redaktora / Associate Editor – Mateusz Woźniak

Sekretarze / Secretaries – Dorota Malarczyk, Anna Bochnak, Barbara Zając

Redaktor tematyczny / Theme Editor:

Peter van Alfen

Redaktor językowy / Linguistic Editor:

Peter van Alfen

Recenzenci / Reviewers:

Prof. Michele Asolati, Dr Hab. Bartosz Awianowicz, Dr Hab. Tomasz Bochnak, Dr Adam Degler, Dr Przemysław Dulęba, Dr Hab. Arkadiusz Dymowski, Prof. Svante Fischer, Dr Witold Garbaczewski, Prof. Koray Konuk, Prof. Stefan Krmniecek, Dr Hab. Kyrilo Myzgin, Prof. Marek Olbrycht, Dr Jan Pelsdonk, Dr Ruth Pliego, Dr Florian Matei-Popescu, Prof. Selene Psoma, Hugo Vanhoudt, Dr David Wigg-Wolf, Dr Hab. Michał Wojenka, Dr Hab. Marcin Wołoszyn, Prof. Bernhard Woytek, Dr Joanna Zagórska-Telega, Dr Bernward Ziehaus

Redaktorzy prowadzący / Managing Editors:

Barbara Zając, Dorota Malarczyk, Katarzyna Kwinta

Korekta / Proofreading:

Aeddan Shaw

Projekt graficzny i typografia / Graphic design and desk top publishing:

Luiza Berdak

Skład i łamanie / Typesetting and page layout:

Knight Press Dariusz F. Jasek

Adres redakcji / Address of the Editorial Office:

Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie

ul. Marszałka Józefa Piłsudskiego 12, 31-109 Kraków

tel. (+48) 12 433 58 50, e-mail: notae@mnk.pl

<http://mnk.pl/notae-numismaticae-zapiski-numizmatyczne-1>

Wyłącznie odpowiedzialność za przestrzeganie praw autorskich dotyczących materiału ilustracyjnego ponoszą autorzy tekstów.
Authors of the texts bear the sole responsibility for observing the copyright illustrations.

Wersją pierwotną *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne* jest wersja elektroniczna.

The electronic edition of the *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne* is treated as its original version.

© Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie i Autorzy, 2024

ISSN 1426-5435

SPIS TREŚCI / CONTENTS

- 9 Od redakcji
10 From the Editors

ARTYKUŁY / ARTICLES

- JAROSŁAW BODZEK
13 Remarks on a Unique Lycian Stater Struck in the Name of Autophradates
Uwagi na temat unikatowego licyjskiego statera bitego w imieniu Autofradatesa
- CATHARINE C. LORBER
35 Die Study of the Middle Facing Head Drachms of Thessalian Larissa
Studium stempli środkowej grupy drachm tesalskiej Larisy z wizerunkiem głowy w trzech-czwartych
- SELENE E. PSOMA
81 On a Motivation Clause of IOSPE P² 25 + 31
O klauzurze fundacyjnej IOSPE P² 25 + 31
- PRZEMYSŁAW DULĘBA
93 First Finds of Celtic Silver Coins from Lower Silesia
Pierwsze znaleziska srebrnych monet celtyckich z Dolnego Śląska
- TOMASZ BOCHNAK
107 A Celtic Stater Associated with the “Lesser Poland Coinage Group” from Site Kaliszany-Folwark 22, Discovered in Orłowiny, Opatów District, Świętokrzyskie Voivodeship
Celtycki stater „małopolskiej grupy menniczej” ze stanowiska Kaliszany-Folwark 22, odkryty w Orłowinach, powiat opatowski, województwo świętokrzyskie
- JAN BULAS, MAGDALENA OKOŃSKA-BULAS
125 The Rarest of Finds: A Discovery of a Kryspinów Type Stater from Charbinowice (Opatowiec Commune, Świętokrzyskie Voivodeship)
Najrzadsze znalezisko: odkrycie statera typu Kryspinów w Charbinowicach (gmina Opatowiec, województwo świętokrzyskie)
- WIOLETTA PAZOWSKA
139 A New Find of a Kryspinów-type Stater from the Archives of Piotr Adamkiewicz
Nowy egzemplarz statera typu Kryspinów z archiwum Piotra Adamkiewicza

- 149 ANDRZEJ ROMANOWSKI
The Function of Roman Coins in the Settlement Environment
of the Przeworsk Culture
Funkcja monet rzymskich w środowisku osadniczym kultury przeworskiej
- 183 KRZYSZTOF JARZĘCKI
An Ostrogothic Imitation of a Solidus of Anastasius I Found at Jeżewice
Ostrogockie naśladownictwo solida Anastazjusza I znalezione w Jeżewicach
- 193 MICHAŁ MOZYRSKI
Pouches of *Minimi* from Byzantine Egypt. How Should We Deal with Them?
Sakiewki minimi z Egiptu bizantyńskiego. Jak sobie z nimi radzić?
- 215 BARTOSZ AWIANOWICZ
How to Make a Rare Coin out of a Common One? Early Modern Forgeries
Using Original Ancient Coins
*Jak z monety popularnej zrobić rzadką? Wczesnonowożytnie fałszerstwa przy
użyciu oryginalnych monet antycznych*
- 229 BARTOSZ SZ. SZMONIEWSKI, DARIUSZ ROZMUS
A New Find of an Axe-like Iron Bar from Kroczyce, Zawiercie County,
Silesian Voivodeship
*Nowe znalezisko grzywny siekieropodobnej z Kroczyce, powiat zawierciański,
województwo śląskie*
- 243 DARIUSZ JASEK
A Manifestation of Friesland's Distinctiveness in its Late Medieval and Early
Modern Coinage
*Manifestacja odmienności Fryzji w jej późnośredniowiecznym
i wczesnonowożytnym mennictwie*
- 255 BARBARA ZAJĄC
Beginnings of the Paper Money Collection of the Numismatic Cabinet
of the National Museum in Krakow
*Początki kolekcji pieniądza papierowego Gabinetu Numizmatycznego Muzeum
Narodowego w Krakowie*

RECENZJE / REVIEWS

- 285 BARBARA ZAJĄC
BORIS CHRUBASIK, JUDITH K. SCHUTZ, ANDREW MEADOWS and
JAROSŁAW BODZEK (eds.), *Coinage in Imperial Space: Coins in the
Economy of the Achaemenid and Early Hellenistic World*, Phoenix 76 (2022),
Journal of the Classical Association of Canada, Toronto, ON 2023

- BARBARA ZAJĄC
- 292 ADAM DEGLER (ed.), *The Collection of Ancient Coins in Lviv Historical Museum / Колекція античних монет у Львівському історичному музеї / Zbiór monet antycznych w Lwowskim Muzeum Historycznym*, Yellow Point Publications, Wrocław–Lwów–Paryż 2023
- SZYMON JELLONEK
- 298 JIŘI MILITKÝ, PETR VESELÝ and LENKA VACINOVÁ, *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. Czech Republic. Vol. 1: The National Museum, Prague. Part 7: Seleucid Empire and Imitations, Syria, Phoenicia, Judaea, Mesopotamia, Commagene, Armenia and Arabia*, Prague 2023

KRONIKI / CHRONICLES

- MATEUSZ WOŹNIAK
- 303 *Kronika Gabinetu Numizmatycznego Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie (2023)*
- 310 *The Chronicle of the Numismatic Cabinet of the National Museum in Krakow (2023)*
- JAROSŁAW BODZEK
- 318 *Kronika Sekcji Numizmatycznej Komisji Archeologicznej Polskiej Akademii Nauk Oddział w Krakowie (2024)*
- 320 *The Chronicle of the Numismatic Section of the Archaeological Commission of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Krakow Branch (2024)*

NEKROLOG / OBITUARY

- WOLFGANG FISCHER-BOSSERT
- 325 NEVILLE KEITH RUTTER (1939–2024)
- 327 *Bibliography of Neville Keith Rutter*



Lech Kokociński. Photo by Piotr Idem
Lech Kokociński. Fot. Piotr Idem

Szanowni Państwo,

oddajemy w Państwa ręce tom XIX *Notae Numismaticae – Zapisków Numizmatycznych*. Zgodnie z przyjętymi przez nas zasadami wszystkie teksty publikujemy w językach kongresowych, z angielskimi i polskimi abstraktami. Zawartość obecnego tomu oraz tomy archiwalne są zamieszczone w formie plików PDF na stronie internetowej Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie (<https://mnk.pl/notae-numismaticae-zapiski-numizmatyczne-1>). Na stronie dostępne są ponadto wszelkie informacje ogólne o czasopiśmie oraz instrukcje dla autorów i recenzentów.

