

NOTAE NUMISMATICAE

ZAPISKI NUMIZMATYCZNE



Tom XVIII

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

Kraków 2023

NOTAE NUMISMATICAE

ZAPISKI NUMIZMATYCZNE

Tom XVIII

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

Kraków 2023

Komitet naukowy / Scientific Committee:

Prof. Peter van Alfen, Prof. Michael Alram, Prof. Aleksander Bursche, Prof. François de Callataÿ, 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 Weisser

Redakcja / Editorial Board:

Redaktor / Editor in Chief – Jarosław Bodzek
Zastępca redaktora / Associate Editor – Mateusz Woźniak
Sekretarze / Secretaries – Dorota Malarczyk, Anna Bochnak, Barbara Zajac

Redaktor tematyczny / Theme Editor:

Peter van Alfen

Redaktor językowy / Linguistic Editor:

Peter van Alfen

Recenzenci / Reviewers:

Prof. Peter van Alfen, Dr Hab. Bartosz Awianowicz, Dr Joe Cribb, Dr Przemysław Dulęba, Dr Hab. Arkadiusz Dymowski, Dr Wolfgang Fischer-Bossert, Dr Witold Garbaczewski, Dr Helle Horsnaes, Dr Szymon Jellonek, Dr Łukasz Koniarek, Dr Kyrilo Myzgin, Dr Dariusz Niemiec, Dr Przemysław Nocuń, Prof. Johannes Nollé, Prof. Marek Olbrycht, Dr Julien Olivier, Prof. Janusz Pezda, Dr Magdalena Piwocka, Dr Hab. Judyta Rodzińska-Nowak, Dr Grzegorz Śniezko, Dr Ömer Tatar, Dr David Wigg-Wolf, Dr Dmitriy Yanov, Dr Michał Zawadzki

Redaktorzy prowadzący / Managing Editors:

Barbara Zajac, Dorota Malarczyk, Anna Kowalczyk

Tłumaczenia / Translations:

Piotr Godlewski

Korekta / Proofreading:

Aeddan Shaw

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

Luiza Berdak

Skład i lamanie / Typesetting and page layout:

Wojciech Skrzypiec

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>

Wyłączną 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, 2023

ISSN 1426-5435

SPIS TREŚCI / CONTENTS

- 11 Od redakcji
12 From the Editors

ARTYKUŁY / ARTICLES

- JAROSŁAW BODZEK
15 A Note on a Satrapal Coin with the Inscription ΔH
Notatka na temat satrapiej monety z legendą ΔH
- MATI JOHANANOFF
31 A Case of Competing Attributions: Small Anepigraphic Levantine Silver Coins with a Female Head and an Eagle on a Thunderbolt
Przypadek konkurencyjnych atrybucji: niewielkie, srebrne, anepigraficzne monety lewantyńskie z kobiecą głową i orłem na błyskawicy
- BARTOSZ AWIANOWICZ
49 An Unknown Coin of Castor of Galatia and a Possible New Dating of Deiotarus' Coins with a Monogram of His Name
Nieznaną monetą Kastora z Galacji i możliwe nowe datowanie monet Deiotarosa z monogramem jego imienia
- JOANNA ZAGÓRSKA-TELEGA, BARBARA ZAJĄC
57 A Roman Republican Denarius from the Early Roman Period Cemetery in Kazimierza Wielka, Świętokrzyskie Province
Denar republikański z cmentarzyska z wczesnego okresu rzymskiego z Kazimierzy Wielkiej, woj. świętokrzyskie
- MARCIN BOHR, DAWID MACIEJCZUK
73 A Hoard of Early Roman Sestertii from the Region of Święta Góra in the Krucze Mountains, Poland
Skarb wczesnorzymskich sesterców z rejonu Świętej Góry w Górach Kruczych
- BORIS STOKLAS
101 Two Interesting Bulk Finds of Roman Denarii from Horovce – Ostrá Hora Hill (Púchov District)
Dwa interesujące kolektywne znaleziska rzymskich denarów z Horovcůw – Góra Ostrá hora (powiat Púchov)
- MAREK JURKOWSKI
145 On the “Dynastic” Toponymy of Cilicia Pedias in the Roman Empire (until ca. AD 260) with Particular Reference to the Numismatic Evidence
O dynastycznej toponimii Cylicji Pedias w Cesarstwie Rzymskim (do około 260 r. n.e.) ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem świadectw numizmatycznych

