

NOTAE NUMISMATICAE

ZAPISKI NUMIZMATYCZNE



Tom XIV

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

Kraków 2019



Ministerstwo Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego

Tłumaczenie tekstów oraz korekta językowa native speakerów tekstów
artykułów naukowych oraz recenzji naukowych w tomach XIII (2018) i XIV (2019)
finansowane w ramach umowy 790/P-DUN/2018 ze środków
Ministra Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego
przeznaczonych na działalność upowszechniającą naukę.

The translation and the proofreading by a native speaker of the texts
of academic articles and reviews in the volumes XIII (2018) and XIV (2019)
financed as part of the Agreement 790/P-DUN/2018 from the funds
of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education allocated for the purpose
of promoting and propagating science.

NOTAE NUMISMATICAE

ZAPISKI NUMIZMATYCZNE

Tom XIV

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

Kraków 2019

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, Zofia Gołubiew, Prof. Wiesław Kaczanowicz, Elżbieta Korczyńska, Prof. Katerini Liampi, Prof. Adam Małkiewicz, Prof. Andrew Meadows, Prof. Mariusz Mielczarek, Dr 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. Bartosz Awianowicz, Prof. Katarzyna Balbuza, Dr Barbara Butent-Stefaniak, Dr Witold Garbaczewski, Dr Adam Kędzierski, Dr Hab. Agata Kluczek, Dr Koray Konuk, Dr Piotr N. Kotowicz, Dr Kyrylo Myzgin, Dr Dariusz Niemiec, Prof. Marek Olbrycht, Prof. Zenon Piech, Dr Hab. Vladimir F. Stolba, Dr Klaus Vondrovec, Dr Eliza Walczak, Dr Tomasz Więcek, Dr David Wigg-Wolf, Dr Hab. Marcin Wołoszyn

Redaktorzy prowadzący / Commissioning Editors:

Dorota Malarczyk, Anna Kowalczyk

Tłumaczenia / Translations:

David Daniel, Grzegorz Haczewski

Korekta / Proofreading:

Aedaan Shaw

Projekt graficzny i typografia / Graphic Design and Desktop Publishing:

Luiza Berdak

Skład i łamanie | Typesetting and Page Layout:

Katarzyna Poznańska

Adres redakcji / Address of the Editorial Office:

Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie

ul. Józefa Piłsudskiego 12, 31-109 Kraków

tel. (+48) 12 433 58 50

e-mail: notae@mnk.pl

<http://mnk.pl/notae-numismatacae-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 pisma *Notae Numismatacae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne* jest wersja elektroniczna.

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

© Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie i Autorzy, 2019

ISSN 1426-5435

SPIS TREŚCI / CONTENTS

- 11 Od redakcji
12 From the Editors

ARTYKUŁY / ARTICLES

- JAROSŁAW BODZEK
15 The Satraps of Caria and the Lycians in the Achaemenid Period: Where is the Numismatic Evidence?
Satrapowie Karii i Licyjczycy w okresie Achemenidów: czy istnieją świadectwa numizmatyczne?
- EMANUEL PETAC, AUREL VÎLCU
43 About the Diobols Hoard of Apollonia Pontica and Mesembria Discovered in 1911 in Constanța (Ancient Tomis)
O skarbie dioboli Apollonii Pontyjskiej i Mesembrii odkrytym w 1911 r. w Konstancy (starożytnej Tomi)
- YANNIS STOYAS
59 Wheat-Ears and Owls. Remarks on Thessalian Coins with Countermarks
Kłosy i sowy. Uwagi na temat kontramarkowanych monet tesalskich
- MATEUSZ OKOŃSKI
93 Images of Central European *externae gentes* in Trajan's Monetary Iconography and Their Role in the Propaganda of the Imperial Era
Wizerunki środkowoeuropejskich externae gentes w ikonografii monetarnej Trajana i ich pozycja w propagandzie imperialnej epoki
- BARBARA ZAJĄC
123 The Roman Imperial Coinage Model for Some Provincial Coins of Bithynia and Pontus Struck During the Reign of Trajan (98–117)
Rzymskie mennictwo imperialne jako wzór dla niektórych monet Bitynii i Pontu bitych w okresie rządów Trajana (98–117)
- ARKADIUSZ DYMOWSKI
149 The Problem of the Presence of Barbarian Imitations of Roman Imperial Denarii in the Lands of Present-Day Poland. An Attempt at a Balance
Problem występowania barbarzyńskich naśladownictw denarów rzymskich na terenie obecnej Polski. Próba bilansu
- VITAL' SIDAROVICH
183 New Find of Gold Roman Coin-Pendants in the South-West of Belarus
Nowe znalezisko złotych rzymskich monet-zawieszek z południowo-zachodniej Białorusi

- 197 KYRYLO MYZGIN, STEPAN STEPANENKO, YURI SYTYI
Discovery of a Panticapaeum Coin at the Shestovytsya Early Medieval Settlement
Znalezisko monety pantikapejskiej z wczesnośredniowiecznej osady Szestowica
- 221 KRZYSZTOF TUNIA, MATEUSZ WOŹNIAK
Coins from an Early-Medieval Burial Ground in Stręgoborzyce, Krakow District
Monety z cmentarzyska wczesnośredniowiecznego w Stręgoborzycach, pow. Kraków
- 249 DARIUSZ ROZMUS
Early Medieval Lead “Weights” from Młoszowa (near Trzebinia)
Wczesnośredniowieczne „ciężarki” ołowiane z Młoszowej k. Trzebini
- 263 MICHAŁ ZAWADZKI
Remarks on Changes in the Iconography of Jagiellonian Crown Coins
Uwagi o zmianach w ikonografii koronnych monet jagiellońskich
- 281 ANNA BOCHNAK, IWONA MŁODKOWSKA-PRZEPIÓROWSKA
A Seventeenth-Century Hoard of Coins Found at the Cemetery near the Church Dedicated to St. Barbara in the Old Town of Częstochowa
Siedemnastowieczny skarb monet znaleziony na cmentarzu przy kościele pw. św. Barbary na Starym Mieście w Częstochowie

RECENZJE / REVIEWS

- 327 JAROSŁAW BODZEK
WILHELM MÜSELER
Lykische Münzen in europäischen Privatsammlungen, (Gephyra Monographien 4), Istanbul 2016, 207 pages, 29 plates; ISBN 978-605-396-421-6
- 335 JAROSŁAW BODZEK
MARIUSZ MIELCZAREK
Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, Poland. Vol. I: The Archaeological and Ethnographical Museum in Łódź. Part 3: Bosphorus-Cilicia, The Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences, The Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Kraków–Warszawa 2016, 122 pages, 42 plates, indices; ISBN 978-83-7676-258-6
- 338 JAROSŁAW BODZEK
ELIZA WALCZAK, ALEKSANDRA KRZYŻANOWSKA
Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, Poland. Vol. II: The National Museum in Warsaw. Part 1: The Northern Black Sea Coast: Chersonesus-Bosporus, The Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences, Kraków–Warszawa 2016, 130 pages, 53 plates, indices; ISBN 978-83-7676-200-5

ELIZA WALCZAK

Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, Poland. Vol. II: The National Museum in Warsaw. Part 2: The Northern Black Sea Coast: Bosphoran Rulers, The Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences, The Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology of the Polish Academy of Sciences, The National Museum in Warsaw, Kraków–Warszawa 2017, 174 pages, 71 plates, indices; ISBN 978-83-7676-280-7

ELIZA WALCZAK

Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, Poland. Vol. II: The National Museum in Warsaw. Part 3: The Northern Black Sea Coast: Bosphoran Rulers – Sarmatia, The Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences, The Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology of the Polish Academy of Sciences, The National Museum in Warsaw, Kraków–Warszawa 2018, 168 pages, 66 plates, indices; ISBN 978-83-7676-304-0

EVGENI I. PAUNOV

342 JAROSŁAW BODZEK

Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, Poland. Vol. III: The National Museum in Cracow. Part 3: Thrace and Pontus, The Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences, The Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology of the Polish Academy of Sciences, The National Museum in Krakow, Kraków–Warszawa 2018, 148 pages, 58 plates, indices; ISBN 978-83-7676-305-7

SZYMON JELLONEK

343 MAREK BUDAJ, JÁN HUNKA

Nálezy Mincí na Slovensku / Coin Finds in Slovakia. V/1. Archeologický Ústav Sav Historické Múzeum SNM, Bratislava–Nitra 2018, 260 pages; ISBN 978-80-8196-026-0

KRONIKA / CHRONICLE

MATEUSZ WOŹNIAK

347 Kronika Gabinetu Numizmatycznego Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie (2018)

354 *The Chronicle of the Numismatic Cabinet of the National Museum in Krakow (2018)*

JAROSŁAW BODZEK

363 Kronika Sekcji Numizmatycznej Komisji Archeologicznej Polskiej Akademii Nauk Oddział w Krakowie (2018)

365 *The Chronicle of the Numismatic Section of the Commission on Archaeology of the Polish Academy of Sciences (Krakow Branch of the Polish Academy of Sciences) (2018)*

BARBARA ZAJĄC, SZYMON JELLONEK, PAULINA KOCZWARA

367 *Pecunia Omnes Vincit. International Numismatic and Economic Conferences (2013–2018)*

NEKROLOG / OBITUARY

JAROSŁAW BODZEK

373 Stefan Skowronek (16 stycznia 1928 – 11 czerwca 2019)

379 *Stefan Skowronek (January 16, 1928 – June 11, 2019)*

386 Bibliografia wybranych prac numizmatycznych prof. Stefana Skowronka

Selected Bibliography of Prof. Stefan Skowronek's Numismatic Works



Stefan Skowronek (1928–2019) podczas wykopalisk archeologicznych w Egipcie (1960/1961)
Ze zbiorów Ośrodka Dokumentacji Filmowej Nauki Polskiej Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego w Krakowie
Stefan Skowronek (1928–2019) during archaeological excavation in Egypt (1960/1961)
From the Center of Visual Documentation of Polish Science (Pedagogical University of Cracow)

Szanowni Państwo,

oddajemy w Państwa ręce tom XIV *Notae Numismaticae – Zapisków Numizmatycznych*. Zgodnie z przyjętymi przez nas zasadami wszystkie teksty publikujemy w językach kongresowych, z angielskimi i polskimi abstraktami. Polskojęzyczne wersje tekstów odnoszących się w większym stopniu do zainteresowań czytelnika polskiego są zamieszczone w formie plików PDF na stronie internetowej Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie (<https://mnk.pl/notae-numismaticae-zapiski-numizmatyczne-1>). W podobny sposób udostępniamy cały obecny tom oraz tomy archiwalne. Na stronie internetowej dostępne są ponadto wszelkie informacje ogólne o czasopiśmie oraz instrukcje dla autorów i recenzentów.