Bieżący Tom naszego czasopisma chcielibyśmy zadedykować Panu Mecenasowi Lechowi Kokocińskiemu, obchodzącemu w 2024 roku swoje 80-te urodziny. Lech Kokociński (ur. 1944), prawnik, sędzia i wieloletni pracownik Ministerstwa Kultury i Sztuki, z numizmatyką związany jest w zasadzie od zawsze. Przede wszystkim należy do grona najwybitniejszych kolekcjonerów numizmatów drugiej połowy XX i pierwszych dziesięcioleci XXI wieku. Jego zainteresowania kolekcjonerskie nie ograniczały się przy tym do wąskiego zakresu, lecz obejmowały szerokie spektrum obiektów: od monet antycznych poczynawszy, poprzez pieniądź papierowy, medale, aż po fałszerstwa monet i banknotów. Ważną część jego zbiorów stanowią starodruki i rękopisy numizmatyczne oraz inne obiekty o charakterze bibliofilskim, szczególnie *Lwowiana*. Mecenas Kokociński przez całe życie aktywnie włączał się w animowanie ruchu numizmatycznego. Od 1962 roku był członkiem Polskiego Towarzystwa Archeologicznego, od 1984 roku przewodniczył Sekcji Numizmatycznej Polskiego Towarzystwa Archeologicznego i Numizmatycznego, a w 1987 roku został Prezesem tej organizacji. W 1991 roku należał do założycieli Polskiego Towarzystwa Numizmatycznego i był jego pierwszym Prezesem, a następnie Prezesem Honorowym. Bliskie związki mecenasa Kokocińskiego z Gabinetem Numizmatycznym Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie sięgają XX wieku. Jest członkiem Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Muzeum im. Emeryka Hutten-Czapskiego (od 1996 r.), a w latach 2011–2015 pełnił funkcję członka Rady Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie. Wszedł też w skład Komitetu Honorowego projektu *Europejskie Centrum Numizmatyki Polskiej*, w ramach realizacji którego udało się otworzyć Muzeum im. Emeryka Hutten-Czapskiego w obecnym kształcie. Przede wszystkim jednak jest jednym z najważniejszych i najbardziej hojnych darczyńców na rzecz Muzeum. Wzbogacił zbiory Gabinetu Numizmatycznego o niemal 11 000 obiektów, w tym monety antyczne, bezprecedensową kolekcję pieniądza fałszywego, pieniądź papierowy i medale. Dodatkowo ofiarował do biblioteki Muzeum ponad 1000 pozycji różnych publikacji, starodruków i znakomite archiwalia związane z życiem i działalnością wybitnych numizmatyków czy towarzystw numizmatycznych, jak np. Związku Numizmatyków Lwowskich czy Towarzystwa Numizmatycznego w Krakowie. Z okazji Jubileuszu życzymy Lechowi Kokocińskiemu, naszemu Drogiemu Przyjacielowi, co najmniej 100 lat!

Redakcja

Dear Readers,

We are delighted to present you with volume 19 of *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne*. As is our policy, we publish all texts in the congress languages, with English and Polish abstracts. The contents of current volume and archive numbers are available as PDF files on the website of the National Museum in Krakow (<https://mnk.pl/notae-numismaticae-zapiski-numizmatyczne-1>). The website also provides all general information about the journal, along with guidelines for authors and reviewers.

We would like to dedicate the current volume of our journal to Mr Lech Kokociński, who celebrated his 80th birthday in 2024. Lech Kokociński (born in 1944), lawyer, judge and long-time employee of the Ministry of Culture and Art, has been involved in numismatics for practically all his life. Above all, he is one of the most outstanding numismatic collectors of the second half of the 20th century and the first decades of the 21st century. His collecting interests were not limited to a narrow range, but covered a wide spectrum of objects, starting with the ancient coins, through paper money and medals, to counterfeits of coins and banknotes. An important part of his collection consists of antique prints and numismatic manuscripts as well as other bibliophile objects, especially *Lvoviana*. Throughout his life, Kokociński has actively participated in promoting the numismatic movement. He was a member of the Polish Archaeological Society from 1962, chaired the Numismatic Section of the Polish Archaeological and Numismatic Society from 1984 and became its president in 1987. In 1991, he was one of the founders and first president of the Polish Numismatic Society, later becoming Honorary President. The close relationship between Mr Kokociński and the Numismatic Department of the National Museum in Krakow dates back to the 20th century. He is a member of the Emeryk Hutten-Czapski Museum Friends Society (since 1996), and in the years between 2011–2015 he was a member of the Council of the National Museum in Krakow. He also became a member of the Honorary *European Center of Polish Numismatics* project, which led to the opening of the Emeryk Hutten-Czapski Museum its present form. Above all, however, he is one of the most important and generous donors to the Museum. He enriched the collection of the Numismatic Cabinet with almost 11,000 objects, including ancient coins, an unprecedented collection of counterfeit money, paper money and medals. In addition, he donated more than 1,000 items to the museum library, including various publications, antique books, and valuable archive material related to the life and work of prominent numismatists or numismatic societies, such as the Union of Lviv Numismatists and the Numismatic Society in Krakow. On the occasion of this milestone birthday, we wish Lech Kokociński, our dear friend, at least 100 years!

The Editors

JAROSŁAW BODZEK

Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Institute of Archaeology

ORCID: 0000-0002-4272-4117

Remarks on a Unique Lycian Stater Struck in the Name of Autophradates

ABSTRACT: In 2021, Jonathan Kagan published a hoard (the so-called “The Unknown-Satrap Hoard”) containing an extremely interesting, previously unknown, unique Lycian coin (“Unknown Satrap Stater”) from the dynastic period. Based on the iconography, he considered it to be an issue minted by an uncertain Achaemenid satrap. Kagan dated the coin to the end of the 5th century BC, i.e. earlier than the well-known Lycian Tissaphernes issue. However, he was unable to read the inscriptions properly but the legend was actually deciphered a year later by Wilhelm Möseler. On this basis, he attributed the coin to the famous Achaemenid military commander and satrap Autophradates. At the same time, he dated the coin in question to the period after 370 BC (precisely 361 BC). The aim of this paper is to verify previous findings regarding the dating of the mentioned coin and the context of its minting.

KEY WORDS: Lycia, Autophradates, Xanthos, stater, Iranian horseman motif

ABSTRAKT: *Uwagi na temat unikatowego licyjskiego statera bitego w imieniu Autofradatesa*

W 2021 roku Jonathan Kagan opublikował skarb (tzw. „Skarb Nieokreślonego Satrapy”) zawierający niezwykle interesującą, nieznaną wcześniej, unikatową monetę licyjską („Stater Nieokreślonego Satrapy”) z okresu dynastycznego. Na podstawie ikonografii uznał, że jest to moneta wybita przez nieokreślonego achemenidzkiego satrapę. Kagan datował monetę na koniec V wieku p.n.e., czyli wcześniej niż datowana jest znana licyjska emisja Tissafernesa. Nie był jednak w stanie poprawnie odczytać legendy. Tę rozszyfrował rok później Wilhelm Möseler, który na jej podstawie przypisał monetę słynnemu achemenidzkiemu dowódcy wojskowemu i satrapi Autofradatesowi. Jednocześnie, datował omawianą monetę na okres po

roku 370 p.n.e. (dokładnie na 361 p.n.e.). Celem artykułu jest weryfikacja dotychczasowych ustaleń dotyczących datowania wspomnianej monety oraz kontekstu jej wybicia.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: Licja, Autofradates, Ksantos, stater, motyw irańskiego kawalerzysty

In 2021 Jonathan Kagan published an article devoted to the coinage and political arrangements in ancient Lycia in the second half of the 5th and the first decade of the 4th century BC.¹ His analysis was partly based on an unpublished hoard containing Lycian and other coins, the hiding of which he dated to approximately the second half of the 390's BC. Kagan called it "the Unknown Satrap Hoard" because of an unpublished, unique coin, which constituted part of it.² He correctly recognized the coin as belonging to an issue struck by a Persian satrap.

The coin in question is a stater weighing 8.39 g, struck according to the so-called light Lycian standard. On the obverse it bears a depiction of a man on horseback wearing an Iranian cavalryman's uniform facing left, and on the reverse a personage in similar attire sitting on a chair, also facing left (Pl. 1.1). Kagan recognized the reverse personage as an Amazon. Both the obverse and reverse types are accompanied by legends written in Lycian script. However, Kagan was not able to read the blurred obverse and reverse legends properly apart from some characters.³

Basing on the general dating of the hoard, his ideas on the fabric and incuse square evolution of the Lycian coins of the 5th and 4th centuries BC, Kagan dated the coin in question to the end of 5th century BC, claiming that it was at least 5 years earlier than the famous Lycian Tissaphernes stater (dated usually ca. 400–395 BC).⁴

A year later Wilhelm Müseler republished the coin in question in an article devoted to the interference of foreign powers in Lycia in the 5th and 4th centuries BC.⁵ First of all, thanks to his experience in studying Lycian coins, he was able to read the reverse legend correctly as WATAPRADAT which he rightly recognized as a Lycian version of the Persian personal name *Vāta-Fradāta, better known in its Hellenized form of Autophradates.⁶

¹ KAGAN 2021.

² *Ibidem*: 28, no. 13; 58f, Fig. 29: "the stater of Unknown Satrap".

³ *Ibidem*: 58f.

⁴ *Ibidem*: 25; on the traditional dating of the stater cf. for example HURTER 1979: 101; ALRAM 1986: 105; ZAHLE 1989: 172; BODZEK 1994: 116; MILDENBERG 1998: 270, no. 24; MÜSELER 2015: 24; on possibility of an alternative dating, cf. BODZEK 2019: 24f.

⁵ MÜSELER 2022: 25ff.

⁶ *Ibidem*: 26. Henceforth, in place of the "Unknown Satrap Hoard" and "Unknown Satrap Stater", I will use the terms "Autophradates Hoard" and "Autophradates Stater", respectively.

Written sources have preserved information about three individuals living during the Achaemenid period and bearing the name Autophradates.⁷ The first one (hereafter Autophradates I) held the position of satrap of Lydia from ca. 392 to ca. 388 BC and again from ca. 380 to ca. 355 BC.⁸ Another Autophradates (II) was satrap of Troas in the 30s of the 4th century BC. After the death of Memnon of Rhodes, he co-commanded the Persian naval counteroffensive in the Aegean in 333–332 with Pharnabazos the Younger (Arr. *Anab.* II, 1–2).⁹ Finally, the third person by this name served during the time of Darius III and Alexander the Great as satrap of Tapuri and Amardi on the Caspian Sea (Arr. *Anab.* III, 23, 7; 24, 3; Curt. VI 5, 21).¹⁰ This Autophradates (III) fought at Gaugamela on the side of the Persian king, but kept his satrapy after the Macedonian conquest. However, he rebelled against Alexander, was defeated and executed at Pasargadae.

Due to the timing and location of their activity, neither Autophradates II nor III could have mint the coin in question.¹¹ In effect, this enabled Müseler to attribute the coin to the satrap of Lydia (Autophradates I).