- 165 ARKADIUSZ DYMOWSKI
Indian *Putalis* as the Key to Understanding Some Aspects of the Manufacture and Use of Barbarian Imitations of Roman Gold Coins. Some Preliminary Remarks
Indyjskie putali jako klucz do zrozumienia niektórych aspektów wytwarzania i użytkowania barbarzyńskich naśladownictw złotych monet rzymskich. Kilka uwag wstępnych
- 175 JAKUB M. NIEBYLSKI, DARIUSZ ROZMUS,
BARTŁOMIEJ SZ. SZMONIEWSKI
New Finds of Early Medieval Weights and Lead Objects from Dąbrowa Górnicza, Chruszczobród, and Chruszczobród-Piaski, Śląskie Province
Nowe znaleziska wczesnośredniowiecznych ciężarków i wyrobów ołowianych z obszaru pogranicza Dąbrowy Górniczej, Chruszczobrodu i Chruszczobrodu-Piasków, woj. śląskie
- 201 ARTUR BOGUSZEWICZ, BARBARA BUTENT-STEFANIAK
Rogowiec (Hornsberg/Hornschloss) Castle. A New Look at the History of the Stronghold on the Silesian-Bohemian Borderland in Light of Numismatic Material
Zamek Rogowiec (Hornsberg/Hornschloss). Nowe spojrzenie na dzieje warowni ze śląsko-czeskiego pogranicza z perspektywy materiałów numizmatycznych
- 241 ANDRII BOIKO-HAHARIN, SERHII KULESHOV
A Copper Coin with the Princely Sign of Olhovych (?) or Olherdovych (?)
Miedziana moneta z książęcym znakiem Olegowicza (?) lub Olgierdowicza (?)
- 251 AGNIESZKA SMOŁUCHA-SŁADKOWSKA
Giovanni Maria Mosca (Called Padovano) and Giovanni Jacopo Caraglio. A Revision of the *Oeuvre* of Italian Medallists at the Court of the Last Jagiellons
Giovanni Maria Mosca (zwany Padovano) i Giovanni Jacopo Caraglio. Rewizja oeuvre medalierskiego artystów włoskich na dworze ostatnich Jagiellonów
- 285 WITOLD GARBACZEWSKI
Medal “To the Ruthenian Brethren Murdered by the Muscovite Tsar for Their Fidelity to the Church and Poland” (the So-Called Chełm Commemorative Medal) from 1875 Engraved by Ernest Paulin Tasset
Medal „Braciom Rusinom pomordowanym przez carat moskiewski za wierność dla Kościoła i Polski” (tzw. pamiątkowy medal chełmski) dłuta Ernesta Paulina Tasseta z 1875 roku

RECENZJE / REVIEWS

- BARBARA ZAJĄC
- 317 EVGENI I. PAUNOV, *From Koine to Romanitas: The Numismatic Evidence for Roman Expansion and Settlement in Moesia and Thrace (ca. 146 BC – AD 98/117)*, vols. 1–2, ANTIQUITATES: Archäologische Forschungsergebnisse 76, Verlag Dr. Kovač, Hamburg 2021
- BARBARA ZAJĄC
- 326 JEROME MAIRAT, MARGUERITE SPOERRI BUTCHER with contributions by MICHEL AMANDRY, ROGER BLAND, KEVIN BUTCHER, JACK NURPETLIAN, and ULRIKE PETER, *Roman Provincial Coinage. Vol. VII.2: From Gordian I to Gordian III (AD 238–244): All Provinces Except Asia. Part I: Introduction and Catalogue. Part II: Indexes and Plates*, British Museum Press, Bibliothèque Nationale, London–Paris 2022
- JAROSŁAW BODZEK
- 332 MARTIN BAER, WOLFGANG FISCHER-BOSSERT and NIKOLAUS SCHINDEL (eds.), *CISTA MYSTICA. Festschrift für Wolfgang Szaivert*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte der Universität Wien 23, Österreichische Forschungsgesellschaft für Numismatik, Wien 2020