11 czerwca 2019 r. w wieku 91 lat odszedł prof. dr hab. Stefan Skowronek (1928–2019), nestor polskiej numizmatyki, wieloletni pracownik i kierownik Gabinetu Numizmatycznego Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie, wybitny znawca numizmatyki antycznej, wykładowca i pracownik Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego w Krakowie, wykładowca Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, członek wielu towarzystw i organizacji naukowych, w tym członek honorowy Sekcji Numizmatycznej Komisji Archeologicznej Polskiej Akademii Nauk Oddział w Krakowie.

Jego pamięci poświęcamy XIV tom *Notae Numismaticae – Zapisków Numizmatycznych*, czasopisma, które mocno wspierał jako autor i członek Komitetu Naukowego.

Redakcja

Dear Readers,

It is with great pleasure that we present volume XIV of *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne* to you. In accordance with the principles that we have adopted, our texts are published in the conference languages with English and Polish abstracts. The Polish-language versions of the texts that are more relevant to the interests of the Polish reader can be found as PDFs on the website of the National Museum in Krakow (<https://mnk.pl/notae-numismaticae-zapiski-numizmatyczne-1>). Similarly, the whole of the present volume is available online, as are previously published volumes of the journal. The website also contains general information about the journal as well as information for prospective authors and reviewers.

Prof. Dr. Hab. Stefan Skowronek (1928–2019), the doyen of Polish numismatics, died on June 11, 2019, at the age of 91. For many years, he worked as an employee – and then as head – of the Numismatic Cabinet at the National Museum of Krakow. He was also a lecturer and employee of the Pedagogical University of Krakow, a lecturer at the Jagiellonian University, and a member of numerous scientific societies and organizations, having honorary membership status at the Krakow branch of the Numismatic Section of the Polish Academy of Sciences' Commission on Archaeology.

It is to his enduring memory that we dedicate volume XIV of *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne*, a journal that he helped to support as both an author and as a member of the Scientific Committee.

The Editors

BARBARA ZAJĄC
Jagiellonian University
Institute of Archaeology

The Roman Imperial Coinage Model for Some Provincial Coins of Bithynia and Pontus Struck During the Reign of Trajan (98–117)¹

ABSTRACT: Roman provincial coins struck in the local centres of particular regions, differed from the coins issued in Rome (the so-called imperial coinage). On the coins struck mainly in the Greek monetary system, images of the emperor and motives reflecting local cults and traditions were placed. It is believed that provincial coins were generally not modelled on imperial coins, although some similarities may be noted on the Bithynia and Pontus emissions of the Trajan period. Some of the portraits of the emperor placed on coins issued by local centres depicted characteristic features of portraits from imperial coins. This allows the time which they were struck to be determined more accurately. In turn, some of the images depicted on the reverse of coins from this period duplicate the earlier motives from the time of Domitian, placed on imperial issues struck between 80 and 82 in an unidentified mint, probably in Thrace.

KEY WORDS: provincial coinage, imperial coinage, Bithynia and Pontus, Trajan

¹ The following text forms part of the author's as-of-yet unfinished doctoral thesis, *Rzymskie mennictwo prowincjonalne Bitynii i Pontu w okresie rządów Trajana (98–117 po Chr.)* [The Roman Provincial Coinage of Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan (AD 98–117)], the writing of which is being made possible thanks to the financial support of the National Science Centre (Preludium project 15, titled "Between Roman Culture and Local Traditions. The Monetary Policy in Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan (98–117 A.D.)", no. UMO-2018/29/N/HS3/01434). Unless otherwise indicated, all the dates are AD.

ABSTRAKT: *Rzymskie mennictwo imperialne jako wzór dla niektórych monet Bitynii i Pontu bitych w okresie rządów Trajana (98–117)*

Rzymskie monety prowincjonalne, bite w ośrodkach lokalnych poszczególnych regionów, różniły się od monet emitowanych w Rzymie (tzw. mennictwa imperialnego). Na monetach, wybijanych głównie w greckim systemie monetarnym, umieszczano wizerunki panującego cesarza oraz motywy odzwierciedlające lokalne kultury i tradycje. Uważa się, iż generalnie nie wzorowano monet prowincjonalnych wprost na monetach imperialnych, jednakże w emisjach Bitynii i Pontu bitych w okresie rządów Trajana można zauważyć pewne podobieństwa. Niektóre z portretów władcy widniejących na monetach emitowanych przez lokalne ośrodki noszą charakterystyczne cechy wizerunków z monet imperialnych. Umożliwia to dokładniejsze określenie czasu, po którym zostały wybite. Z kolei pewne przedstawienia ukazwane na rewersach monet z tego okresu powielają wcześniejsze motywy z czasów Domicjana, występujące na emisjach imperialnych bitych między 80 a 82 r. w niezidentyfikowanej dotychczas mennicy, prawdopodobnie na terenie Tracji.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: mennictwo prowincjonalne, mennictwo imperialne, Bitynia i Pont, Trajan

INTRODUCTION

One of the most interesting categories of ancient Roman coins consists of so-called provincial coinage. These coins, which were struck in the local centres of individual regions, differed from the coins issued in Rome (the so-called imperial coinage). Taking into account the images on these coins (for example, the lack of a portrait of the emperor or images showing local traditions and cults) or the character of the coin-issuing centre (for example, whether it was a colony, a provincial capital, or a city with an imperial cult), we can distinguish between pseudo-autonomous coinage, colonial coinage, *koinon* coins, or neocorate coins. Although provincial coinage was mainly based on the Greek monetary system, the colonies were also able to issue coins in the Roman denominational system. In reality, the category of coin at each centre depended on its needs and production capabilities. Coins at provincial mints were oftentimes issued irregularly, and it was mostly bronze coins that were issued.² In addition to the local currency, coins issued by the mint in the capital were also in circulation.³ These were mainly silver coins. Among the published coin finds from along the border between Bithynia and Pontus and

² Depending on its capabilities as well as the rights that were granted to it, some of these cities also issued silver coins. JONES 1963; JOHNSTON 1985; IDEM 1997; IDEM 2007; BURNETT 1987; BUTCHER 1988; AMANDRY, BURNETT et AL 1992: 1–54; IDEM 1999: 1–42; IDEM 2015: 797–873; HARL 1996: 106–117; HEUCHERT 2005: 29–56; HOWGEGO 2005: 1–17; KATSARI 2011; FILGES 2015.

³ ARSLAN 2012; SCHACHINGER 2012.

Asia, attention should be paid to the hoard of imperial coins from the village of Koçoğlu (Manyas, Balıkesir) in Turkey, a large portion of which consisted of denarii issued in Rome during the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian.⁴ Bronze imperial coins are also found in this province, but they are rather single finds.⁵ One exception is a hoard of 1,200 bronze coins. Dated to the age from Marcus Aurelius to Gallienus, it was found near Antalya.⁶

The iconography of provincial coins usually reflected local tradition. The images were easily decipherable for a resident of a given city or region. Because the centres had diverse histories, provincial coinage is characterized by its large variety of iconographic types. Some motives (for example, Artemis, Dionysus) were very popular; hence, they appeared on the coins of numerous cities. Others were unique in character and were solely tied to the local history (for example, the myth of Hero and Leander that appeared on the coins of Abydos and Sestos). Colonial coins often have images connected to the dominant Roman tradition. Cities granted the rank of *neocorate* (a city in charge of the imperial cult) issued coins with an image of the temple or temples; these coins, above all, were supposed to emphasize the rank and status of the centre. Not all provincial coins showed the portrait of the ruling emperor (so-called pseudo-autonomous coinage).⁷ The legends on provincial coins were mostly written in Greek or Latin (for Roman colonies), but some issues contained legends in two languages or words or single letters in the local languages.⁸ As a result, when it comes to the investigation of provincial coinage, it is necessary to exercise caution when proposing an idea because it is impossible to generalize with regard to certain phenomena. One should remember that it was usually the centres themselves that made decisions with regard to the denominations or images. Thus, even certain noticeable “minting trends” will not necessarily be repeated in all the cities issuing coins.

BITHYNIA AND PONTUS DURING THE REIGN OF TRAJAN

The province of Bithynia and Pontus, located in the north of Anatolia, in modern-day Turkey, was formed in the 1st century BC. According to Herodotus,⁹ Bithynia was inhabited by Thracians who came there in the 7th century BC. In c. 297 BC, the kingdom of Bithynia was created by Nicomedes I (279–255 BC). In 74 BC, it was willed to Rome by Nicomedes IV (c. 94–74 BC). The Kingdom of Pontus, which

⁴ ARSLAN 1996: 31.

⁵ JONES 1963: 318.

⁶ MAC DONALD 1989: 120.

⁷ JOHNSTON 1985; HEUCHERT 2005: 29–56; HOWGEGO 2005: 1–17; PRICE 2005: 115–124.

⁸ AMANDRY, BURNETT et AL 2015: 838.

⁹ Hdt., VII, 75.

came into being in 281 BC, was annexed by the Roman Empire following the defeat of Mithridates VI (120–63 BC) by the efforts of Pompey the Great (106–48 BC).¹⁰

The province's location was of strategic significance due to its control of the Bosphorus and the Sea of Marmara, as well as the access that it provided to the Black Sea. Bithynia and Pontus, with its capital in Nicomedia, neighboured other provinces like Thrace, Asia, Cappadocia, and Galatia.

During the reign of Trajan (98–117), that is, during an age of felicity, prosperity, and numerous conquests,¹¹ one can differentiate between 14 minting centres in Bithynia and Pontus in which the production focused on bronze coinage. Among the cities issuing their own coinage, we can distinguish between important ports (Byzantium or Heraclea), metropolises (Nicomedia, Heraclea, Amastris), Roman colonies (Apamea Myrlea, Sinope), and autonomous cities (Amisus).

Provincial coinage during the reign of Trajan shows a continuation of the minting traditions introduced during the age of Flavian dynasty. It should be emphasized, however, that the iconographic types on the coins changed, becoming more diverse as the individual centres developed. On the obverse, the coins mostly show a portrait of the ruler or that of a member of the imperial family (with the exception of so-called pseudo-autonomous coinage); on the reverse, the motives are generally connected to the local culture and tradition but also to the city's name (though this is not a fixed rule either).¹² Moreover, at the beginning of the 2nd century, there was, in general, a growth of interest in the history of the individual centres; as a result, the coins show the legendary founders or important personages connected to the city.¹³

THE IMPERIAL PORTRAIT AND THE PROVINCIAL COINAGE OF BITHYNIA AND PONTUS

On the obverses of provincial coins from the age of Trajan, the portrait of the ruler is usually accompanied by a long legend referring to the titulature given him.¹⁴ This

¹⁰ Strabo, *Geography*, XII, 4; REMY 1986; SARTRE 1997: 284–285; LORIOT 2011; WINNICZUK 2017: 79.