Less successful was Müseler's attempt to read an even more blurred obverse legend most likely containing the name of the mint. In this case, only a few letters are literally legible: P and P in the upper right corner, perhaps E in the upper left corner, and Λ under the horse's belly.¹² In the case of the latter, however, it is uncertain whether it is part of the legend or one of the linear symbols found on many Lycian issues.¹³ On the basis of the legible letters, Müseler cautiously suggested that the coin could have been minted at Araxa (*Araththi*).¹⁴ It is difficult to settle this question conclusively, but however valid Müseler's hypothesis may be, at this stage one cannot fully rule out reading the mint name as *arñnahe* i.e. identifying it as Xanthos (Lycian *Arñna*). The minting of the aforementioned coin in the main city

⁷ In general, see KAERST 1896: col. 2607; STÄHELIN 1918; DANDAMAYEV 1987; BRIANT 2002: see index; KLINKOTT 2005: see index.

⁸ Cf. STÄHELIN 1918; DANDAMAYEV 1987: 1; WEISKOPF 1989: 38ff; DEBORD 1999: see index; BRIANT 2002: see index.

⁹ KAERST 1896: col. 2607, no. 1; BERVE 1926 II: no. 188; DANDAMAYEV 1987: 2; DEBORD 1999: see index; KLINKOTT 2005: 333f. The further literature there.

¹⁰ KAERST 1896: col. 2607, no. 2; BERVE 1926 I: 265, II: no. 189; DANDAMAYEV 1987: 3; KLINKOTT 2005: 128, note 73.

¹¹ It is generally accepted that after the fall of Perikle (380–362) and the takeover of Lycia by Mausollos, the so-called dynastic coinage came to an end in the country (cf. HILL 1897: xxi, xlv; MØRKHOLM 1964: 65–66; KEEN 1998: 174; TIETZ 2009: 169; KOLB 2018: 145f). The activity of Autophradates II comes too late (30s of the 4th century BC). In the case of Autophradates III, on the other hand, both the period of activity and its location (northwestern Iran) obviously rule out the possibility of his minting in Lycia.

¹² MÜSELER 2022: 25f.

¹³ *Ibidem*.

¹⁴ MÜSELER 2022: 26, note 62.

of Lycia would be quite natural for a high ranking Persian dignitary. After all, an earlier issue of Tissaphernes was minted at Xanthos.

Müseler also identified the seated figure depicted on the reverse of the stater differently, recognizing it as a man dressed in Iranian equestrian costume, holding a bow and possibly an arrow. At the same time, he pointed to analogies in the image of a similar sitting figure on coins struck by Tarkumuwa/Datames in Tarsos in Cilicia (Pl. 1.3) and in a seated Persian, most likely Autophradates himself, depicted in the audience scene on the west side of the Payava Sarcophagus (Pl. 2).¹⁵ While the reading of the legend proposed by Müseler, and thus the attribution of the coin to the satrap of Lydia, and the interpretation of the figure on the reverse as a man in Iranian equestrian costume, are correct, it is worth asking whether he is also right in his proposal of the dating of the stater.

Müseler based his proposal on its attribution to Autophradates I and on a critique of Kagan's arguments. His thesis can be summarized by the following points:

1. The Historical Argument

On the territory of Lycia, the activity of Autophradates I is epigraphically attested to the late 360s BC.¹⁶ The attribution of the coin to this satrap, in conjunction with the epigraphic evidence, consequently led Müseler to redate the coin to the period after 370 BC, i.e. exactly to the ca. mid-360s or even ca. 361 BC.¹⁷ Such a dating was part of his presented concept of the political history of Lycia in the 5th and 4th centuries BC.

2. The Iconographic Argument

As already mentioned, Müseler highlighted the similarity of the depiction of the male figure on the reverse to the image of a seated satrap in the audience scene on the Payava Sarcophagus.¹⁸ In addition, as an analogy he cited the depiction of a seated figure in Iranian equestrian costume holding a bow and arrow on coins minted in Cilicia on behalf of Tarkumuwa/Datames.¹⁹ The former testimony was to prove that the seated figure on the Autophradates coin should be identified as

¹⁵ MÜSELER 2022: 26.

¹⁶ Autophradates is mentioned in the inscriptions on a grave at ancient Sebeda (Bayindir Liman) = TAM I, 61 and on the Payava Sarcophagus in Xanthos = TAM I, 40. Content analysis of these inscriptions KEEN 1998: 171f; SCHÜRR 2012: 26ff; KOLB 2018: 118, 144, 426.

¹⁷ MÜSELER 2022: 17f, 26.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*: 26. On Payava Sarcophagus and the audience scene see DEMARGNE 1974: 61ff, especially 78ff, Pl. XXX.1 and 42.2, 43.1; ZAHLE 1979: 328, Cat. 18; BORCHHARDT 1980: 11f; BRUNS-ÖZGAN 1987: 286f, Cat. S28; KOLB 2018: 638ff, especially 641f and Fig. 229. The further literature there.

¹⁹ MÜSELER 2022: 26. On the Datames issue, cf. HILL 1900: 168f, nos. 32–34, Pl. XXIX.11–13; BABELON 1910: nos. 609–614; SNG VON AULOCK: 5951–5952; SNG Cop.: 295–298; MOYSEY 1986: Pl. 5.51–59; SNG LEVANTE: 85–88; SNG FRANCE 2: 282–289; DEBORD 1999: Pl. X.2; CASABONNE 2000b: Pl. VII.13; LE RIDER 2001: 211, Pl. VII.1; CASABONNE 2004: 174, Series 2, Pl. 3.23; BODZEK 2011: 274f, Pl. VII.3.

the satrap himself, while arguing for its dating to the 60s of the 4th century BC. This dating was also meant to be supported by its similarity to the image on the Tarkumuwa coin.²⁰

3. The Numismatic Argument

In order to date the coin to the 360s BC, Mūseler had to reject the dating of the Autophradates Hoard as a whole. Recall that, according to Kagan, the hoard should have been hidden around 395–390 BC. Since shifting the date of its hiding to the 360s BC is difficult, if not impossible, given the composition of this hoard, Mūseler questioned the validity of the reconstruction of the deposit.²¹ He concluded that there was insufficient reason to consider a set of coins seen on the market some 20 years earlier as coming from a single hoard. In doing so, he criticized Kagan's proposed concept of the chronological development of coin flans in Lycia in the 5th and early 4th centuries BC.²² According to Mūseler, the different fabric of Lycian coin flans was not related to their chronology. Based on these arguments, he was able to date the timing of Autophradates' coin to the 60s of the 4th century BC.

Despite the elaborate line of argumentation, the dating proposed by Mūseler seems too late to me. My counter-arguments are presented below.

1. The Historical Argument

The attribution of the stater to Autophradates I is indeed the only possible solution. At the same time, his activity in Lycia is confirmed through epigraphic sources to the late 360s BC, which is a very strong argument for such a dating of the coin. On the other hand, however, Autophradates' career in the western satrapies began much earlier, in the late 390s BC. According to Theopompos (FGrH 115, fr. 103), around 392 BC Autophradates, as satrap of Lydia, co-commanded with the satrap of Karia, Hekatomnos, an expedition against Euagoras I (411–374), king of Salamis in Cyprus.²³ Again, the sources mention him in connection with fighting against unspecified rebels in the late 380s BC probably somewhere in southwestern Asia Minor (Nep. *Datames*, 2.1).²⁴ Around 370 BC Autophradates acted on the king's orders against the rebellious Datames, and then waged war with varying fortunes against various revolting satraps and other rebels (during the so-called "Great Satrap Revolt").²⁵ At one point he himself rebelled against the king but quickly came back to his service. Eventually the revolts ended and Autophradates pacified rebellious

²⁰ Mūseler has dated the Tarkumuwa/Datames issue in the mid-60s of the 4th century BC (2022: 26, note 63).

²¹ MÜSELER 2022: 14ff.

²² *Ibidem*.

²³ Cf. STÄHELIN 1918; DANDAMAYEV 1987; WEISKOPF 1989: 38; BRIANT 2002: 648ff.

²⁴ Cf. STÄHELIN 1918; JUDEICH 1892: 190f; WEISKOPF 1989: 39; BRIANT 2002: 650. See also SEKUNDA 1988: 36ff.

²⁵ On the revolt cf. WEISKOPF 1989; on activity of Autophradates in it cf. *Ibidem*; STÄHELIN 1918; DANDAMAYEV 1987; BRIANT 2002: 356ff.

Lycia, among others, around 361 BC.²⁶ Later, in the mid-350s he fought against Orontes (Polyaen. VII 14, 3f).²⁷

There is no consensus on the function that Autophradates I took during these events. Some scholars, following the account of the written sources, believe that he served as a satrap of Lydia throughout his activities²⁸ while others disagree with this interpretation.²⁹ Weiskopf thought that Autophradates assumed the function of satrap only after the failed attempt to re-conquer Egypt by the Persians, i.e. after about 374 BC.³⁰ Before that, he was believed to be simply serving as a military officer. Regardless of which hypothesis is correct, whether as a satrap or as a co-commander of an army, both during the preparations for the expedition against Euagoras I and when fighting against the rebels mentioned by Nepos, Autophradates probably used local human resources, i.e., those from Asia Minor.³¹ This could also have applied to Lycia.³² The Lycians had previously made themselves known as valuable allies of the Persians as evidenced by the Inscribed Pillar and the issuance of staters in the name of Tissaphernes.³³ As further evidence of cooperation one could also add the “Medizing” iconography of some of the coins minted by the local dynasts.³⁴ In addition, it is worth noting that the expedition against Euagoras was prepared in cooperation with Hekatomnos, the satrap of Karia, i.e. a country neighboring Lycia, and that one of the possibilities for identifying the unnamed rebels against whom Autophradates I fought along with Datames are the Pisidians.³⁵ Thus, we are again dealing with a land that neighbored Lycia. Even if this identification is incorrect, the rebels were probably inhabitants of some other land in western Asia Minor.³⁶

The likelihood of Autophradates I’s earlier-than-360s activity in the area of Lycia in terms of mustering local forces would be even greater if Weiskopf’s other hypothesis linking Autophradates’ origins to a land possession in western Asia Minor,

²⁶ KEEN 1998: 170ff; KOLB 2018: 143f.