KRONIKI / CHRONICLES

- MATEUSZ WOŹNIAK
- 341 *Kronika Gabinetu Numizmatycznego Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie (2022)*
The Chronicle of the Numismatic Cabinet of the National Museum in Krakow (2022)
- JAROSŁAW BODZEK
- 357 *Kronika Sekcji Numizmatycznej Komisji Archeologicznej Polskiej Akademii Nauk Oddział w Krakowie (2020–2023)*
The Chronicle of the Numismatic Section of the Archaeological Commission of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Krakow Branch (2020–2023)
- WIOLETTA PAZOWSKA
- 365 International Numismatic Conference “NUMISMATICA CENTROEUROPAEA VI” – 18–21 September 2023, Znojmo, Centrum Louka

NEKROLOGI / OBITUARIES

373 JOHANNES NOLLÉ
Wilhelm Müseler – In Memory of a Numismatic ἄωρος

375 CLAIRE FRANKLIN WERZ
Ulrich Werz (January 15, 1964 – June 14, 2023)
Bibliography of Ulrich Werz



Elżbieta Hutten-Czapska née Meyendorff (1833–1916), autor I. Makarov, 1880

Elżbieta Hutten-Czapska z domu Meyendorff (1833–1916), autor I. Makarow, 1880

Szanowni Państwo,

oddajemy w Państwa ręce tom XVIII *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.

W roku 2023 przypada 120. rocznica Daru Rodziny Czapskich. Jego autorką była Elżbieta Hutten-Czapska z domu Meyendorff (1833–1916) i jej synowie Jerzy (1861–1930) i Karol (1860–1904) Hutten-Czapscy. Dar hrabiego Emeryka Hutten Czapskiego (1828–1896), obejmujący znakomitą kolekcję numizmatów polskich i z Polską związanych oraz zaprojektowany według jego życzeń i dokończony przez wdowę pawilon muzealny, złożony na rzecz Gminy Miasta Kraków, czyli de facto Narodu Polskiego, miał olbrzymie znaczenie nie tylko dla jakości kolekcji numizmatycznej Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie, ale także dla rozwoju całościowo pojmowanej numizmatyki polskiej. Ponad 11 tysięcy polskich monet, medali i pieniędzy papierowych, wśród nich wiele unikatów lub rzadkości, stanowiło, stanowi i będzie stanowić podstawę dla organizowanych przez Muzeum wystaw, dla edukacji numizmatycznej i ekonomicznej szerokiej rzeszy publiczności i wreszcie dla badań naukowych nad różnymi zagadnieniami z zakresu numizmatyki polskiej i nie tylko. Nie należy również zapominać o społecznym znaczeniu Daru Rodziny Czapskich. Poczynając od 1903 roku, do dziś całe pokolenia zainspirowanych nim darczyńców wzbogacały i wzbogacają kolekcję numizmatyczną Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie w pragnieniu nawiązania do czynu Czapskich czy też chęci uzupełnienia muzealnych zbiorów o obiekty, których hrabia nie posiadał. Zapatrzeni w jakość zbioru zbudowanego przez Emeryka Hutten-Czapskiego nie możemy jednak zapomnieć o rzeczywistej ofiarodawczyni, wdowie po kolekcjonerze – Elżbiecie. Bez niej i jej decyzji fantastyczna, unikatowa kolekcja zapewne uległaby rozproszению, jak wiele innych zbiorów, a w każdym razie nie byłaby dostępna dla wszystkich zainteresowanych polską i światową numizmatyką. Dzięki jej decyzji o ofiarowaniu zbiorów męża Narodowi możemy dzisiaj podziwiać zbiory hrabiego w Muzeum jego imienia przy ulicy Marszałka Józefa Piłsudskiego 12 w Krakowie. Elżbieta poprzez dar realizowała plan zachowania kolekcjonerskiego dziedzictwa męża. Wspierała go zresztą w jego pasji już wcześniej. Pomagała mu przy pracach nad zbiorem, wykonując precyzyjne rysunki monet i medali. Pamięci hrabiny Elżbiety Hutten-Czapskiej pragniemy zadekować obecny tom naszego czasopisma.