¹¹ Plin. *Pan.*; BENNETT 1997 (2015): 13–14.

¹² HEUCHERT 2005: 29–56; HOWGEGO 2005: 1–17; AMANDRY, BURNETT et AL 2015: 838.

¹³ HEUCHERT 2005: 51–52.

¹⁴ Crete and Cyrenaica: RPC III 1–44, 49–55; Achaea: Corinth RPC III 111–112, Tanagra RPC III 412–413, Nicopolis RPC III 476–478; Macedonia: Stobi RPC III 600–602, Pella RPC III 606, Dium RPC III 609–611, Cassandreia RPC III 637, Philippi RPC III 659–663; Thrace: Perinthus RPC III 682–683, 687–690, 694–709, Deultum RPC III 743, Philippopolis RPC III 744–745; Moesia: Odessus RPC III 762–764, Tomi RPC III 779–782; Bithynia and Pontus: Apamea RPC III 1029–1031; Prusa ad Olympum RPC III 1035–1049; Nicaea RPC III 1059; Calchedon RPC III 1060–1061; Byzantium RPC III 1067–1069, 1071–1083; Nicomedia RPC III 1089–1092; Juliopolis RPC III 1098–1100; Prusias ad Hypium RPC III 1101–1103; Uncertain mint RPC III 1121–1160; Heraclea RPC III 1161–1177; Tium RPC III 1178–1090; Amastris RPC III 1198–1208; Abonoteichos RPC III 1211–1213; Sinope RPC III 1217–1219; Amisus RPC III 1231–1233, 1236–1238, 1240–1244; Asia: RPC III 1308–1320, Cyzicus RPC III 1485–1496, Parium RPC III 1536–1538, Lampsacus RPC III 1548–1550, Dardanus RPC III 1562, Gargara RPC III 1582, Apollonia ad Rhyndacum RPC III 1597–1598, Miletropolis RPC III 1636–1643, Adramyttium RPC III 1668, Eresus RPC III 1678, Pergamum RPC III 1710–1724, Thyatira RPC III 1815–1827,

confirms that imperial coinage had an influence on the coinage of individual centres. However, not all cities followed this rule, for we can also find short legends like TPAIANOC KAICAP or CEBACTOC.¹⁵ This may reflect certain local trends in terms of the images used, the engraver's talent, or, quite simply, the limitations connected to the size of the flan. With respect to the imperial coins issued at this time, the shortest legend that can be found on the obverse of a quadrans is IMP CAES TRAIAN AVG GERM.¹⁶ In spite of the numerous similarities, provincial coins are not believed to have been modelled directly on imperial coinage (due to the numerous differences that existed between them, such as the absence of the number of consulships, the absence of other titles like *Pater Patriae*, or the absence

Hierocaesarea RPC III 1846–1847, Hermocapelia RPC III 1871, Fokaia RPC III 1940, Magnesia ad Sipylum RPC III 1945, Hyrcanis RPC III 1949–1952, Smyrna RPC III 1965, Klazomenai RPC III 1984–1986, Erythrae RPC III 1993–1994, Colophon RPC III 2003–2008, Metropolis RPC III 2011–2013, Hypaepa RPC III 2014–2015, Ephesus RPC III 2047–2056, Briula RPC III 2093, Samos RPC III 2094–2097, Miletus RPC III 2132–2134, Halicarnassus RPC III 2149–2152, Alinda RPC III 2216, Euippe RPC III 2221, Orthosia RPC III 2222, Harpasa RPC III 2224, Neapolis ad Harpasum RPC III 2231, Bargasa RPC III 2236–2237, Antioch ad Meandrum RPC III 2240–2242, Attuda RPC III 2256, Apollonia Salbace RPC III 2276–2277, Tabae RPC III 2288–2290, Laodicea RPC III 2318–2319, Hierapolis RPC III 2343–2347, Philadelpia RPC III 2366–2368, 2373–2383, Sardis RPC III 2392–2395, Maonia RPC III 2416–2418, Trajanopolis RPC III 2461, Grimenothyrae RPC III 2481, Tiberiopolis RPC III 2511, Ancyra RPC III 2532–2534, Iulia Gordus RPC III 2545–2549, Triopolis RPC III 2562–2571, Dionysopolis RPC III 2573, Alia RPC III 2616, Appia RPC III 2624–2626, Cotiaeum RPC III 2630, 2633, Dorylaeum RPC III 2635–2637, Midaeum RPC III 2643–2651, Nacolea RPC III 2653–2658; Lycia and Pamphilia: Attalea RPC III 2678, Side RPC III 2720, Laerte RPC III 2746; Galatia and Cappadocia: RPC III 2842–2902, Adada RPC III 2809–2810, Neoclaudiopolis RPC III 2905–2908, Amasea RPC III 2909–2912, Sebastopolis RPC III 2918–2919, Comana RPC III 2921, Neocaesarea RPC III 2922–2925, Trapezus RPC III 2929–2933, Zela RPC III 2934–2936, Megalopolis-Sebasteia RPC III 2937–2939, Nicopolis ad Lycum RPC III 2941–2945, Tyana RPC III 2946–2948, Caesarea RPC III 2978–3070, 3137–3138, 3143, Cybistra RPC III 3178–3179; Cilicia: Philadelphia RPC III 3211–3213, Ninica RPC III 3218–3225, Diocaesarea RPC III 3238–3239, Tarsus RPC III 3254–3257, Augusta RPC III 3314–3316, Anazarbus RPC III 3363–3371, Flaviopolis RPC III 3376–3378, Alexandria ad Issum RPC III 3395–3398; Cyprus RPC III 3408–3411; Syria: Beroea RPC III 3425–3434, Cyrrhus RPC III 3437–3445, Hierapolis RPC III 3447–3457, Chalcis ad Belum RPC III 3458–3466, Antioch RPC III 3508–3678, Seleucia RPC III 3766–3788, Laodicea RPC III 3795–3799, Gabala RPC III 3808–3811, Balanea RPC III 3812–3813, Aradus RPC III 3814–3822, Berytus RPC III 3832, 3840–3847, Ptolemais RPC III 3911–3914, Dora RPC III 3915–3918; Judea: Tiberias Claudiopolis RPC III 3923–3931, Gaba RPC III 3940–3942, Caesarea Maritima RPC III 3954–3957; Arabia: RPC III 4050–4081; Egypt: Alexandria RPC III 4120–4123, 4125–4143, 4146–4168, 4175–4201, 4208–4270, 4282–4351, 4355–4489, 4498–4569, 4575–4649, 4652–4768, 4777–4817, 4825–4968, 4971–4986, Egyptian Nomes RPC III 6275, 6278–6284, 6289–6293, 6298–6299, 6304–6313, 6316–6317, 6322–6323, 6326, 6329–6330, 6335–6338, 6343–6346, 6351–6352, 6355–6356, 6359–6372, 6378–6380, 6383–6388, 6396–6397, 6403–6412, 6419, 6422–6423, 6426–6434, 6437, 6442–6446, 6449, 6454, 6457–6459, 6462–6465, 6468–6469, 6472–6478, 6484, 6489–6492, 6495–6498, 6502–6504, 6507, 6512–6513, 6518–6519, 6522–6523, 6524–6526, 6529–6531. AMANDRY, BURNETT et AL 2015: 840–841; DALAISON 2017.

¹⁵ Crete and Cyrenaica: RPC III 45–48, Cydonia RPC III 108–110; Achaia: Andros RPC III 400, Carystus RPC III 416–419, Nicopolis RPC III 467–475; Macedonia: Thessaloniki RPC III 617–620, Amphipolis RPC III 643–644; Thrace: Sestos RPC III 756; Bithynia and Pontus: Tium RPC III 1080A; Amisus RPC III 1234; Asia: Abydus RPC III 1553–1556, Dardanus RPC III 1561, Methymna RPC III 1681, Hypaepa RPC III 2020–2022, Miletus RPC III 2136, Kos RPC III 2160–2162, Euromus RPC III 2210–2214, Heraclea Salbace RPC III 2266, 2269, Trajanopolis RPC III 2462–2465, Synaus 2525; Lycia and Pamphilia: Magdus RPC III 2681–2683, Perga RPC III 2686–2688, Aspendus RPC III 2713–2715; Galatia and Cappadocia: Pednelissus RPC III 2812–2813; Cilicia: Selinus RPC III 3183–3184, Anemurium RPC III 3196, 3198, Flaviopolis RPC III 3379; Judea: Ascalon RPC III 3972–3973, 3975–3979, 3981–3982, 3984–3985, 3987–3988, 3990–3992, 3994. AMANDRY, BURNETT et AL 2015: 840–841; DALAISON 2017.

¹⁶ Cf. WOYTEK 595, 597–600, 609.

of elements like the aegis); rather, they came about as a result of the development and earlier history of the cities.¹⁷ Thus, it is necessary to take into account the importance of the individual elements for the local community, the minting trends of the centre in question, or, finally, the talent of the engraver producing the dies. However, based on the titlature that was used or the imperial portrait, it would seem that some provincial coins were based on imperial coins. Above all, this would have been a relatively easy way to correctly execute the emperor's image. Some of the imperial portraits found on coins from the centres of Bithynia and Pontus could have been modelled on these imperial issues, bearing in mind the way individual physiognomic features are represented, not to mention the manner in which the dress is portrayed.¹⁸ However, great caution should be exercised in this regard. Very often the portraits combine different elements of an image or else they reflect the individual style of the engraver, one that is not present on the portraits from imperial coins.

We can use the imperial titlature on coins (whether imperial or provincial) to aid us in coming up with a more precise chronology of the individual issues, thus approximating the earliest point after which they were struck (the so-called *terminus post quem*). During his reign, Trajan took on various nicknames, such as *Germanicus* (as of 98), *Dacicus* (in December of 102), *Optimus* (in June of 114), and *Parthicus* (in February of 116), which were also put on coins.¹⁹ Paul Strack and, later, Bernhard Woytek came up with a different method for giving a more precise date to certain imperial coins issued during the age of Trajan, one that was based on changes in the portrait (the imperial portrait was also examined by Hill, Etienne, Rachet, Besombes).²⁰ The features of the image – whether it is more realistic or more idealized, whether individual characteristics are emphasized and reflected – made it possible to specify the date of the coins with an accuracy of up to a few years.²¹ Thus far, this method has not been used to give a more exact description of the chronology of individual provincial coins because of the different styles used by the engravers and the individual character of the portrait.