²⁷ Cf. STÄHELIN 1918.

²⁸ Cf. JUDEICH 1892: 119, note 1; DANDAMAYEV 1987.

²⁹ Cf. KRUMBHOLZ 1883: 66; WEISKOPF 1989: 39f.

³⁰ WEISKOPF 1989: 39f; cf. KRUMBHOLZ 1883: 66.

³¹ Compare the list of Autophradates’ forces given by Nepos (*Datames*, 8, 1-2), among which were numerous troops composed of local peoples from Asia Minor. Generally, the forces of satraps or Achaemenid military commanders were based in part on local contingents; cf. KLINKOTT 2005: 422.

³² According to Nepos’ quoted account, there were no Lycians among the contingents making up Autophradates’ army. However, this does not mean that they did not take part in the satrap’s earlier military actions.

³³ The Lycians had already taken part in Xerxes’ great expedition against the Greek poleis in 480 BC. The Lycian contingent was commanded by Kybernis, son of Kossikas (Hdt. 7.98). On Tissaphernes activity in Lycia cf. TAM I: 44c; KEEN 1998: 136ff; KOLB 2018: 136f. On the Tissaphernes’ stater see below.

³⁴ First of all, issues with the “tiarate head” motif. On this topic, cf. MØRKHOLM and ZAHLE 1976: 70, 79ff; ZAHLE 1982; IDEM 1989: 175f; IDEM 1991: 150; further literature there.

³⁵ Cf. SEKUNDA 1988: 39.

³⁶ Cf. WEISKOPF 1989: 39.

probably in Karia, is accepted.³⁷ However, even if the latter hypothesis is rejected, the other arguments indicated above do not, in my opinion, allow us to dismiss the possibility of Autophradates I's activity in Lycia, whether in preparation for the expedition against Euagoras I or against the unnamed rebels mentioned by Nepos. It is perhaps worth noting additionally that the mobilization of the Lycian soldiers, was not necessarily linked to the physical presence of the Achaemenid dignitary in Lycia. He could have acted through his agents, lower-ranking officers, or through allied Lycian dynasts or military officers.

2. The Numismatic Argument

The reading of the issuer's name and his identification with Autophradates I automatically refuted Kagan's proposed dating of the coin to at least 5 years earlier than the famous Tissaphernes' stater. The latter could not have been minted later than 395 BC. The beginning of Autophradates I activity is confirmed by written sources to be in the late 390s BC, a few years after Tissaphernes' death.³⁸ Thus, the Autophradates Stater, must be dated at least five years later than Kagan proposed at the earliest to around 390 BC. This, of course, does not change that still the "Autophradates Hoard" can theoretically still be dated to ca. 390 BC, i.e. before the accepted date of the Tissaphernes Hoard hiding (385/380 BC). The basic question that arises is whether Müseler was right to question the authenticity of the Autophradates Hoard?

It is difficult to argue with the argument of the unreliability of information on a hoard composition obtained from a coin dealer. Of course, one can only be certain of their composition in the case of deposits unearthed as a result of legitimate, well-documented archaeological research. However, we are not dealing with such a situation here. On the other hand, the method of reconstructing hoards on the basis of information obtained from the antiquarian market, including directly from coin dealers, has been used successfully for a long time. As examples reconstructed in this way, one can mention the Hekatomnos and the Pixodaros hoards, both very important for understanding the minting in Asia Minor in the 4th century BC.³⁹ In addition, other elements such as the degree of wear of the coins, patina, etc. may be important arguments for the integrity of the Autophradates Hoard. These factors were presumably taken into account by such an experienced numismatist as Kagan. Thus, rejecting *a priori* the authenticity of the Autophradates Hoard seems too hasty.

³⁷ WEISKOPF 1989: 38–39.

³⁸ Cf. above note 23.

³⁹ On the Hekatomnos Hoard see ASHTON et AL. 2002b; on the Pixodaros Hoard cf. ASHTON et AL. 2002a; the further literature there.

Two further key questions arise at this point. The first is whether Kagan's analysis of the hoard's chronology is correct, while the second is if the Autophradates coin should be considered an intrusion in this deposit. I do not want to enter into a detailed discussion of the differences between the chronologies of the Lycian dynasts proposed by Müsseler and Kagan here, as this goes beyond the scope of this article. Suffice to say that, regardless of the aforementioned differences, the composition of the hoard seems to be acceptable, and the chronology of the included coins points to its hiding between ca. 390 and 385 BC.⁴⁰ This is a dating very close to that of the Tissaphernes Hoard. As mentioned above, the composition and dating of the hoard do not coincide with Müsseler's proposed dating of the Autophradates coin. Is it therefore an intrusion in the hoard, should it be removed from its composition and thus dated to the late 360s BC? Or, on the contrary, is Müsseler's chronological proposal wrong and the coin was minted earlier and matches the hoard's chronology? In the absence of certainty about the composition of the hoard and the chronology of the Autophradates Stater, its uniqueness, and thus the impossibility of linking it through dies or even in terms of stylistic similarity with other Lycian coins, numismatic research alone will not help answer this question.

3. The Iconographic Argument

It seems that some arguments as to the dating of the coin under discussion can be provided by its iconography. On the obverse of the Autophradates' Stater, analogously to the Xanthian coin of Tissaphernes, a horseman in Iranian cavalry costume is depicted. The motif of the Iranian horseman (hereafter IH) is one of the "interregional" monetary types used in the "coinages of the satraps" during the Achaemenid period.⁴¹ It is also one of the most interesting motifs due to its wide geographical coverage, the possibility of linking coins bearing it with historical personalities, and numerous analogies known in both small-scale and monumental art.⁴² There are three known basic varieties of the motif in coinage:

Type IH1 – a rider on a walking or trotting horse, holding reins, a flower, a spear or a whip.

⁴⁰ This is the dating I accept on the assumption that the Autophradates coin was part of the hoard. If not, the date of the hiding of the hoard could be somewhat earlier, as Kagan suggested (cf. KAGAN 2021: 26).

⁴¹ On coins of the satraps, cf. recently HARRISON 1982; BODZEK 2011; IDEM 2014a; IDEM 2022; ALRAM 2012; TUPLIN 2014. The further literature there. On the concept of "interregional types" in Achaemenid coinage see BODZEK 2011: 183; IDEM 2014a: 66–67.

⁴² The "Persian Horseman" (Personally, I prefer to call it the "Iranian Horseman") motif in Achaemenid art was examined by A. Farkas (1969) and more recently by C. Tuplin (2010: 104ff; coinage: 106–107); on its typology in coinage see BODZEK 2004; IDEM 2011: 241ff; IDEM (forthcoming A); cf. also NIESWANDT 2012; MÜSELER 2015.

Type IH2 – a cavalryman at a gallop, brandishing a spear.⁴³

Type IH3 – a rider at a gallop holding a sword (?) or a short scepter (?) upright.⁴⁴

The rider depicted on the Autophradates' coin belongs to Type IH1. This type only appeared on coins minted in Cilicia and Lycia. It was introduced into the repertoire of monetary iconography in the first of the mentioned lands, the coins bearing it were minted exclusively in Tarsos and generally between ca. 430 and 395 BC.⁴⁵ The different series of Tarsiot coins represent various variants of the described type differing in the details of the costume, the attributes of the rider, the gait of the horse, etc.⁴⁶ The motif was copied to the iconographic repertoire of the Lycian coinage from Tarsiot coins in the late 5th or early 4th century BC.⁴⁷ This certainly occurred no later than 395 BC and the image was definitely not based on the latest Tarsos prototypes.⁴⁸ Comparing the motif of the horseman on Tissaphernes' and Autophradates' staters, despite some differences such as the rider to the right – rider to the left, it is possible to advance the thesis that the image of the cavalryman on the coin of the second of the Persian dignitaries is probably modeled or at least inspired by the depiction on the staters of the first one. Another possible way of explaining the choice of the horseman's motif is the direct copying of the image from the coins of Tarsos. In my opinion, this is less likely, although not out of the question. On the other hand, the possibility of copying the motif of the horseman in Type I from the iconographic repertoire of other categories of artworks, such as monumental reliefs, textiles or gems seems to me by far the least likely.⁴⁹ The first hypothesis is supported primarily by the unusual nature and meaning of the Iranian horseman motif in Lycian coinage. As mentioned, it only appeared in Lycian minting once before Autophradates, on the Tissaphernes' stater. In my opinion, the satrap's choice of the motif was not random, and can be explained by more than the tendency, characteristic of the Lycian minting, to copy monetary types from coinages of other

⁴³ This is the most widespread variant; cf. BODZEK 2011: 242; IDEM (forthcoming A).

⁴⁴ The variant is known solely in Samarian coinage; cf. BODZEK 2004; IDEM 2011: 242; IDEM (forthcoming A).

⁴⁵ Traditionally, the dating of the type described is based on the findings of O. Casabonne (2000b; 2004). New material that has appeared in recent years seems to indicate that the dating of the introduction of the described type can be moved some years back; cf. ELLIS-EVANS, WARTENBERG and KAGAN 2022: 277; BODZEK (forthcoming B).

⁴⁶ Cf. BODZEK 2011: 243ff, Pls. II.4; XII.1–2, 4, 6, 8, 12–14; IDEM 2015: Pl. 2.5a–5c (horseman holding flower); IDEM 2011: Pl. XII.15–16 (horseman holding whip), 10–11 (spear). See also: NIESWANDT 2012: 84ff; MÜSELER 2015; BODZEK (forthcoming B). On a general classification of Tarsiot issues, see CASABONNE 2004.