Redakcja

Dear Readers,

We are delighted to present you with volume 18 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 the 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.

The year 2023 marked the 120th anniversary of the Czapski Family Donation. The donation was made by Elżbieta Hutten-Czapska, née Meyendorff (1833–1916), and her sons Jerzy (1861–1930) and Karol Hutten-Czapski (1860–1904), and comprised Count Emeric Hutten Czapski's (1828–1896) magnificent collection of numismatic items from Poland and connected with Poland, as well as a museum pavilion designed according to his wishes and completed by his widow. It was given to the Municipal Commune of Krakow, i.e. de facto to the Polish Nation, and was of enormous significance not only for the numismatic collection of the National Museum in Krakow, but also for the development of Polish numismatics in general. Including many rare and unique pieces, the more than 11,000 Polish coins, medals, and paper money that comprise the collection have been, and will continue to be, the basis for exhibitions organised by the Museum for the numismatic and economic education of the general public, as well as research into various problems in Polish numismatics and beyond. The social significance of the Czapski Family Donation should not be forgotten either. Since 1903, generations of donors inspired by this act have contributed to the enrichment of the numismatic collection of the National Museum in Krakow in their desire to follow in the footsteps of the Czapski family or to supplement the museum's holdings with objects that the Count did not have. While admiring the quality of the collection assembled by Emeryk Hutten-Czapski, however, we cannot forget the actual donor, his widow Elżbieta. Without her and her decision, this fantastic, unique collection would probably have been dispersed, like many other collections, and in any case would not have been accessible to all those interested in Polish and world numismatics. Thanks to her decision to donate her husband's holdings to the nation, today we can admire the Count's collection in the eponymous museum at 12 Marszałka Józefa Piłsudskiego Street in Krakow. Through the donation, Elżbieta pursued a plan to preserve her husband's collecting heritage. In fact, she had already supported her husband in his passion previously, assisting him in his work on the collection by making precise drawings of coins and medals. We would like to dedicate the present volume of our journal to the memory of Countess Elżbieta Hutten-Czapska.

The Editors

MATI JOHANANOFF
Tel Aviv University

A Case of Competing Attributions: Small Anepigraphic Levantine Silver Coins with a Female Head and an Eagle on a Thunderbolt¹

ABSTRACT: Possible attributions of small anepigraphic silver coin types portraying a female head wearing a flat crown on the obverse and an eagle standing on a thunderbolt (sometimes alongside a club) on the reverse are discussed. A coin belonging to this group was published by Meshorer and Qedar in 1999 and tentatively attributed to Samaria.² This uncertain attribution is revisited considering new specimens documented as part of the “Corpus of Samarian Coinage” project. The suggested attribution is analyzed against competing attributions to Phoenicia (Tyre), Cyprus (Paphos), Cilicia (uncertain mint) and Manbog/Hierapolis-Bambyke (Syria) considering the relevant numismatic, historical, and archaeological sources. It is concluded that these coin types were most probably minted in Samaria after the Macedonian conquest and should be dated to the reign of Ptolemy I. Since no such coin types are known from controlled archaeological provenances, it is suggested that this likely attribution should, however, remain uncertain. Methodologically, case by case, cross-regional, traditional numismatic analysis, still offers the best available tool for the study of such uncertain attributions.