The coins issued in Bithynia and Pontus also included Trajan's nicknames, which enables us to narrow down the chronology of the individual issues further. It was only on certain coins struck in Apamea, Sinope, and Amisus that the dates or number of consulships were also added. Separate issues of Sinope have been dated

¹⁷ AMANDRY, BURNETT et AL 2015: 843.

¹⁸ Later on, the article describes various types of portraits and their characteristic features with respect to the shape of the head or bust; it also describes the appearance of such elements as the *corona radiata* or the *paludamentum*.

¹⁹ AMANDRY, BURNETT et AL 2015: 791; BENNETT 1997 (2015): 25–26; WOYTEK 2010: 18.

²⁰ HILL 1970; ETIENNE and RACHET 1984; BESOMBES 2008.

²¹ STRACK 1931: 26–29; WOYTEK 2010: 55–73.

to 103/104 (the year 149 from the foundation of the colony), 107/108 (the year 153), and 109/110 (the year 155). The coins of Amisus were struck in 98 (the year 129), 98/99 (the year 130), 106/107 (the year 138), 108/109 (the year 140), and 113/114 (the year 145).²² The number of Trajan's consulships (COS II, COS III) can be found on coins from Apamea Myrlea, a Roman colony, thus showing that these coins were issued in 98 and 100.²³ No dates are indicated on the coins from Heraclea and Tium, but, on the basis of features from portraits on imperial coins, they can be assigned to three time periods: one between 98 and 102, another between 103 and 114, and a third between 114 and 116.²⁴ The coins from Amastris, which were issued at the beginning of Trajan's reign and then again after he received the nicknames *Optimus* and *Parthicus*, can be grouped in a similar fashion.²⁵

Coins from Bithynia and Pontus usually had a portrait of the emperor on the obverse. Only four centres in the province – Byzantium, Amastris, Sinope, and Amisus – also issued pseudo-autonomous coins, probably during this period.²⁶ These were single types with images of Byzas (Byzantium), Dionysus, Helios (Amastris), and Diogenes (Sinope). In turn, images of Nike, Dionysus, Aphrodite, and Athena appeared on the coins of Amisus.²⁷ The emperor was usually portrayed with a laurel wreath or, somewhat less commonly, wearing a radiate crown. This latter element only appeared on coins from Calchedon, Byzantium, Tium, and Sinope.²⁸ In imperial coinage, the *corona radialis* served as an indicator of the denomination. In provincial coinage, this element was rather standard and did not serve as an indicator.²⁹ It appeared on the coins of Byzantium on numerous different denominations.³⁰ On issues of identical size (25–26 mm, 9–12 g) that were struck in Tium, the emperor appeared both in a laurel wreath and in a radiate crown.³¹ It may be that the *corona radialis* indicated separate denominations in

²² Apamea RPC III 1029–1031; Amastris RPC III; Sinope RPC III 1217–1219; Amisus RPC III 1231–1244; WOYTEK 2011.

²³ RPC III 1029–1031.

²⁴ AMANDRY, BURNETT et AL 2015: 139–141.

²⁵ *Ibidem*: 139, 141 and 143.

²⁶ Because no portrait of the emperor appears, and because there is no issue date on some of the coins, it is often difficult to determine when certain pseudo-autonomous coins were struck. When this is the case, other features of the coins are taken into account, such as the style of execution or the iconographic types. ZAJĄC 2018: 80–85.

²⁷ Byzantium: Byzas RPC III 1088; Amastris: Dionysus RPC III 1209, Helios RPC III 1210; Sinope: Diogenes RPC III 1230; Amisus: Nike RPC III 1231–1233, Dionysus RPC III 1235, Aphrodite RPC III 1239, Athena RPC III 1297.

²⁸ Calchedon RPC III 1061; Byzantium RPC III 1072–1083A; Tium RPC III 1180; Sinope RPC III 1219.

²⁹ BUTCHER 1988: 40–44; AMANDRY, BURNETT et AL 2015: 843.

³⁰ Byzantium: 26–30 mm, 10–15 g (RPC III 1071–1074), 24 mm, 7–9 g (RPC III 1077–1079); 18–21 mm, 5–7 g (RPC III 1080–1082).

³¹ Tium: RPC III 1180–1182.

Calchedon and Sinope,³² but the small number of coins from both of these cities does not allow us to verify this hypothesis.

The coins on which only the title *Germanicus* appeared in Greek were issued in Apamea, Nicomedia, Juliopolis, Prusias ad Hypium, Tium, Amastris, and Abonoteichos.³³ They make up 35% of the issues struck in Bithynia and Pontus. The imperial coins from the beginning of Trajan's reign show the emperor in a non-idealized fashion, with a long neck and a head that is flat in the back. These features were also reflected on issues from Bithynia and Pontus.³⁴ On this basis, one can assume that some of the coins without an ethnicon could also have been struck at the beginning of Trajan's reign.³⁵ The period in which cognomen *Dacicus* appeared on the coins is the one that most of the coins (48%) come from. This part of Trajan's title appeared on issues from Prusa ad Olympum, Nicaea, Calchedon, Byzantium, Heraclea, Tium, Sinope, Amastris, and Amisus.³⁶ Woytek divided the busts from imperial coins with the cognomen *Dacicus* into four categories of representations.³⁷ Type A representations are dated to between 99 and 105. The images from this period have a flat, elongated face, a flat spot on the back of the head, a forehead, and strong facial features. Type B representations have a large, wide head and bust, a head that is rounded in back, a forehead, and a clearly engraved jaw. These representations are dated to between 105 and 107. The issues with type C representations are dated to between 107 and 109. The representations of the emperor from this period have a long neck and a head that is rounded in back. They are similar to type A representations but the portrait is idealized. Finally, type D representations can be found on coins struck after 109. These portraits are characterized by their wide busts, a clearly defined nose and chin, and a head that is rounded in the back.

It is only on some of the coins struck in mints from the lands of Bithynia and Pontus that the portraits have features which enable us to determine the type of

³² Calchedon: 23 mm, 7–8 g (RPC III 1061); Sinope: 29 mm, 16–17 g (RPC III 1219).

³³ Apamea RPC III 1029–1031; Nicomedia RPC III 1089–1092; Juliopolis RPC III 1098–1100; Prusias ad Hypium RPC III 1101–1103; Tium RPC III 1178–1183; Amastris RPC III 1199–1204; Abonoteichos RPC III 1211–1212.

³⁴ Apamea RPC III 1029–1031; Nicomedia RPC III 1089–1092; Juliopolis RPC III 1098–1100; Prusias ad Hypium RPC III 1101–1103; Heraclea Pontica RPC III 1161–1162; Tium RPC III 1178–1184; Amastris RPC III 1198–1204; Abonoteichos RPC III 1211–1213.

³⁵ RPC III 1121–1130, 1137–1138, 1149, 1153.

³⁶ This nickname appears on all the coins from Prusa ad Olympum (RPC III 1035–1049), on 95% of the issues from Byzantium (RPC III 1067–1069, 1071–1083), on 80% of the issues from Heraclea (RPC III 1163–1177), on 66% of the issues from Sinope (RPC III 1217–1218), on 64% of the issues from Amisus (RPC III 1236–1244), on 50% of the issues from Tium (RPC III 1185–1190), on 10% of the issues from Amastris (RPC III 1207), on one issue from Nicaea (RPC III 1059), and on one issue from Calchedon (RPC III 1061).

³⁷ WOYTEK 2010: 58–62; 685–686.

imperial issue that was probably used as a model for Trajan's image.³⁸ The portraits on coins issued in Prusa³⁹ were based on earlier representations of Trajan from imperial coins. The issues struck in Byzantium did not represent very clearly the individual features in the emperor's portrait from imperial coins; however, in some cases the ruler was depicted with a radiate crown and paludamentum.⁴⁰ It may be that coins of this type were modelled on dupondii issued no earlier than in the years 103 to 107.⁴¹ The coins struck in Nicaea, at the earliest in 105, have very clear type B portraits.⁴² The images of Trajan that can be found on the coins of Heraclea with the nickname *Dacicus* are indicative of type A, B, and C portraits. It is likely that the issues with representations of Heracles and Dionysus⁴³ were struck after 105 (type B portraits), whereas the coins with a bust of Athena⁴⁴ were struck after 107 (type C portraits). Issues with the image of Poseidon⁴⁵ were based on early portraits of the emperor. The representations of Trajan on issues from Tium have type A and B characteristics. It is assumed that coins with images of Zeus Syrgastes, Hera, or Asclepius⁴⁶ were struck after 105. Only some of the coins issues in Heraclea and Amastris have the nickname *Optimus* (*Αριστος*),⁴⁷ while *Parthicus* can only be found on some of the coins from Amastris.⁴⁸

On the basis of the titulature, among other things, it is estimated that most of the provincial coins during Trajan's rule were issued between 98 and 102.⁴⁹ Based on an analysis of Trajan's portraits, we can say that most of the issues in Bithynia and Pontus were struck after 102. This means that the production of coins in Bithynia and Pontus was greater during this period compared to the beginning of Trajan's rule, suggesting that there was an increase in the influx of imperial coins struck after 102. It may be that one of the reasons for this increase was Pliny the Younger's arrival in the province (c. 109⁵⁰). Unfortunately, there are not enough sources to confirm this theory, and, using Pliny's letters as a base, the various architectural projects

³⁸ Prusa (RPC III 1035–1049), Byzantium (RPC III 1071–1083A), Nicaea (RPC III 1059, 1134, 1136), Heraclea (RPC III 1163–1165, 1167, 1170), Tium (RPC III 1187–1190).

³⁹ RPC III 1035–1049.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem* 1071–1083A.

⁴¹ WOYTEK 2010: 606; *Ibidem* 196f, 201f, 251f (103–107), 324f, 330f (107–110).

⁴² RPC III 1059, 1134, 1136.

⁴³ *Ibidem* 1163–1165.

⁴⁴ *Ibidem* 1167.

⁴⁵ *Ibidem* 1170.

⁴⁶ *Ibidem* 1187–1190.

⁴⁷ Heraclea RPC III 1172–1177; Amastris RPC III 1205–1206.

⁴⁸ RPC III 1207.

⁴⁹ AMANDRY, BURNETT et AL 2015: 841.