⁴⁷ HURTER 1979: 101.

⁴⁸ *Ibidem*; BODZEK 2019.

⁴⁹ Monumental reliefs with the image of a horseman wearing Iranian cavalry garb are known from Lycia cf. Western frieze of the Limyra Heroon – BORCHHARDT 1976: 49ff, Figs. 12, 13, Pls. 23.4, 24.1–5. Generally on a horseman motif in Lycia see ZAHLE 1983: 57f; IDEM 1989: 172, note 9.

regions. Tissaphernes used the IH motif twice in his minting activity. Once in the case of the discussed Xanthos issue and the second time while minting a series of AEs in North-Western Asia Minor, probably at Adramytteion. In the latter case, however, the Type IH2 was used.⁵⁰ The double use of the IH motif by Tissaphernes indicates its special significance for the issuer. This is because the motif was part of the iconographic repertoire recalling the ideology of the nobility of the Achaemenid state and well understood throughout the country.⁵¹ Moreover, the choice of this particular motif may have been the result of a desire to distinguish the Tissaphernes' coins from other Lycian coins of the time with "Medizing" iconography. The dominant motif among the latter was the "tiarate head" used by several dynasts like Kherei, Ddenevele or Artumpara.⁵² The use of the motif of the IH, unusual for Lycian minting and containing an appropriate ideological message, distinguished the special stater issue, which was struck in the name of a high-ranking Persian dignitary.⁵³ Probably the same motivation was behind the choice of the horseman motif, but also, as discussed below, the outstanding type of reverse, in the case of Autophradates' coins.

Whether one accepts the hypothesis of copying the IH motif from Tissaphernes' coins or directly from a Tarsos issue, one must ask how long the prototypes, i.e. potential sources of inspiration for the engraver working for Autophradates, were in circulation. The already mentioned Tissaphernes Hoard, which provides direct evidence of the circulation of both Tissaphernes and Tarsiot coins in Lycia, was probably hidden around 385/380 BC.⁵⁴ As indicated by the compilation prepared by O. Casabonne, the hiding of other hoards containing the Cilician coins of interest is dated similarly.⁵⁵ To summarize: there would be a gap of about thirty years between the time of minting of both the last Cilician issues with the IH motif and the Xanthian coins of Tissaphernes, struck no later than 395 BC, and the time of issue of the Autophradates' staters suggested by Müseler. If, on the other hand, we assume that the general circulation time of Lycian (Tissaphernes' stater) and Cilician (Tarsos issues) coins with IH motif ended around 380 BC, based on the date of hiding of the Tissaphernes Hoard as well as other hoards containing the coins of Tarsos with

⁵⁰ On the Tissaphernes bronze coins with horseman type, see: CAHN 1985: 588, no. 3, Fig. 4; IDEM 1989: 99, Pl. 3.1; STAUBER 1996: 255f, A–B; KLEIN 1999: no. 255, Pl. IX; DEBORD 1999: Pl. I. 13; BODZEK 2011: 248f, Pl. II.2; IDEM 2012: 109, Fig. 3; IDEM 2014a: Fig. 19; NIESWANDT 2012: 94, Tissaphernes Typus 2.

⁵¹ Cf. FARKAS 1969; TUPLIN 2010: 104f; BODZEK 2011: 241f.

⁵² On this topic, see *inter alia*: SCHWABACHER 1968; MØRKHOLM and ZAHLE 1976: 76ff; ZAHLE 1982; IDEM 1990a; IDEM 1990b; BODZEK 1994; there the further literature.

⁵³ Cf. BODZEK 2019: 24.

⁵⁴ HURTER 1979: 98f.

⁵⁵ CASABONNE 2000b: 27ff. See also commentary LEVANTE 1994: 8; CASABONNE 2000b: 36. Such a statement is unlikely to be changed by a hoard spotted on the antiquarian market in the early 2020s – see TAHBERER 2021; IDEM 2022a; IDEM 2022b.

Type IH1, the hiatus would only be about 20 years. Is it feasible to consider that the IH motif of Type H1, generally rare in Lycian minting and perhaps even unique, would be utilized after a gap of 30 or 20 years? In my opinion, it is not. It is more likely that the motif was employed at a time when earlier coins with it were still fairly commonly left in circulation. As for the IH motif during the period we are talking about (i.e. 360s BC), the iconography of satrap coins minted in other lands of Asia Minor is dominated by variant IH2 (the horseman brandishing a spear).⁵⁶ Why then did Autophradates not choose this popular variant as a monetary type?

A few remarks must also be made about the reverse image. As mentioned, Mūseler pointed out as an analogy for the seated figure in Iranian cavalry garb a similar personage depicted on the coins of Tarkumuwa (Pl. 1.5), minted in the 70s or 60s of the 4th century BC,⁵⁷ as well as the figure on the Payava Sarcophagus (Pl. 2), identified with Autophradates.⁵⁸ Although in general the indicated similarity is correct, these depictions differ from the image on Autophradates' coinage in certain details. Both the figure on the Tarkumuwa coin and the satrap on the relief from Payava Sarcophagus are depicted in a rather rigid pose, with both legs bent at the knees at a 90° angle and the shins parallel to them. In the case of the Autophradates coin, one of the legs is bent at the knee at 90°, but the bending angle of the other is much greater, and the limb itself is extended forward. Admittedly, a detailed iconographic analysis is beyond the scope of this article, but it can be mentioned that both compositional solutions are known from other monetary and non-monetary representations.⁵⁹ An image of a figure seated on a throne, holding a bow, and dressed in Iranian cavalry garb, one very similar to that on the Tarkumuwa coins, was found on coins minted at Tarsos in Cilicia, probably in the late 90s and/or 80s of the 4th century BC and attributed to Tiribazos (Pl. 1.7).⁶⁰ The similarity between the depictions on the coins of Tiribazos and Tarkumuwa is very high, and to some extent the image on the former's coins can be taken as a prototype for the engraver working on the dies of the later issue. However, the arrangement of the legs is not identical in both cases. Although the right leg of the figure on Tiribazos coin is bent at the knee at 90° and the shank pointed perpendicular to the ground line, the

⁵⁶ Cf. BODZEK (forthcoming B).

⁵⁷ Cf. SNG FRANCE 2: 282–289; CASABONNE 2000b: Pl. VII.13; IDEM 2004: 174, 2nd series, Pl. 3.23; BODZEK 2011: 274, Pl. VII.3; on the Tarkumuwa minting, see MOYSEY 1989: 117 (here Tarkumuwa as Datames); CASABONNE 2004: 179; depending on the sequence of issues adopted and the resulting dating proposed by these authors, the minting of the series with a seated figure in Iranian cavalry garb can be assumed to be around the mid-370s or the first half of the 360s; cf. summary of BODZEK 2011: 96ff. According to Mūseler the Tarkumuwa/Datames issue should be dated in the mid-60s of the 4th century BC (2022: 26, note 63).

⁵⁸ In this case, of course, the representation differs from that of the coin with the attributes held by the satrap.

⁵⁹ On the motif of a figure sitting on a throne in Iranian cavalry garb on coins, see BODZEK 2011: 274ff; cf. also REGLING 1931: 12ff.

⁶⁰ SNG LEVANTE 66; DEBORD 1999: Pl. IX.6; CASABONNE 2004: Pl. 4, 5; BODZEK 2011: Pl. VI.12.

left leg is depicted bent at a much smaller angle with the shank firmly retracted and the foot visible under the chair. This arrangement of the legs can therefore be called transitional between that depicted on the Autophradates coin and that on the Tarkumuwa stater. Closer to the image on the Tarkumuwa coin, though depicted in a slightly more frontal view, is the Persian on the 5th century BC-dated gold ring of Athenades, excavated in Crimea and currently housed in the Hermitage.⁶¹ A seated figure in Iranian cavalry garb, a Persian or a Scythian, is also depicted on a Kyzikos stater dated to around the first half of the 4th century BC (Pl. 1.9).⁶² In this case, however, due to the unusual depiction of a figure sitting on a tuna, the arrangement of the legs is slightly different. As for the image on the Autophradates coin, a very similar arrangement of the legs can be found in the case of the image of the seated Persian figure on the reverse of an obol or hemiobol, probably dating to the period of the decline of Achaemenid rule (Pl. 1.8),⁶³ and on the reverses, of obviously much later, Parthian coins.⁶⁴ A seated Persian on a Greco-Persian cornelian pear-shaped pendant is also depicted in a very similar way (Pl. 1.6).⁶⁵ In conclusion, it is worth pointing out that both variants of the leg arrangement appear to be well rooted in the iconography of the second half of the 5th century BC and the 4th century BC. Dating the analogy, therefore, will not help in determining the time of minting the Autophradates coin. However, it is worth looking at how the problem of the seated figure's leg arrangement was solved for other Lycian issues of the dynastic period and there are not many options available here. The seated Athena was depicted on the reverses of coins minted in the name of some dynasts, Kheriga, Kherei and Artumpara. On the Kheriga staters minted at Xanthos around 440/430 BC, the arrangement of Athena's legs is very similar to that of the Autophradates coinage (Pl. 1.10).⁶⁶ On the Kherei and Artumpara coins dated respectively 430–410 or 410–390 BC and ca. 380–370 (?) BC, on the other hand, the arrangement of Athena's legs somewhat resembles that of the figure in Iranian riding garb on the Tiribazos coins, thus something in between the solution used for the Autophradates and Tarkumuwa staters (Pl. 1.11–12).⁶⁷ It is worth recalling that Kheriga coins of the

⁶¹ Cf. FURTWÄNGLER 1900: Pl. 10.27; MAXIMOVA 1928: 670, Fig. 25; BOARDMANN 1994: 297, Pl. 681.

⁶² FRITZE 1912: 13, no. 166; REGLING 1931: 12, no. 32; cf. BABELON 1910: no. 2639, Pl. CLXXIV.14; HARRISON 1982: 228.