KEY WORDS: Levantine coins, Samaria, Early Hellenistic, uncertain attributions

¹ This research was supported by the Israel Science Foundation (Grant No. 2883/20, headed by Oren Tal). The project “A Corpus of Samarian Coinage” aims to update the coin types issued by the Samarian mint during the late Persian period, while offering a new typology for these coins. I am indebted to Haim Gitler, Yinon Horesh, Catharine Lorber and Oren Tal for their valuable comments on the manuscript of this paper.

² MQ: 125, IC-5.

ABSTRAKT: *Przypadek konkurencyjnych atrybucji: niewielkie, srebrne, anepigraficzne monety lewantyńskie z kobiecą głową i orłem na błyskawicy*

W artykule omówiono potencjalne atrybucje niewielkich srebrnych, anepigraficznych monet z wizerunkami kobiecej głowy w płaskiej koronie na awersie oraz orła stojącego na błyskawicy (czasami obok maczugi) na rewersie. Moneta należąca do tej grupy została opublikowana przez Meshorera i Qedara w 1999 roku i wstępnie przypisana Samarii. Ta niepewna atrybucja została poddana weryfikacji przy okazji dokumentowania nowych egzemplarzy tego typu w ramach projektu „Korpus monet samaryjskich”. Atrybucję przeanalizowano przy wykorzystaniu odpowiednich źródeł numizmatycznych, historycznych i archeologicznych, porównując ją z konkurencyjnymi propozycjami przypisania tych monet Fenicji (Tyr), Cypru (Pafos), Cylicji (niepewna mennica) i Syrii (Manbog/Hierapolis-Bambyke) (Syria). W efekcie stwierdzono, że tego typu monety bito najprawdopodobniej w Samarii po podboju macedońskim i należy je datować na czasy panowania Ptolemeusza I. Ponieważ brak tego typu monet z wiarygodnych archeologicznych kontekstów, sugeruje się, że ta prawdopodobna atrybucja musi jednak pozostać niepewną. Metodologicznie tradycyjna analiza numizmatyczna jest nadal najlepszym dostępnym narzędziem do badania takich niepewnych atrybucji.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: monety lewantyńskie, Samaria, okres wczesnohellenistyczny, niepewne atrybucje

INTRODUCTION

During the Persian period, Achaemenid royal coins were minted alongside numerous indigenous and satrapal coinages issued throughout the empire, probably with tacit or direct approval of the Persian suzerain. Such indigenous coinages were also minted in the Levant, which belonged to the “fifth satrapy” also known as the satrapy “beyond the river”. Since only a minority of such late Persian period coins bear legends identifying the minting authority, questions of attribution are not settled and reattributions to neighboring mints are occasionally suggested in an ongoing attempt to reconstruct and refine the minting map of the area during the period.³ Affinity between the outputs of Levantine mints in the southern Levant, Phoenicia and eastern Asia Minor further complicates the quest for accurate attributions, especially of anepigraphic coin types, which often draw loosely from the Achaemenid and Greek iconographic repertoires. Since most late Persian coinages are known to us from non-provenanced contexts, such problems are even more challenging and must be decided mainly by traditional numismatic tools.

³ E.g., GITLER and TAL 2016; ARIEL 2016; JOHANANOFF 2021; JOHANANOFF, GITLER and TAL (forthcoming).