⁵⁰ WINNICZUK 2017: 81.

(in Prusa the building of the baths; in Nicomedia, the aqueduct; in Nicaea, the theatre⁵¹) rather point to the financing as having come from a local source.

ROMAN CULTURE AND THE LOCAL TRADITION – THE IMPERIAL COINS OF DOMITIAN ISSUED IN THRACE AS A MODEL FOR THE COINS OF TRAJAN STRUCK IN BITHYNIA AND PONTUS

The reverses of coins struck in many of the centres in Bithynia and Pontus have the same motives. These are coins with images of Eirene (Pax),⁵² Ares (Mars),⁵³ Elpis (Spes),⁵⁴ Demeter (Ceres),⁵⁵ Athena (Minerva),⁵⁶ Nike (Victoria),⁵⁷ an eagle standing on a globe,⁵⁸ or an altar.⁵⁹ These motives were first used on coins in Bithynia and Pontus during the age of Domitian (81–96). It was at this time that mints in Nicaea, Nicomedia, and Prusias ad Hypium began producing coins with these representations (cf. Table 1). Some of the above-mentioned types – e.g. Eirene,⁶⁰ Athena,⁶¹ Nike,⁶² an eagle standing on a globe,⁶³ an altar⁶⁴ – were present on coins of Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of the Julio-Claudian dynasty or that of Vespasian, but, iconographically, they are not always the same images that we can observe during the reign of Domitian or that of Trajan.

We might be able to see as a prototype of these motives the bronze imperial issues that were struck at an unidentified mint functioning between 80 and 82, most likely in Thrace. In comparison to the imperial coins issued in Rome, the issues from this mint differ in style and make. Initially, this group of coins was attributed to Lugdunum; however, taking into account the finds, we should regard the mint as

⁵¹ Plin., *Ep.* X, 23, 37, 39.

⁵² Apamea RPC III 1029; Juliopolis RPC III 1099; Prusias ad Hypium RPC III 1101; Uncertain mint RPC III 1125–1126, 1131

⁵³ Nicaea RPC III 1059; Juliopolis RPC III 1098; Amastris RPC III 1198.

⁵⁴ Amastris RPC III 1199; Abonoteichos RPC III 1211; Uncertain mint RPC III 1127.

⁵⁵ Prusa ad Olympum RPC III 1038; Juliopolis RPC III 1100; Uncertain mint (Prusias?) RPC III 1123, 1128–1130, 1132–1133, 1137–1140, 1144; Amastris RPC III 1201–1202; Abonoteichos RPC III 1213.

⁵⁶ Uncertain mint (Nicaea?) RPC III 1141–1143; Amastris RPC III 1203.

⁵⁷ Uncertain mint (Nicaea?) RPC III 1146–1147.

⁵⁸ Prusias ad Hypium RPC III 1102; Uncertain mint RPC III 1124, 1152–1153, 1155, 1158–1160; Amastris RPC III 1103.

⁵⁹ Prusias ad Hypium RPC III 1103; Uncertain mint (Nicaea?) RPC III 1121–1122, 1148–1152, 1154, 1156–1157, 1159.

⁶⁰ Nicomedia RPC I 2062 – Eirene standing left, holding a caduceus.

⁶¹ Heraclea RPC I 2088 – Athena standing left, holding a patera, spear, and shield.

⁶² Apamea RPC I 2004–2006 – Victoria standing on a globe, holding a wreath and palm; 2016 – Victoria standing left, holding a shield; Nicaea RPC I 2026–2027 – Nike advancing, holding a palm and wreath; Nicomedia RPC I 2084 – Nike advancing, holding a palm and wreath; Amisus RPC I 2145, 2154; RPC II 729 – Nike advancing, holding a palm and wreath.

⁶³ Prusa RPC I 2019 – an eagle with a wreath in its beak.

⁶⁴ Nicaea RPC I 2049, 2053, 2055, 2059; Prusias ad Hypium RPC II 670.

having existed in the eastern Balkans. Because of the similarities between the motives used in both this group of imperial coins and the provincial issues from Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Domitian, Cahn regarded this mint as having existed in Bithynia. However, the alloy, the metrological values, and the presence of coins of this type in museums and private collections in Sofia, Belgrade, and Istanbul lead us to believe that the mint was located in Thrace.⁶⁵

The above-mentioned bronze imperial coins, which were struck between 80 and 82, probably in an unidentified mint in Thrace, have images and legends characteristic of imperial coins struck in Rome; they are not connected to the local tradition or culture. The motives used included Pax, Mars, a palm tree with personifications of the people of Judea, Spes, Roma, and Ceres, as well as a poppy head between crossed cornucopiae.⁶⁶ Restitution coins were also issued: ones with representations of Victoria, an altar, an eagle standing on a globe, Neptune, Spes, Minerva, and a poppy head between crossed cornucopiae.⁶⁷ Many of these motives became the precursors of images on coins issued by mints in Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Domitian and that of Trajan. The only thing that wasn't included was a representation with the legend *IVDAEA CAPTA*.⁶⁸

Comparing issues from the time of Domitian and that of Trajan, we can see that the same iconographic motives continued to be used in particular centres in Bithynia and Pontus. During the reign of Domitian, the Greek equivalent of the personification of Pax (Eirene) appeared on the coins of Nicaea, Prusias ad Hypium, and probably Nicomedia⁶⁹ on denominations similar to a Roman sesterius (cf. Table 1).⁷⁰ During the time of Trajan, this same representation appeared on coins from Apamea, Juliopolis, and Prusias ad Hypium. This motive is also present on coins with no ethnicon, ones that perhaps should be attributed to the mints in Amastris and Nicaea.⁷¹ Much like

⁶⁵ CAHN 1984–1985; CARRADICE and COWELL 1987; AMANDRY, BURNETT et AL 1999: 87–91; BURNETT 1999.

⁶⁶ Pax – Cahn 1, 4, 20, 24; BMCRE 309, 315; RIC 181; RPC II 501, 504, 526, 530; Mars – Cahn 2, 5, 21, 25; BMCRE 310; RIC 182; RPC II 502, 527, 531; the palm tree with the personifications of the people of Judea – Cahn 3; RPC II 503; Spes – Cahn 6; RPC II 506; Roma – Cahn 7, 22, 26; BMCRE 314; RPC II 507, 528, 532; Ceres – Cahn 8–9, 23, 27; RPC II 508–509, 529, 533; poppy between crossed cornucopiae – RPC II 510.

⁶⁷ Victoria – Cahn 11; RPC II 512, 534; BMCRE 266; altar – Cahn 12, 28; RPC II 513, 535; an eagle standing on a globe – Cahn 13, 29; RPC II 514, 536; Neptune – Cahn 14; RPC II 520; Spes – Cahn 18, 34; RPC II 521–522, 541; Minerva – Cahn 19, 35; RPC II 523, 542; poppy between crossed cornucopiae – RPC II 543.

⁶⁸ Either that or coins of this type have not yet been recorded. The lands of what used to be Bithynia and Pontus have not undergone extensive archaeological investigation.

⁶⁹ Some iconographic elements on the coin are indecipherable.

⁷⁰ Some of the types are represented by just one coin; hence, it is not possible to provide a weight or diameter that could be regarded as a standard for the issue. Nor do these values strictly correspond to the denominations of imperial coins. It is evident that some of the coins are a little bit lighter. One should also remember that there were monetary systems in the provinces that cannot be set down using one standard. Instead of indicating average weights and diameters, the table indicates the range that the given coins fall into.

⁷¹ ZAJAČ 2019: 43–45.

during the reign of Domitian, this same image was used on larger denominations. The figure of Mars advancing with a *tropaeum* and spear appeared on sestertii issued between 80 and 82; it also appeared on the coins of Nicaea, Nicomedia, and Prusias ad Hypium during the time of Domitian⁷² and on the coins of Nicaea, Juliopolis, and Amastris during the reign of Trajan.⁷³ The same motive was also used on larger denominations. The personification of Spes present on imperial sestertii was used on coins from Nicaea during the reign of Domitian⁷⁴ and then on coins from Amastris and Abonoteichos during the reign of Trajan.⁷⁵ It is probably the case that issues with this representation but without an ethnicon should also be assigned to Amastris.⁷⁶ All the coins with the personification of Elpis were struck in a larger denomination. On the reverse of one series of dupondii, issued between 80 and 82, we can see Roma holding a wreath; on another, we can see Ceres with corn ears and a long sceptre. Asses were also struck with the personification of Ceres. During the reign of Domitian, the motive of Roma was used on coins in Nicaea, while Demeter was used on coins in Nicaea, Prusias ad Hypium and Bithynium Claudopolis.⁷⁷ The coins without an ethnicon should probably be assigned to Prusias. Nearly all the centers issued denominations similar to imperial coins. Only the mint in Bithynium Claudopolis struck a smaller denomination with the image of Demeter (24 mm, 7–9 g). In the age of Trajan, the centres of Bithynia and Pontus did not use Roma on their coins; however, the personification of Demeter, being one of the universal cults, can be seen on the coins of Prusa ad Olympum, Juliopolis, Amastris, and Abonoteichos.⁷⁸ Many coins without an ethnicon were also struck with the personification of the goddess of the harvest; most likely, they came out of the mints in Nicaea and Prusias.⁷⁹ In comparison to an earlier period, this motive had already been used on three different coins. With respect to the metrological values, it was the coins that were struck in Juliopolis, Amastris, as well as Nicaea and/or Prusias that were the most similar to imperial coins.⁸⁰ Dupondii issued between 80 and 82 also showed the image of Victoria holding a shield, while asses showed a wreath and palm. Both of these motives can be found on the coins of Bithynia and Pontus that were struck during

⁷² Nicaea RPC II 632; Nicomedia RPC II 653; Prusias ad Hypium RPC II 671.

⁷³ Nicaea RPC III 1059; Juliopolis RPC III 1098; Amastris RPC III 1198.

⁷⁴ Nicaea RPC II 634.

⁷⁵ Amastris RPC III 1199; Abonoteichos RPC III 1211.

⁷⁶ AMANDRY, BURNETT et AL 2015: 136; ZAJĄC 2019: 43–44.

⁷⁷ Nicaea RPC II 636; Prusias ad Hypium RPC II 673–674; Bithynium Claudopolis RPC II 694–695.

⁷⁸ Prusa ad Olympum RPC III 1038; Juliopolis RPC III 1100; Amastris RPC III 1201–1202; Abonoteichos RPC III 1213.

⁷⁹ ZAJĄC 2019: 42–48.