⁶³ Cf. BODZEK 2014b.

⁶⁴ See, for example, SELLWOOD 1980: no. 1.1; Cf. HARRISON 1982: 228, note 25; CASABONNE 1997: 37; DEBORD 1999: 362f.

⁶⁵ MAXIMOVA 1928: 669–670, Fig. 24; BOARDMANN 1994: 317, Fig. 294; DEBORD 1999, 362, note 464; CASABONNE 1997: 37–38, Fig. 37; IDEM 2000c: 100; IDEM 2004: 121, 175, Fig. 29.

⁶⁶ Cf. MØRKHOLM and ZAHLE 1976: no. 28; MÜSELER 2016: V.50 and V.51; KAGAN 2021: 3, nos. 9–11.

⁶⁷ Cf. MØRKHOLM and ZAHLE 1976: no. 36; HURTER 1979: no. 1; MÜSELER 2016: VI. 51 (Kherei); KAGAN 2021: Fig. 25D (Artumpara).

type were also part of the Autophradates Hoard and which, assuming a proper reconstruction of this deposit by Kagan, could have some significance. In any case, the use of two different ways of showing the legs of a seated figure is attested in Lycia, but in general, however, closer to that of Autophradates' coins. It is also worth noting that in the case of the seated Athena from the coins of Kherei, the way the legs are depicted is closer to that of the Tiribazos coins minted in the 90s-80s than to the Tarkumuwa staters minted ca. 10 years later.

To sum up: it can be said that the minting of the Autophradates Stater in the late 90s or in the 80s of the 4th century BC cannot be ruled out i.e. earlier than Müseler assumed. Autophradates was operating in the southwestern part of Asia Minor at the time, either as a satrap or as a military officer, and may even have owned estates in the region. An iconographic analysis of the depiction on the reverse does not undermine the possibility of such a dating for the coin. In fact, it can be assumed that it slightly points to an earlier time for the minting of Autophradates' staters than the 60s of the 4th century BC. On the other hand, in my opinion, the use of the IH1 motif as the obverse type supports the earlier date of the Autophradates' stater. Rather, the minting of the coin could not have been too far away from ca. 380 BC, the limit of reasonably widespread circulation of Tarsiot, but also Lycian (Tissaphernes stater), prototypes. Therefore, I propose the years ca. 390 – ca. 380 BC as the time of issue of the Autophradates Stater.

Like the Tissaphernes' stater, the coins bearing Autophradates' name were struck as a karanic issue intended for the local, Lycian market.⁶⁸ This is evidenced by the use of a local weight standard and a legend in the Lycian language and script. In turn, the uniqueness of the issue was emphasized by Autophradates' name and the specific iconography of the coins. The obverse motif repeated that of the Xanthian issue of Tissaphernes. The continued use of the Iranian cavalryman motif on the Autophradates coin underscored its similar status to the earlier karanic coins struck by Tissaphernes and distinguished it from other Lycian dynastic issues, including those with "Medizing" iconography. The motif of the Iranian horseman itself appealed ideologically to the ethos of the aristocracy of the Achaemenid State. Of similar significance was the use of the motif of a seated figure in Iranian cavalry garb with a bow and arrow, which was completely unique in Lycian coinage. Furthermore, this choice alluded to the widespread iconographic repertoire in Anatolian (Greek–Iranian–Epichoric) circles, again ideologically linked to the Achaemenid aristocracy (not necessarily exclusively of Iranian origin). At the same time, both the legend (the satrap's name) and the coin's iconography served to self-promote Autophradates among the coin's recipients, i.e. his Lycian allies (soldiers).

⁶⁸ Cf. BODZEK 2019: 25f.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that other coins, probably minted in other regions, are also usually associated with Autophradates I, although not everyone agrees with such attribution.⁶⁹ First of all, there are silver drachms and diobols with the OATA legend, possibly minted in Aeolian Kyme,⁷⁰ and chalkoi with the OA legend.⁷¹ The mentioned silver denominations have an image of a “tiarate head” on the obverse, except that in the case of the drachm it is an image of a bearded man’s head, and in the case of the diobols a beardless head. The reverse of silver coins depicts a horse’s protome (drachm) or a horse’s head (obol). Bronze coins bear on obverses the image of a bearded head wearing a tiara, and on reverses monoskeles and an ear of grain. Legends for all of the coins are placed on the reverses. To Autophradates are also attributed anonymous obols minted at Klazomenai or Leukas in Ionia with a swan depicted on the reverse.⁷² The attribution of the coins to Autophradates is based on the similarity of the image of the head in a tiara on the obverse to that of the obols from Kyme. Here again we are dealing with a youthful face without a beard and the way the tiara is depicted is even identical in comparison to the Kyme obols. There have been attempts to attribute other coins to Autophradates, but in these cases the attribution is strictly hypothetical.⁷³ It seems that Autophradates conducted minting activities in various regions under his control.

The issuance of staters with the satrap’s name in Lycia fits into this picture of Autophradates’ minting activity. At the same time, it indicates a certain pattern of satrap minting, also evident in the case of Tissaphernes, Pharnabazos and other issuers, characterized by minting coins in different regions and mints depending on current, usually military, needs.⁷⁴

⁶⁹ On coins attributed to Autophradates see HEAD 1892: 127, no. 20, Pl. XXXI.13 (as uncertain satrap); SIX 1894: 327–329, no. 8, Pl. XIII.16; BABELON 1910: 121–124, no. 67, Pl. LXXXVIII.27; HARRISON 1982: 402; ALRAM 1986: 104, no. 314; WEISER 1996; DEBORD 1999: 61, 460, Pl. II.21; WINZER 2005: 37, nos. 11.1–11.8; BODZEK 2008: 7f, Pl. 1.6–7; MAUERMANN 2009: Pl. 1.1–10; BODZEK 2011: 295, A1–2, Pl. III.1–5. Debord (1999: 61, note 238, 460) prefers to attribute the OATA coins to Autophradates II. See also BABELON 1910: 123–124; HARRISON 1982: 401–402. Mauermann (2009) rejects the attribution of OATA coins to Autophradates at all.

⁷⁰ Cf. respectively WINZER 2005: 37f, no. 11.1 (obol), 11.6 (drachm); MAUERMANN 2009: Pl. 1.1–3 (obols), 10 (drachm); BODZEK 2008: Pl. 1–2.6b (drachm), 7 (obol); IDEM 2011: Pl. III.1 (drachm), 2 (obol); NIESWANDT 2012: 102–103, Autophradates Typus 2a (obol); 103 Autophradates Typus 2b (drachm). The further literature there. Obols are sometimes attributed to a mint in western Lycia (Cf. WEISER 1996: 18; WINZER 2005: 37, nos. 11.2–11.4). However, this is a purely theoretical assumption not supported by sufficient evidence (cf. MAUERMANN 2009).

⁷¹ Cf. WEISER 1996; WINZER 2005: 38, nos. 11.7–11.8; MAUERMANN 2009: Pl. 1.4–9; BODZEK 2011: Pl. III.3–4; NIESWANDT 2012: 69–70, Autophradates Typus 1a–1b.

⁷² BODZEK 2011: Pl. III.5.

⁷³ Cf. WEISER 1996; WINZER 2005: 37, nos. 11.2–11.4. It would be particularly interesting to accept the proposal to attribute hemiobols minted in Lycian mints to Autophradates (WINZER 2005: 37). However, the hypothesis is not sufficiently justified.

⁷⁴ Cf. BODZEK 2014a; IDEM 2022.

ABBREVIATIONS

- FGrH = F. JACOBY (ed.), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Teil 2b: *Spezialgeschichten, Autobiographien und Memoiren, Zeittafeln*, vol. 1, Berlin 1926.
- SNG Cop. = O. MØRKHOLM, *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, The Royal Collection of Coins and Medals Danish National Museum*, vol. 33: *Lycaonia–Cilicia*, Copenhagen 1956.
- SNG FRANCE 2 = E. LEVANTE (ed.), *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, France 2, Cabinet des Médailles, Cilicie*, Paris–Zürich 1993.
- SNG LEVANTE = E. LEVANTE (ed.), *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, Switzerland I, Levante–Cilicia*, Berne 1986.
- SNG VON AULOCK = H. VON AULOCK, *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, Deutschland, Sammlung v. Aulock*, vol. 13: *Kilkien*, Berlin 1966.
- TAM I = E. KALINKA, *Tituli Asiae Minoris*, vol. I: *Tituli Lyciae Lingua Lycia conscripti*, Vindobona 1901.