The accepted view is that most civic minting authorities ceased to mint coins after the Graeco-Macedonian conquest of 331.⁴ However, recent scholarship has demonstrated that this is not the case with regard to certain southern Levantine mints such as the Yehud mint (Judah), which continued to strike small silver coins during the Macedonian and early Hellenistic period.⁵ A further exception might be the minting of certain generic Athenian-styled coins issued most probably by a central Philistian mint well into the 3rd century when locally minted royal Hellenistic coins replaced them. These coins were essentially fulfilling the demand for small change during the transitional period between the reduction of civic autonomous minting at the end of the Persian period and the reform taking place during the 25th regnal year of Ptolemy II in 261/60, in which three local royal Hellenistic mints opened, and began a regular annual production that lasted for twenty years.⁶

SOUTHERN LEVANTINE LATE PERSIAN PERIOD MINTING, THE SAMARIAN MINTING AUTHORITY AND IC-5

Autonomous civic minting authorities were the first to strike coins in the southern Levant during the late Persian period.⁷ Local minting during the period was executed in silver (and silver-plated coins) and was characterized by the predominance of small denominations (weighing under 1 g in average). Scholarship from recent decades has identified five main minting authorities, active during this period, which include three Philistian administrative centers (Gaza, Ashqelon/Ascalon, and Ashdod), the minting authority of the Province of Samaria, that most likely operated in the Province's capital, the city of Samaria, and the minting authority of the Province of Yehud, that most likely operated in the Province's capital, the city of Jerusalem.⁸ Two smaller mints with a lesser output and intermittent emissions were possibly operating in Edom and Dor.⁹

The late Persian minting authority of Samaria was one of the first to strike coins in the southern Levant.¹⁰ The chronological framework of this minting phase is mainly centered in the 4th century, but some suggestions have already indicated that minting might have started earlier, possibly in the last two decades of the 5th century due to stylistic features such as the archaic eye shape on certain early Samaritan coins and its relations to the chronology of contemporaneous Athenian and Athenian-styled

⁴ All dates are BCE unless otherwise stated. CS: 65–67; MQ: 71; GITLER and TAL 2006: 63–68.

⁵ GITLER, LORBER and FONTANILLE 2023: 100–125.

⁶ GITLER and TAL 2017: 35–46; EIDEM 2022.

⁷ GITLER and TAL 2006; TAL 2012: 9–12; GITLER, LORBER and FONTANILLE 2023: 108–110.

⁸ CS; MQ; GITLER and TAL 2006; ARIEL 2016: 14–19; GITLER, LORBER and FONTANILLE 2023.

⁹ GITLER, TAL and VAN ALFEN 2007: 47–62; QEDAR 2000–2002: 9–14.

¹⁰ MQ: 11–12; CHL: 206–222; ARIEL 2016: 17–18; GITLER and TAL 2019; JOHANANOFF, GITLER and TAL (forthcoming).

coins.¹¹ In their 1999 book, Meshorer and Qedar defined 224 Samarian coin types (including coins bearing the same motifs but issued in different denominations and including several coins which were later reattributed) demonstrating that the mint was unusually prolific in the diversity of types minted during its several decades of operations.¹² They also defined another six types labelled IC-1–IC-6 for which the attribution to Samaria was less than certain.¹³ This paper will reevaluate a coin type tentatively attributed to Samaria in 1999, labelled IC-5 and additional related coin types which have come to light in recent years, and which are closely related to IC-5 in iconography, style, and fabric but display an additional club as a secondary motif on the reverse (Tab. 1; Pl. 1, Figs. 1–14). Meshorer and Qedar state that this category includes coins of “uncertain attribution to Samaria”, mainly attributed to the mint because of where they were found.¹⁴ Out of the six types in this uncertain category, three types are unique, in the sense that only one specimen is known to date, making it hard to determine their correct origin (IC-1; IC-2; IC-6). Two coins have been reattributed to Tyre (IC-3; IC-4).¹⁵ Unlike the rest of this category, IC-5 (Pl. 1, Figs. 1, 15) is different and is known in multiple specimens and variants appearing in local public and private collections and from various auction records (see Tab. 1; Cat. nos. 1–14; Pl. 1, Figs. 1–14). This coin type may also be distinguished by the iconography on its reverse, which as will be further shown is indicative of an early Hellenistic minting date rather than a late Persian one.¹⁶