⁸⁰ With respect to metrological values, the similarity is to a Roman as: Juliopolis RPC III; Amastris RPC III 1201–1202; uncertain mint (perhaps Nicaea and/or Prusias) RPC III 1128, 1132, 1133, 1137.

the period of Domitian's reign. The former representation can be found on coins of Nicaea of the same denomination as in Rome. The latter representation of these iconographic types was also found on coins without an ethnicon but corresponding to a Greek as. During the age of Trajan, the image of Nike holding a shield or globe could be found on coins that were the same denomination as a Roman dupondius – it may be the case that these coins came from the mint in Nicaea.⁸¹ Coins with the image of an approaching Minerva holding a spear and a shield were used on asses issued between 80 and 82. During the reign of Domitian, this motive only existed on the coins of Prusias ad Hypium. Because only one coin of this kind has been recorded, it is very difficult to state whether it corresponded to imperial coins, especially with respect to its weight. During the age of Trajan, this motive was used on the coins of Amastris and, probably, those of Nicaea (coins without an ethnicon).⁸² The personification of Athena could be found on two different denominations that were lighter than imperial coins. On another issue of asses from the mint in Thrace we can also see an eagle standing on a globe. During the reign of Domitian, this was a motive that was used on coins from Nicaea that were issued in a lighter denomination than the imperial coins. During the age of Trajan, the representation of an eagle on a globe appeared on the coins of Prusias ad Hypium, those of Amastris, and probably those of Nicaea (the coins without an ethnicon).⁸³ However, these coins represent four or five different denominations. Asses also had a representation of an altar. Nicaea had issued coins with this same image before, during the reign of Nero.⁸⁴ During the age of Vespasian, the coins of Prusias ad Hypium had a representation of an altar which could have corresponded to two asses.⁸⁵ During the reign of Domitian, this motive was found on coins from the same mint that were similar to the Roman denomination. We can also probably assign coins without an ethnicon to this mint, ones struck in the same denomination as those from an earlier period. During the age of Trajan, coins with a representation of an altar – probably in two or three denominations – were issued in Prusias ad Hypium and Nicaea (the coins without an ethnicon).⁸⁶ It may be that one of these coins (from those with an uncertain attribution) was similar to an imperial as.

The motive showing Neptune holding a dolphin and a trident, which was also found on asses issued between 80 and 82,⁸⁷ was probably not a representation used

⁸¹ AMANDRY, BURNETT et AL 2015: 136; ZAJĄC 2019: 45–46.

⁸² *Ibidem*: 45–46.

⁸³ *Ibidem*: 42–43, 50.

⁸⁴ RPC I 2049, 2053, 2055, 2059.

⁸⁵ RPC II 670.

⁸⁶ AMANDRY, BURNETT et AL 2015, p. 136; ZAJĄC 2019: 42–43, 48–49.

⁸⁷ CAHN 14, 30; RPC II 520, 540.

on any of the issues of Bithynia and Pontus during the time of Domitian.⁸⁸ This same image has been found on coins of Heraclea Pontica struck in two different denominations during the reign of Trajan.⁸⁹ Because this centre was located on the coast, there is nothing strange about the fact that this motive is to be found on these coins. The representation is rather standard for both imperial and provincial coins. During the age of Domitian, Poseidon was represented with a dolphin and a trident on the coins of Roman colonies like Corinth or Patras and on those from the local centre in Dorylaeum.⁹⁰ During the reign of Trajan, images of Poseidon were used on coins from Corinth, Magnetes, Rhodes, Dorylaeum, Aradus, and Alexandria;⁹¹ however, it was not always the same iconographic type that was used. The coins from Heraclea with a representation of Poseidon were not modelled on imperial coins but referred to a certain universal and well-known iconographic tradition. Moreover, coins with this representation already appeared in Heraclea during the reign of Claudius.⁹² During the reign of Trajan, the mint in Tium also issued coins with the image of Poseidon⁹³ but in a different iconographic type than the representations on the coins of Heraclea. Interestingly enough, the obverse showed the emperor with a radiate crown; the denomination is somewhat reminiscent of a Roman dupondius, though it seems to be lighter (26 mm, 8–11 g).

On the smallest denominations (17 mm, 4–6 g) of imperial coins (perhaps semisses) issued between 80 and 82, we can see a representation of a poppy head between crossed cornucopiae.⁹⁴ During the reign of Domitian, this exact same iconographic type was not used on coins from Bithynia and Pontus but only one that was very similar. On coins issued in Nicomedia, Tium, and Calchedon, we can see representations of a poppy head between two corn ears; these coins were of a denomination similar to the imperial coins.⁹⁵ During the reign of Trajan, probably only one series of coins with this image was issued, perhaps by the mint in Nicomedia (coins without an ethnicon).⁹⁶ It is worth noting that some iconographic types only

⁸⁸ No coins in Bithynia and Pontus with this iconographic type have thus far been found.

⁸⁹ RPC III 1174: 23–24 mm, 14–15g; RPC III 1170: 19–21 mm, 4–6 g.

⁹⁰ Corinth RPC II 138, 182 (standing figure of a deity); 139–141, 150, 188–191 (sitting figure of a deity); 142–143, 192–193 (deity in biga); 148 (foot on rock); 183–187; 149 (foot on dolphin); Patras on a rock 244–246; Dorylaeum RPC II 1414.

⁹¹ Corinth RPC III 111–113; Magnetes RPC III 465; Rhodes RPC III 2184; Dorylaeum RPC III 2637; Aradus RPC III 3818; Alexandria RPC III 4318, 4690, 4747, 4978.

⁹² RPC I 2090.

⁹³ RPC III 1180.

⁹⁴ RPC II 510, 543.

⁹⁵ Nicomedia RPC III 663A (18–19 mm, 3–5 g); Tium RPC III 703A (19 mm, 3–4 g); Calchedon RPC III 370A (22 mm, 4–5 g).

⁹⁶ Uncertain mint RPC III 6548 (19 mm, 4–5 g).

occurred on the smallest provincial coins.⁹⁷ However, one should keep in mind that this is not a hard and fast rule for all of the minting centres. The motive of a poppy head between corn ears could have been an image that was characteristic in particular for the smallest denominations.

During the reign of Domitian, provincial coins made use of at least seven iconographic types found on imperial coins struck between 80 and 82. These motives were duplicated on coins issued mainly in Nicaea, Nicomedia, and Prusias ad Hypium. Moreover, because the parameters of some provincial coins of Bithynia and Pontus are similar⁹⁸ to imperial coins with regard to their weight and diameter, we can confirm that the former were modelled after the latter. During the age of Trajan, the same motives were reflected on coins from these same mints but also on ones from other centres in the province, which goes to show how far the individual images travelled. The mint in Amastris issued five iconographic types from imperial coins;⁹⁹ similar to their Roman denominations, they were, however, lighter than them. One coin issue, with a representation of an eagle standing on a globe, was struck in a larger denomination (32 mm, 24 g). The minting centre in Juliopolis issued coins with the same representations of Eirene, Ares, and Demeter on denominations that were very similar to imperial coins. The same image of Elpis as well as that of Demeter could be found on coins from Abonoteichos, but it is only the issue with the former motive that has a similar diameter to sestertii. Apamea Myrlea and Prusa ad Olympon struck coins with motives duplicating representations from imperial coins issued between 80 and 82. Only the coins issued by the Roman colony in Apamea reproduced the same image on a denomination that, with regard to its diameter, was very similar to imperial coins.

It may be that provincial coins struck in Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan – ones without an ethnicon (and which were probably issued mainly by Nicaea and Prusias ad Hypium) but with images of Demeter, Elpis, Eirene, Nike, Athena, an altar, or an eagle standing on a globe – were supposed to imitate imperial coins that were commonly in circulation and recognized across the empire to some extent. Thus, these coins might have been in circulation throughout the province – and not only in the center of production – so as to satisfy the needs of cities that, for example, could not issue their own coinage at the time in question.

⁹⁷ For example, the smallest denominations had motives such as a lyre (Sestus 756; Apollonia ad Rhyndacum RPC III 1598A; Thyatira RPC III 1830), the figure of Telesphorus (Cyzicus RPC III 1530; Hadrianotherae 1625; Pergamum RPC III 1733–1734) or grapes (Tium RPC III 1184; Sala RPC III 2433, 2436A; Philadelphia RPC III 3214).

⁹⁸ They are not always the same.

⁹⁹ Ares RPC III 1198; Elpis RPC III 1199; Demeter RPC III 1201–1202; Athena RPC III 1203; an eagle standing on a globe RPC III 1204–1205.

The motives above that were used on some of the coins from Bithynia and Pontus were general iconographic types that would have been recognized by everyone in the provinces; however, they would not always have been used on coins from all the local centres. During the rule of Domitian, 33.7% of the motives that appeared on imperial coins between 80 and 82 were also used on some coins from Bithynia and Pontus; during the time of Trajan, 39.5% of all the iconographic types appeared on coins from this province. During Hadrian's reign, only images of Demeter were still a popular representation appearing on *koinon* coins and coins from Bithynium Claudiopolis and Amisus,¹⁰⁰ whereas Athena appeared on coins from Apamea, Cius, Bithynium Claudiopolis, and Amisus.¹⁰¹

The most widespread motive in Domitian's imperial mint was Minerva, the emperor's tutelary deity.¹⁰² The second type that appeared most often was Victoria. The remaining images were found mostly on restored coins struck during Flavians rule. From among these types, the representations that appeared most frequently on provincial coinage of this period were as follows: Athena (4.8%), Nike (4.2%), an eagle (3%), and Demeter (2.5%). The following appeared much less frequently: Eirene (0.7%), Ares (0.7%), and Elpis (0.5%). During the age of Trajan, the motives on imperial coins were far more diverse. Among the images duplicated from imperial coins issued between 80 and 82, the type that most often appeared on imperial coins from this period was Victoria (11.8%); less frequent appearances are made by Pax (5.3%), Mars (4.2%), and Roma (2.52%). In provincial coinage of this period, the above-mentioned iconographic types did not appear widely. Among these, the images that appeared most frequently were Athena (4.5%), Victoria (4.2%), and Demeter (4.1%), while Ares (1.3%), Eirene (1.07%), and Elpis (0.69%) appeared less frequently. At the same time, it needs to be emphasized that these were not always the exact same iconographic types.