REFERENCES

- ALRAM, M. 1986. *Nomina propria iranica in nummis*, Iranisches Personennamenbuch IV, Wien.
- ALRAM, M. 2012. “The Coinage of the Persian Empire”. In: W.E. METCALF (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Coinage*, Oxford: 61–87. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195305746.013.0005
- ASHTON, R.H.J., HARDWICK, N., KINNS, P., KONUK, K. and MEADOWS, A.R. 2002a. “The Pixodarus Hoard (CH 9.421)”. In: MEADOWS and WARTENBERG (eds.) 2002: 159–243, Pls. 21–41.
- ASHTON, R.H.J., KINNS, P., KONUK, K. and MEADOWS, A.R. 2002b. “The Hecatomnus Hoard (CH 5. 17, 8. 96, 9. 387)”. In: MEADOWS and WARTENBERG (eds.) 2002: 95–158, Pls. 6–20.
- BABELON, E. 1910. *Traité des monnaies grecques et romaines*, vol. II/2, Paris.
- BERVE, H. 1926. *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, vols. I–II, München.
- BOARDMANN, J. 1994. *Greek Gems and Finger Rings. Early Bronze Age to Late Classical*, New York.
- BODZEK, J. 1994. “Uwagi na temat portretu monetarnego w Licji końca V i pierwszej połowy IV w. p.n.e.”. In: J. ŚLIWA (ed.), *Munus Amicitiae. Studia archeologiczne poświęcone pamięci Olgi Hirsch-Dyrczek*, Kraków: 111–134.
- BODZEK, J. 2004. “Review of Y. MESHORER and SH. QEDAR, *Samaritan Coinage*, Jerusalem 1999”, *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne* 5: 173–183. DOI: 10.11588/diglit.22228.24
- BODZEK, J. 2008. “A Note on a Samaritan Coin-Type”, *Israel Numismatic Research* 3: 3–12, Pls. 1–2.
- BODZEK, J. 2011. *TA ΣΑΤΡΑΠΙΚΑ ΝΟΜΙΣΜΑΤΑ. Mennictwo satrapów w okresie panowania Achemenidów (ok. 550–331 a.C.)*, Kraków.
- BODZEK, J. 2012. “On the Dating of the Bronze Issue of Tissaphernes”, *Studies in Ancient Art and Civilization* 16: 105–118.
- BODZEK, J. 2014a. “Achaemenid Asia Minor: Coins of the Satraps and of the Great King”. In: K. DÖRTLÜK, O. TEKIN and R. BOYRAZ SEYHAN (eds.), *First International Congress of the Anatolian Monetary History and Numismatics, 25–28 February 2013, Antalya, Proceedings*, Istanbul: 59–78.
- BODZEK, J. 2014b. “A Note on a Satrapal Coin – Perhaps another Mazaces Issue?”, *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne* 9: 13–23. DOI: 10.11588/diglit.31073.6

- BODZEK, J. 2019. "The Satraps of Caria and the Lycians in the Achaemenid Period: Where is the Numismatic Evidence?", *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne* 14: 15–41. DOI: 10.11588/diglit.57341.8
- BODZEK, J. 2022. "Kings, Satraps, Local Dynasts, and Cities in Achaemenid Imperial Space: Pseudo-Aristotle's *Oikonomika* and Numismatic Reality". In: B. CHRUBASIĆ, J.K. SCHUTZ, A. MEADOWS and J. BODZEK (eds.), *Coinage in Imperial Space: Coins in the Economy of the Achaemenid and Early Hellenistic World*, Phoenix, Journal of the Classical Association of Canada 76, Toronto, ON: 70–121. DOI: 10.1353/phx.2022.a914304
- BODZEK, J. "Iranian riders on coins of the Achaemenid period". In: *Essays in honor of a very important numismatist* (forthcoming A).
- BODZEK, J. "Archaic and Classical Coinage of Cilicia. An Overview". In: J. BODZEK, A. BURSCHE and A. ZAPOLSKA (eds.), *Proceedings of the XVI International Numismatic Congress, 11–16.09.2022, Warsaw*, vol. I: *Greek Numismatics*, Warsaw Studies in Archaeology 10, Turnhout 2025 (forthcoming B).
- BORCHHARDT, J. 1976. *Die Bauskulptur des Heroons von Limyra. Das Grabmal des lykischen Königs Perikles*, Istanbuler Forschungen 32, Berlin.
- BORCHHARDT, J. 1980. "Zur Deutung lykischer Audienzszenen". In: H. METZGER (ed.), *Actes du colloque sur la Lycie antique*, Bibliothèque de l'Institut français d'études anatoliennes d'Istanbul 27, Paris: 7–12.
- BRIANT, P. 2002. *From Cyrus to Alexander. A History of the Persian Empire*, Winona Lake, IN.
- BRUNS-ÖZGAN, C. 1987. *Lykische Grabreliefs des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Istanbuler Mitteilungen 33, Tübingen.
- CAHN, H.A. 1985. "Tissaphernes in Astyra", *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 4: 587–594.
- CAHN, H.A. 1989. "Le monnayage des satrapes: iconographie et signification". In: DESCAT (ed.) 1989: 97–105. DOI: 10.3406/rea.1989.4369
- CASABONNE, O. 1997. "Notes ciliciennes", *Anatolia Antiqua* 5: 35–43. DOI: 10.3406/anata.1997.866
- CASABONNE, O. (ed.) 2000a. *Mécanismes et innovations monétaires dans l'Anatolie achéménide. Numismatique et histoire. Actes de la Table Ronde Internationale d'Istanbul, 22–23 mai 1997*, Varia Anatolica 12, Paris.
- CASABONNE, O. 2000b. "Conquête perse et phénomène monétaire: l'exemple cilicien". In: CASABONNE (ed.) 2000a: 21–91, Pls. IV–VIII.
- CASABONNE, O. 2000c. "Notes ciliciennes", *Anatolia Antiqua* 8: 89–103. DOI: 10.3406/anata.2000.939
- CASABONNE, O. 2004. *La Cilicie à l'époque achéménide*, Persika 3, Paris.
- DANDAMAYEV, M.A. 1987. "Autophradates", *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, vol. III/1: 29, available online at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/autophradates> (accessed on 15 September 2019).
- DEBORD, P. 1999. *L'Asie Mineure au IV^e siècle (412–323 a.C.). Pouvoirs et jeux politiques*, Ausonius-Publications Études 3, Bordeaux.
- DEMARGNE, P. 1974. *Fouilles de Xanthos*, vol. V: *Tombes-maisons, tombes rupestres et sarcophages*, Paris.
- DESCAT, R. (ed.) 1989. *L'or perse et l'histoire grecque. Table ronde CNRS, Bordeaux, 20–22 Mars 1989*, Revue des Études Anciennes 91 (1–2), Paris.
- ELLIS–EVANS, A., WARTENBERG, U. and KAGAN, J. 2022. "Asia Minor: Archaic to Hellenistic". In: M. ALRAM, J. BODZEK and A. BURSCHE (eds.), *Survey of Numismatic Research 2014–2020*, vol. I, Warsaw–Krakow–Winterthur: 253–292.
- FARKAS, A. 1969. "The Horse and Rider in Achaemenid Art", *Persika* 4: 57–76.
- FRITZE, H. VON 1912. *Die Elektronprägung von Kyzikos. Eine chronologische Studie*, Numismata 7, Berlin.

- FURTWÄNGLER, A. 1900. *Die antiken Gemmen. Geschichte der Steinschneidekunst im klassischen Altertum*, Leipzig–Berlin.
- HARRISON, C.M. 1982. *Coins of the Persian Satraps*, Ann Arbor, MI.
- HEAD, B.V. 1892. *A Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum*, vol. 16: *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Ionia*, London.
- HILL, G.F. 1897. *A Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum*, vol. 18: *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Lycia, Pamphylia, and Pisidia*, London.
- HILL, G. 1900. *A Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum*, vol. 21: *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Lycaonia, Isauria, and Cilicia*, London.
- HURTER, S. 1979. “Der Tissaphernes-Fund”. In: O. MØRKHOLM and N.M. WAGGONER (eds.), *Greek Numismatics and Archaeology. Essays in Honour of Margaret Thompson*, Wetteren: 97–108.
- JUDEICH, W. 1892. *Kleinasiatische Studien. Untersuchungen zur griechisch-persischen Geschichte des IV. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Marburg.
- KAERST, J. 1896. “Autophradates (1)”. In: G. WISSOWA (ed.), *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. II/4: *Artemisia–Barbaroi*, Stuttgart: col. 2607.
- KAGAN, J. 2021. “Return to Xanthos: New Numismatic Light on the Harpagid Dynasty of Western Lycia”. In: A. MEADOWS and U. WARTENBERG (eds.), *Presbeus. Studies in Ancient Coinage Presented to Richard Ashton*, New York: 25–64.
- KEEN, A.G. 1998. *Dynastic Lycia. A Political History of the Lycians and Their Relations with Foreign Powers, c. 545–362 B.C.*, Mnemosyne, Supplements 178, Leiden–Boston–Köln. DOI: 10.1163/9789004351523
- KLEIN, D. 1999. *Sammlung von griechischen Kleinsilbermünzen und Bronzen*, Nomismata 3, Milano.
- KLINKOTT, H. 2005. *Der Satrap. Ein achaimenidischer Amtsträger und seine Handlungsspielräume*, Oikumene. Studien zur antiken Weltgeschichte 1, Frankfurt am Main.
- KOLB, F. 2018. *Lykien. Geschichte einer antiken Landschaft*, Darmstadt.
- KRUMBHOLZ, P. 1883. *De Asiae Minoris Satrapis Persicis*, Lipsiae.
- LE RIDER, G. 2001. *La naissance de la monnaie. Pratiques monétaires de l'Orient ancien*, Paris.
- LEVANTE, E. 1994. “Le ‘trésor de Nagidos’”. In: M. AMANDRY and G. LE RIDER (eds.), *Trésors et circulation monétaire en Anatolie antique*, Paris: 7–11.
- MAUERMANN, D. 2009. “Eine prägende Persönlichkeit”. In: R. EINICKE, S. LEHMANN, H. LÖHR, G. MEHNERT, A. MEHNERT and A. SLAWISCH (eds.), *Zurück zum Gegenstand. Festschrift für Andreas E. Furtwängler*, vol. 2, Langenweißbach: 365–371.
- MAXIMOVA, A.E. 1928. “Griechisch-persische Kleinkunst in Kleinasien nach der Perserkriege”, *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 43: 648–677.
- MEADOWS, A.R. and WARTENBERG, U. (eds.) 2002. *Coin Hoards IX. Greek Coins*, Royal Numismatic Society Special Publications 35, London.
- MILDENBERG, L. 1998. “Über das Münzwesen im Reich der Achämeniden”. In: U. HÜBNER and E.A. KNAUF (eds.), *Vestigia Leonis. Studien zur antiken Numismatik Israels, Palästinas und der östlichen Mittelmeerwelt*, Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 36, Freiburg–Göttingen: 3–29, 270–294.
- MOYSEY, R.A. 1986. “The Silver Stater Issues of Pharnabazos and Datames from the Mint of Tarsos in Cilicia”, *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* 31: 7–61.
- MOYSEY, R.A. 1989. “Observations on the Numismatic Evidence Relating to the Great Satrapal Revolt of 362/1 B.C.”. In: R. DESCAT (ed.) 1989: 107–139. DOI: 10.3406/rea.1989.4371
- MØRKHOLM, O. 1964. “The Classification of Lycian Coins before Alexander the Great”, *Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte* 14: 65–76, Pl. 4.