Because of the similarities between the coins indicated above, C. Kraay suggested that a centralized system of mints may have existed in the province,¹⁰³ one that could be reflected in the similar denominational structure, the similar metal structure, the images, legends, the die-links, and the fact that the same currency was in circulation. Looking at the coins, however, it seems that, to a certain extent, three cities were integrated during the reign of Domitian: Nicaea, Nicomedia, and Prusias ad Hypium. These centres were located in the northwestern part of Anatolia. Unfortunately, we still do not have at our disposal certain requisite information

¹⁰⁰ Koinon RPC III 966; Bithynium Claudiopolis RPC III 1104; Amisus RPC III 1256–1257, 1260, 1289–1291.

¹⁰¹ Apamea RPC III 1034; Cius RPC III 1052; Bithynium Claudiopolis RPC III 1106; Amisus RPC III 1249–1250.

¹⁰² MROZEWICZ 2012; CARRADICE 1983; IDEM 2012: 385–386.

¹⁰³ KRAAY 1953.

that would confirm that a union of these three cities existed. Despite the number of similarities, especially with regard to the iconography and certain denominations, it is not possible to conclude that a centralized monetary system existed in Bithynia and Pontus. During the age of Trajan, certain monetary tendencies were popularized and made use of by individual mints. However, coins with other images were still issued, ones that reflected local traditions. Each city had its own monetary system, which was not standardized for the entire province.

CONCLUSIONS

Some of the images on coins from Bithynia and Pontus issued during the reign of Trajan were modelled on imperial coins. These similarities and identical motives were reproduced from coins struck during the age of both Trajan (mostly portraits) and that of Domitian (the images on issues struck between 80 and 82). Because certain elements are absent on provincial coins (other legends are used or the attire is different), researchers are generally inclined towards the opinion that these provincial coins were not based directly on imperial coins; however, this would have been a much easier and more practical way to reproduce the emperor's image on the obverse as well as the titulature. Some portraits of Trajan on the coins of Bithynia and Pontus reflect certain features from imperial coins, thus enabling us to give a more exact description of the time at which a given issue was struck. Trajan's likenesses on the coins from Prusa with the nickname *Dacicus* have features that are characteristic of early portraits of the emperor and were struck after 102 at the earliest. The coins from Nicaea were issued after 105. Some issues from Byzantium could have been modelled on dupondii from between 103 and 107. The portraits on coins from Heraclea and Tium reproduce elements of the image from imperial coins struck after 102, 105, and 107.

In particular, our attention is drawn by the fact that, during the reign of Trajan, the reverses of provincial coins from particular centres in Bithynia and Pontus have the same motives of Eirene, Ares, Elpis, Demeter, Nike, Athena, an eagle standing on a globe, and an altar. However, this tradition has its origin in the age of Domitian. At that time, Nicaea, Nicomedia, and Prusias ad Hypium duplicated images from imperial issues struck between 80 and 82 at a mint that is still not known but which probably existed in Thrace. During the reign of Trajan, certain motives became more widespread, beginning to appear on coins from Apamea, Juliopolis, Amastris, Abonoteichos, and Prusa ad Olympum. The denominations on which the images of Eirene, Ares, and Elpis appear are very similar to imperial sestertii. Moreover, certain issues from Juliopolis, Amastris, and probably Nicaea are reminiscent of Roman dupondii in terms of their denomination.

In relation to the past, however, particular images were used on a much greater number of denominations. Despite the fact that certain cities in Bithynia and Pontus

issued coins with the motives described in this article, it needs to be remembered that these motives were not all modelled on images of imperial coins issued between 80 and 82. The cities that belong to this category include Bithynium Claudiopoli during the reign of Domitian, Prusa ad Olympum, Abonoteichos, and Heraclea. Issues from these cities used the well-known image of Demeter (Bithynium Claudiopoli, Prusa, Abonoteichos) but also that of Neptune because of the centre's cult and location (Heraclea). Some of the representations appeared on coins during the rule of earlier emperors; however, this does not mean that imperial coins issued between 80 and 82 did not also contribute, to a certain degree, to the popularization of particular types within the province. Despite the many similarities, the fact that there is no agreement in terms of the metals that are used, the denominations, the iconography, or the relations between the dies makes it impossible for us to accept the idea that a centralized system existed in Bithynia and Pontus. However, there may have been cooperation between the centres in Nicaea, Nicomedia, and Prusias during the age of Domitian. Why were certain images on provincial coins modelled on those from imperial coins issued between 80 and 82? While the motives that were chosen do not seem to have been popular on local coinage, they were universal in scope and well known in the province. It may be that the coins of Nicaea, Nicomedia, and Prusias ad Hypium that were struck during the reign of Domitian were supposed to imitate imperial coins of a particular value, ones that would have been recognizable across the empire. We should also keep in mind the mysterious location of an imperial mint that Cahn regarded as having been in Bithynia. On the basis of further similar motives on coins from other centres during the reign of Trajan, we can conclude that coins with these images were present throughout the province. Unfortunately, because of the small number of archaeological investigations in northern Turkey, we cannot verify the circulation of coins during this period. We should assume, however, that at this time it was well-known images from an earlier period that were duplicated; at the same time, each city would have preserved its own identity in terms of its minting policy.

ABBREVIATIONS

- Cahn = CAHN, H.A. 1984–1985. “An imperial mint in Bithynia”, *INJ* 8: 14–26.
 Mi = MIONNET, T.E. *Description des médailles antiques, grecques et romaines*, Paris 1806–1837.
 Rec = WADDINGTON, W., BABELON, E. and REINACH, T. *Recueil général des monnaies grecques d'Asie mineure*, Paris 1904–1912.
 RPC I = AMANDRY, M., BURNETT, A. and RIPPOLÉS, P. *Roman Provincial Coinage*, vol. I: *From the death of Caesar to the death of Vitellius 44 BC–AD 69*, London–Paris 1992.
 RPC II = AMANDRY, M., BURNETT, A. and CARRADICE, I. *Roman Provincial Coinage*, vol. II: *From Vespasian to Domitian (AD 69–96)*, London–Paris 1999.
 RPC III = AMANDRY, M., BURNETT, A. et AL. *Roman Provincial Coinage*, vol. III: *Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian (AD 96–138)*, London–Paris 2015.
 Sch = SCHÖNERT-GEISS, E. *Die Münzprägung von Byzantion*, Teil 2: *Kaiserzeit*, Berlin 1972.

REFERENCES

- ARSLAN, M. 2012. "Iuliopolis Nekropolu Kharon Sikkeleri". In: K. DORTLUK, O. TEKIN and R.B. SEYHAN (eds.), *First International Congress of the Anatolian Monetary History and Numismatics*, Istanbul: 13–24.
- ARSLAN, M. 1996. "The Manyas Hoard of Denarii". In: R. ASHTON (ed.), *Studies in ancient coinage from Turkey*, London: 31–36.
- BENNETT, J. 1997 (2015). *Trajan. Optimus Princeps. Życie i czasy*, trans. M.N. Faszczka and M. Baranowski, Oświęcim.
- BESOMBES, P.-A. 2008. *Monnaies de l'Empire romain IV. Trajan (98–117 après J.-C.)*, Paris–Strasbourg.
- BURNETT, A. 1987. *Coinage in the Roman World*, London.
- BURNETT, A. 1999. "Regional coinage in Thrace and Bithynia during the Flavian period". In: M. AMANDRY and S. HURTER (eds.), *Travaux de numismatique grecque offerts à Georges Le Rider*, London: 95–101.
- BUTCHER, K. 1988. *Roman Provincial Coins: An Introduction to the "Greek Imperials"*, London.
- CAHN, H.A. 1984–1985. "An Imperial Mint in Bithynia", *Israel Numismatic Journal* 8: 14–26.
- CARRADICE, I. 1983. *Coinage and Finances in the Reign of Domitian*, Oxford.
- CARRADICE, I. 2012. "Flavian Coinage". In: W. METCALF (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Coinage*, Oxford: 375–390.
- CARRADICE, I. and COWELL, M. 1987. "The minting of Roman imperial bronze coins for circulation in the East: Vespasian to Trajan", *Numismatic Chronicle* 147: 26–50.
- DALAISON, J. 2017. "Les monnayages sans portrait impérial du nord de l'Asie mineure (Bithynie, Paphlagonie, Pont et Arménie mineure)", *Numismatic Chronicle* 177: 261–306.
- DEBIŃSKI, A., JOŃCA, M., LERACZYK, I. and ŁUKA, A. 2017. *Korespondencja Pliniusza Młodszego z cesarzem Trajanem. Tekst i tłumaczenie. Komentarz*, Lublin.
- ETIENNE, R. and RACHET, M. 1984. *Le Trésor de Garonne: Essai sur la Circulation Monétaire en Aquitaine à la Fin du Règne d'Antonin le Pieux (159–161)*, Bordeaux.
- FILGES, A. 2015. *Münzbild und Gemeinschaft: Die Prägungen der römischen Kolonien in Kleinasien*, Bonn.
- HARL, K.W. 1996. *Roman Economy, 300 B.C. to A.D. 700*, Baltimore–London.
- HEUCHERT, V. 2005. "The Chronological Development of Roman Provincial Coin Iconography". In: C. HOWGEGO and V. HEUCHERT (eds.), *Coinage and Identity in Roman Provinces*, Oxford: 29–56.
- HILL, Ph.V. 1970. *The Dating and Arrangement of the Undated Coins of Rome A.D. 98–148*, London.
- JOHNSTON, A. 1985. "The so-called pseudo-autonomous Greek Imperial", *Museum Notes* 30: 89–112.
- JOHNSTON, A. 1997. "Greek Imperial denominations in the province of Asia". In: J. NOLLE, B. OVERBACK and P. WEISS (eds.), *Internationales Kolloquium zur kaiserzeitlichen Münzprägung Kleinasien. 27.–30. April 1994 in der Staatlichen Münzsammlung München*, Milano: 205–229.
- JOHNSTON, A. 2007. *Greek Imperial Denominations, ca. 200–275. A Study of the Roman Provincial Bronze Coinages of Asia Minor*, London.
- JONES, T. B. 1963. "A Numismatic Riddle; the so-called Greek Imperials", *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 107 (4): 308–347.
- KATSARI, C. 2011. *The Roman Monetary System: The Eastern Provinces from the First to the Third Century AD*, Cambridge.

- KRAAY, C.M. 1953. *The aes coinage of Rome and its subsidiary mints in the West, AD 68–81*, Unpublished thesis, Oxford.
- LORIOT, X. 2011. “La province de Pont-Bithynie sous le Haut-Empire: assise territoriale et administration”. In: S. BENOIST, A. DAGUET-GAGEY and C. HOET VAN CAUWENBERGHE (eds.), *Figures d’empire, fragments de mémoire: Pouvoirs et identités dans le monde romain imperial (Ile s. av. n. è.–VIe s. de. n. è.)*, Lille: 257–286.
- MAC DONALD, D. 1989. “The Worth of the Assarion”, *Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 38 (1): 120–123.
- MROZEWICZ, L. 2012. “Religia i despotyzm: Domicjan”. In: L. MROZEWICZ (ed.), *Studia Flaviana II*, Poznań: 283–293.
- PRICE, S. 2005. “Local Mythologies in the Greek East”. In: C. HOWGEGO and V. HEUCHERT (eds.), *Coinage and Identity in Roman Provinces*, Oxford: 115–124.
- REMY, B. 1986. *L’Évolution administrative de l’Anatolie aux trois premiers siècles de notre ère*, Lyon.
- SALMERI, G. 2005. “Central power intervention and the economy of the provinces in the Roman Empire: the case of Pontus and Bithynia”. In: S. MITCHELL and C. KATSARI (eds.), *Patterns in the Economy of Roman Asia Minor*, Swansae: 187–207.
- SCHACHINGER, U. 2012. “The Coin Finds from the Theatre in Ephesus and Some Remarks on Coin Circulation in Ephesus”. In: K. DORTLUK, O. TEKIN and R. B. SEYHAN (eds.), *First International Congress of the Anatolian Monetary History and Numismatics*, Istanbul: 525–540.
- STRACK, P.L. 1931. *Untersuchungen zur römischen Reichsprägung des zweiten Jahrhunderts*, Teil I: *Die Reichsprägung zur Zeit des Traian*, Stuttgart.
- WINNICZUK, L. 2017. “Pliniusz w Bitynii”. In: A. DĘBIŃSKI, M. JOŃCA, I. LERACZYK and A. ŁUKA (eds.), *Korespondencja Pliniusza Młodszeo z cesarzem Trajanem. Tekst i tłumaczenie. Komentarz*, Lublin: 79–87.
- WOYTEK, B. 2010. *Die Reichsprägung des Kaisers Traianus (98–117)*, Wien.
- WOYTEK, B. 2011. “The coinage of Apamea Myrlea under Trajan and the problem of double communities in the Roman East”, *Numismatic Chronicle* 171: 121–132.
- ZAJĄC, B. 2018. “Who, why and when? Pseudo-autonomous coins in Eastern provinces at the beginning of the 2nd century AD”. In: B. ZAJĄC, P. KOCZWARA, A. JURKIEWICZ and S. JELLONEK (eds.), *Pecunia Omnes Vincit. Coin as a medium of exchange throughout centuries, Conference Proceedings of the 3rd International Numismatic Conference, Krakow 20–21 May 2016*, Kraków: 75–91.
- ZAJĄC, B. 2019. “Mysterious uncertain Bithynian coins”. In: B. ZAJĄC, P. KOCZWARA and S. JELLONEK (eds.), *Pecunia Omnes Vincit. Conference Proceedings of the 4th International Numismatic and Economic Conference, Krakow 12–13 May 2017*, Kraków: 41–56.

Author’s address:

Barbara Zajac
Institute of Archaeology, Jagiellonian University
11 Gołębia Street
31-107 Krakow, Poland
basia.zajac21@gmail.com
ORCID 0000-0003-4731-5782

Translation: David Daniel

TABLE 1	Iconographic types used on both imperial coins issued in the 80–82 in the mint in Thrace (?) and provincial coins of Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Domitian and Trajan
PLATE 1	<p>Fig. 1. Trajan, Byzantium, AE, 103–117, 22 mm; RPC III 1080, Sch 1355–6 © Münzkabinett, Kunsthistorischen Museums, Vienna</p> <p>Fig. 2. Trajan, Uncertain Mint, AE, 105–117, 32 mm; RPC III 1134, Mi 6, 696–7/562 © Agora Auctions LLC</p> <p>Fig. 3. Trajan, Heraclea, AE, 107–117, 20 mm; RPC III 1167, Rec 89 © Münzen und Medaillen GmbH</p> <p>Fig. 4. Trajan, Tium, AE, 105–117, 32 mm; RPC III 1188 © Agora Auctions LLC</p> <p>Fig. 5. Domitian, Nicaea, AE, 81–96, 33 mm; RPC II 632 © Gorny & Mosch GmbH</p>
PLATE 2	<p>Fig. 6. Trajan, Nicaea, AE, 105–117, 35 mm; RPC III 1059 © Münzkabinett, Kunsthistorischen Museums, Vienna</p> <p>Fig. 7. Domitian, Prusias ad Hypium, AE, 81–96, 27 mm; RPC II 673 © rpc.ashmus.ox.ac.uk</p> <p>Fig. 8. Domitian, Flavian Latin Mint in Thrace, AE, 80/81, 28 mm; RPC II 508, Cahn 8 © Naville Numismatics Ltd</p> <p>Fig. 9. Trajan, Uncertain Mint, AE, 98–117, 24 mm; RPC III 1157 © rpc.ashmus.ox.ac.uk</p> <p>Fig. 10. Trajan, Uncertain Mint, AE, 98–117, 30 mm; RPC III 1125, Mi 6, 695/553 © Agora Auctions LLC</p>

TABLE 1

Imperial coinage from Thrace (?) (80–82)		Ref.	Iconographic type	Provincial coinage Domitian (81–96)			Provincial coinage Trajan (98–117)		
Iconographic type	Denomi-nation			Sestertius	Mint	Denomi-nation	Ref. (RPC II)	Mint	Denomi-nation
Pax standing l., with olive branch and cornucopia	Sestertius	Cahn 1, 4, 20, 24; BMCRE 309, 315; RIC 181; RPC II 501, 504, 526, 530	Eirene standing l., with olive branch and cornucopia	Nicaea	34–36 mm, 23–27 g	633	Apamea	32–33 mm, 20–21 g	1029
				Nicomedia (Eirene/Demeter?)	35 mm, 23–24 g	654	Juliopolis	32–34 mm, 23–26 g	1099
				Prusias ad Hypium	33–34 mm, 22–26 g	672	Prusias ad Hypium	31–32 mm, 19–21 g	1101
				Uncertain Mint (perhaps Prusias)	34 mm, 24–25 g	676	Uncertain Mint (Amastris and Nicaea?)	30–32 mm, 20–24 g	1125 1126 1131
Mars walking r., with trophy and spear	Sestertius	Cahn 2, 5, 21, 25; BMCRE 310; RIC 182; RPC II 502, 527, 531	Ares walking r., with trophy and spear	Nicaea	33–36 mm, 23–26 g	632	Nicaea	35 mm, 21–22 g	1059
				Nicomedia	34 mm, 22–23 g	653	Juliopolis	32 mm, 24–26 g	1098
				Prusias ad Hypium	35 mm, 25–27 g	671	Amastris	31–32 mm, 21–22 g	1198
Spes standing l., holding up flower in r. hand and raising hem of dress with l.	Sestertius	Cahn 6, 18, 34; RPC II 506, 521, 522, 541	Elpis standing l., holding up flower in r. hand and raising hem of dress with l.	Nicaea	33 mm, 26–27 g	634	Uncertain Mint (Amastris?)	31–34 mm, 20–23 g	1127
							Amastris	29–30 mm, 24–25 g	1199
							Abonoteichos	30–31 mm, 20 g	1211

TABLE I

Iconographic type	Denomination	Ref.	Iconographic type	Mint	Denomination	Ref. (RPC II)	Mint	Denomination	Ref. (RPC III)
Ceres standing l., holding corn ears in r. hand, l. resting on sceptre	Dupondius	Cahn 9; RPC II 509	Demeter standing l., holding corn ears in r. hand, l. resting on sceptre	Nicaea	26–27 mm, 11–13 g	636	Prusa ad Olympum	35 mm, 28 g, 29 mm, 20 g	1038
	As	Cahn 8, 23, 27; RPC II 508, 529, 533		Prusias ad Hypium	27–28 mm, 10–14 g	673–674	Juliopolis	25–26 mm, 10–14 g	1100
				Uncertain Mint (perhaps Prusias)	28 mm, 11–14 g	679–682	Uncertain Mint (Nicaea, Prusias?)	21–2 mm, 6–7 g (Bassus) 23–26 mm, 6–13 g 20–2 mm, 5–7 g 27–28 mm, 11–12 g	1123 1128 1133 1137 1129 1130 1138 1139 1140 1144 1132
Roma seated l., holding wreath	Dupondius	Cahn 7, 22, 26; BMCRE 314; RPC II 507, 528, 532	Roma seated l., holding wreath	Bithynium, Claudiopolis	24 mm, 7–9 g	694–695	Amastris	25–27 mm, 7–11 g	1201 1202
Victory flying l., with shield	Dupondius	RPC II 512, 534	Nike flying l., with shield	Nicaea	25–27 mm, 9–11 g	640	–	20–21 mm, 5–6 g	1213
Victory advancing r., with wreath and palm	As	RPC II 508A		Uncertain Mint	20 mm, 5–6 g	709, 709A, 711A	Uncertain Mint (Nicaea?)	24–25 mm, 12–13 g	1146 1147

TABLE 1

Iconographic type	Denomination	Ref.	Iconographic type	Mint	Denomination	Ref. (RPC II)	Mint	Denomination	Ref. (RPC III)
Minerva advancing r., with spear and shield	As	Cahn 19, 35; RPC II 523, 542	Athena advancing r., with spear and shield	Prusias ad Hypium	25 mm, 7–8 g	648A	Uncertain Mint (Nicaea?)	22–24 mm, 5–7 g	1141 1142 1143
							Amastris	24–27 mm, 8–9 g	1203
Eagle standing facing on globe	As	Cahn 13, 29; RPC II 514, 536	Eagle standing facing on globe	Nicaea	24–25 mm, 6–9 g	641, 641A	Prusias ad Hypium	18–19 mm, 4–5 g	1102
							Uncertain Mint (Nicaea?)	21–23 mm, 6–9 g 20–22 mm, 3–6 g	1124 1152 1158 1158A,B 1158C 1159A 1153 1155 1160
Altar	As	Cahn 12, 28; RPC II 513, 535	Altar	Nicaea	26–27 mm, 9–10 g	640A	Amastris	23–24 mm, 32 mm, 24 g	1204 1205
				Nicaea?	23 mm, 6–8 g		Prusias ad Hypium	19–22 mm, 5–7 g	1103
						710	Uncertain Mint (Nicaea?)	19–22 mm, 6–8 g (Bassus) 24–25 mm, 9 g 19–22 mm, 5–6 g	1121 1122 1149 1148 1150 1151 1152A 1154 1156 1159 1156A 1157



1



2



3



4



5



6



7



8



9



10