- MØRKHOLM, O. and ZAHLE, J. 1976. "The Coinages of Lycian Dynasts Kheriga, Kherei and Erbbina. A Numismatic and Archaeological Study", *Acta Archaeologica* 47: 47–90.
- MÜSELER, W. 2015. "Tarsos und die Anabasis des jüngeren Kyros. Persische Militärprägungen in Kilikien und der Levante zwischen dem späten 5. und frühen 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.", *Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte* 65: 9–30.
- MÜSELER, W. 2016. *Lykische Münzen in europäischen Privatsammlungen*, Gephyra Monographien 4, Istanbul.
- MÜSELER, W. 2022. "'Out of Area': The Involvement of Non-Local Powers in Lycian Affairs between the 5th and the 4th Centuries BC", *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne* 17: 13–41. DOI: 10.52800/ajst.1.17.a1
- NIESWANDT, H.-H. 2012. "Stoffbinden im Achaimenidischen Reich. Zu sog. Satrapenmünzen und verwandten Denkmälern im östlichen Mittelmeergebiet". In: A. LICHTENBERGER, K. MARTIN, H.-H. NIESWANDT and D. SALZMANN (eds.), *Das Diadem der Hellenistischen Herrscher. Übernahme, Transformation oder Neuschöpfung eines Herrschaftszeichens? Kolloquium vom 30.–31. Januar 2009 in Münster*, Bonn: 63–159.
- REGLING, K. 1931. "Der griechische Goldschatz von Prinkipo", *Zeitschrift für Numismatik* 41: 1–46, Pls. I–IV.
- SCHWABACHER, W. 1968. "Lycian Coin Portraits". In: C.M. KRAAY and G.K. JENKINS (eds.), *Essays in Greek Coinage Presented to Stanley Robinson*, Oxford: 111–124.
- SCHÜRR, D. 2012. "Der lykische Dynast Arttumbara und seine Anhänger", *Klio* 94 (1): 18–44. DOI: 10.1524/klio.2012.0002
- SEKUNDA, N.V. 1988. "Some Notes on the Life of Datames", *Iran* 26: 35–53. DOI: 10.2307/4299799
- SELLWOOD, D. 1980. *An Introduction to the Coinage of Parthia*, 2nd edition, London.
- SIX, J.P. 1894. "Monnaies grecques, inédites et incertaines", *The Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Numismatic Society* 14: 297–338.
- SMITH, A.H. 1900. *A Catalogue of Sculpture in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum*, vol. 2, London. DOI: 10.11588/diglit.18217
- STAUBER, J. 1996. *Die Bucht von Adramytteion*, vols. I–II, Berlin.
- STÄHELIN, F. 1918. "Autophrades". In: W. KROLL (ed.), *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Supplementum*, vol. 3: *Aachen–ad Iuglandem*, Stuttgart: 190.
- TAHBERER, B. 2021. "A Recent Hoard of Silver Staters from the Eastern Mediterranean Mints Ca. 5th Century BC 2018–2021. A Preliminary Report", available online at <https://independent.academia.edu/BekircanTahberer?nbs=user> (accessed on 15 May 2023).
- TAHBERER, B. 2022a. "A Recent Hoard of Silver Staters from the Eastern Mediterranean Mints Ca. 5th Century BC 2018–2021. A Preliminary Report. 2. Mallos", available online at <https://independent.academia.edu/BekircanTahberer?nbs=user> (accessed on 15 May 2023).
- TAHBERER, B. 2022b. "A Recent Hoard of Silver Staters from the Eastern Mediterranean Mints Ca. 5th Century BC 2018–2021. A Preliminary Report. 3. Soloi", available online at <https://independent.academia.edu/BekircanTahberer?nbs=user> (accessed on 15 May 2023).
- TIETZ, W. 2009. "Karer und Lykier. Politische und kulturelle Beziehungen im 5/4 Jh. v. Chr.". In: F. RUMSCHEID (ed.), *Die Karer und die Anderen. Internationales Kolloquium an der Freien Universität Berlin 13. bis 15. Oktober 2005*, Bonn: 163–172.
- TUPLIN, C. 2010. "All the King's Horse: In Search of Achaemenid Persian Cavalry". In: G.G. FAGAN and M. TRUNDLE (eds.), *New Perspectives on Ancient Warfare*, History of Warfare 59, Leiden: 101–182. DOI: 10.1163/ej.9789004185982.i-391.26
- TUPLIN, C. 2014. "The Changing Pattern of the Achaemenid Persian Royal Coinage". In: P. BERNHOLZ and R. VAUBEL (eds.), *Explaining Monetary and Financial Innovation*, Financial and Monetary Policy Studies 39, Cham: 127–168. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-06109_2_6

- WEISER, W. 1996. "Porträt-Chalkoi von Autophradates (I.) Satrap von (Ionien und) Lydien (392–388 bzw. 380–355)", *Numismatisches Nachrichtenblatt* 9: 17–20.
- WEISKOPF, M. 1989. *The so-called 'Great Satraps' Revolt', 366–360 B.C. Concerning Local Instability in the Achaemenid Far West*, Historia Einzelschriften 63, Stuttgart.
- WINZER, A. 2005. *Antike Portraitmünzen der Perser und Griechen aus vor-hellenistischer Zeit (Zeitraum ca. 510–322 v.Chr.). Die frühesten Portraits lebender Menschen. Von Dareios I. bis Alexander III.*, Stuttgart.
- ZAHLE, J. 1979. "Lykische Felsgräber mit Reliefs aus dem 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Neue und alte Funde", *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 94: 245–346.
- ZAHLE, J. 1982. "Persian Satraps and Lycian Dynasts. The Evidence of Diadems". In: T. HACKENS and R. WEILLER (eds.), *Actes du 9^{ème} Congrès International de Numismatique, Berne, Septembre 1979*, vol. 1, Louvain-la-Neuve: 101–112.
- ZAHLE, J. 1983. *Arkæologiske studier i lykiske klippegrave og deres relieffer*, København.
- ZAHLE, J. 1989. "Politics and Economy in Lycia during the Persian Period". In: DESCAT (ed.) 1989: 169–182. DOI: 10.3406/rea.1989.4374
- ZAHLE, J. 1990a. "Herrscherporträts auf lykischen Münzen". In: J. BORCHHARDT (ed.), *Götter, Heroen, Herrscher in Lykien*, Wien–München: 51–56, 172–179.
- ZAHLE, J. 1990b. "Lycian Coin Portraits. Forerunners of the Hellenistic Portraits of Rulers on Coins". In: *Akten XIII. Internationalen Kongresses für klassische Archäologie, Berlin 1988*, Mainz: 568–569.
- ZAHLE, J. 1991. "Achaemenid Influences in Lycia (Coinage, Sculpture, Architecture). Evidence for Political Changes during the 5th Century B.C.". In: H. SANCISI-WEERDENBURG and A. KUHRT (eds.), *Achaemenid History VI: Asia Minor and Egypt: Old Cultures in a New Empire. Proceedings of the Groningen 1988 Achaemenid History Workshop*, Leiden: 145–160.

Author's address:

Jarosław Bodzek
Jagiellonian University, Institute of Archaeology
11 Gołębia Street, 31-107 Krakow, Poland
jaroslaw.bodzek@uj.edu.pl

PLATE 1

Fig. 1. Autophradates I, Lycia, Xanthos (?), AR, stater, ca. 390–380 BC (?), after KAGAN 2021: 34, Fig. 29

Fig. 2. Tissaphernes, Lycia, Xanthos, AR, stater, ca. 407–401 or 400–395 BC
© The Danish National Museum / photographer Victor P. Bizoevb, CC-BY-SA

Fig. 3. Syennesis (?), Cilicia, Tarsos, AR, stater, ca. 410/395 BC, Iranian horseman type H1c

© CNG, Triton XXV, lot 5092, 11 January 2022

Fig. 4. Tissaphernes, Mysia, Adramytteion (?), AE, chalkous (?), ca. 413–407 or 400–395 BC, Iranian horseman Type H2a

© CNG Electronic Auction 288, lot 193

Fig. 5. Tarkumuwa, Cilicia, Tarsos, AR, stater, ca. 375–365 BC

© CNG, Electronic Auction 288, lot 255

Fig. 6. A Persian, seated with bow and arrow, Greco-Persian cornelian pear-shaped pendant, once in the Arndt collection

Drawing by K. Niziołek after BOARDMAN 1994: 317, Fig. 294

Fig. 7. Tiribazos, Cilicia, Tarsos, AR, stater, ca. 388–385 BC

© CNG, Electronic Auction 299, lot 203

Fig. 8. Mazakes (?), as satrap of Egypt (?), 333/332 BC

© Heidelberger Münzhandlung Herbert Grün, Auction 54, lot 107, 16 November 2010

Fig. 9. Mysia, Kyzikos, Electrum stater, ca. 450–330 BC

© CNG, Triton XXIV, lot 630, 19 January 2021

Fig. 10. Kheriga, Lycia, Xanthos, AR stater, ca. 440/430 BC, after KAGAN 2021: 27, no. 9

Fig. 11. Kherei, Lycia, Xanthos, AR stater, ca. 430–410 or 410–390 BC

© CNG, Triton XXVI, lot 296, 10 January 2023

Fig. 12. Artumpara, Lycia, Xanthos, AR stater, ca. 380–370 BC (?)

© Roma Numismatics, Auction 9, lot 370, 22 March 2015

PLATE 2

Fig. 13. Payava Sarcophagus, west side frieze, after SMITH 1900: Pl. XI, drawing by G. Scharf



1



2



3



4



5



6



7



8



9



10



11



12