DESCRIPTION OF IC-5 AND VARIANT WITH A CLUB ON THE REVERSE

The main features on the obverse of IC-5 and club variant (Cat. nos. 1–14) are essentially the same. Both display a female head (Aphrodite?) turned to the r., wearing a flat crown, most probably a *polos*, which is round and flat on its top, and pendant earrings and a necklace. This type of crown is originally associated with female goddesses from Anatolia and was adopted by the Greek world which commonly associated it with goddesses such as Aphrodite and Hera.¹⁷ The motif is set within a circular dotted border. Similar female heads wearing a flat crown appear

¹¹ GITLER and TAL 2014: 24–25; EIDEM 2019: 33; JOHANANOFF 2021: 5–6.

¹² The forthcoming *Corpus of Samarian Coinage*, co-authored by Haim Gitler, Oren Tal and myself has identified to date a total of ca. 350 types of coins (including uncertain attributions) related to the Samarian mint.

¹³ MQ: 125–126, Pl. 31.

¹⁴ MQ: 12.

¹⁵ JOHANANOFF 2021: 22–23.

¹⁶ Denominations in the southern Levant were demonstrated by TAL 2007 to be based on a local Šql/Sheqel standard rather than on the Attic Drachm. Since IC-5 and variants are early Hellenistic, they were most probably minted according to an Attic standard.

¹⁷ The crown/headdress is reminiscent of the turreted/mural crown, often portrayed as an attribute of the goddess Tyche, but may be differentiated due to the flat form of its top side. It is also reminiscent of a *stephane* headdress, but the latter leaves the top of the head visible. See MQ: No. 95 for a female wearing a *stephane*.

on inscribed Samarian coins from the period, bearing the inscription ŠMRYN.¹⁸ The conjunction of the toponym and this female head may suggest the existence of a local Samarian cult dedicated to a female goddess).¹⁹ Such female heads also appear on early Hellenistic coins from Cyprus (Pl. 1, Fig. 18) and certain late Persian coins from eastern Asia Minor (e.g., Pl. 1, Fig. 19c).²⁰

The reverse of IC-5 displays an eagle on a thunderbolt (turned to r.), a symbol which became known as a characteristic emblem of Ptolemaic kingship.²¹ The symbol became synonymous with the Ptolemies and first appears as a secondary motif (turned to l.) on a silver tetradrachm of Ptolemy I Soter from Alexandria minted around 313/2.²² On the next types,²³ the symbol also appears as a secondary motif but is portrayed turned to r., in the same orientation as on IC-5 and the club variants. The motif appears first as the main motif on a coin of Ptolemy I dated to ca. 294 or shortly after.²⁴ Cat. nos. 1–6 are examples of IC-5.²⁵ Cat. nos. 7–14 below are also related to IC-5 but portray an additional secondary (or auxiliary/adjunct) motif in the form of a club on the reverse. It is currently unclear what is the significance of the additional club motif on these coins and whether this variant predates or postdates IC-5. In general, such auxiliary motifs were used to identify separate issues and emissions on early Ptolemaic coins as the plethora of auxiliary motifs on early Hellenistic coins demonstrate.²⁶ The club on IC-5 variants may also suggest that these coins were issued by a different mint (especially if the secondary motif represents a mintmark). The club as a mintmark is associated with the Phoenician mint of Tyre and a club alongside an eagle on a thunderbolt (albeit in a somewhat different manner) is portrayed on other Ptolemaic coins from the Tyrian mint.²⁷

A club as part of the main motif and not as a mintmark appears on several Macedonian fractions minted in the name of Alexander as it also appears on other small denominational coins minted in Cilicia, which can be differentiated from

¹⁸ E.g., MQ: 182, nos. 93–94, Pl. 3, Figs. 16a–16b.

¹⁹ Similar female heads wearing a flat crown also appear on other, albeit less securely attributable, Samarian coins such as CHL: nos. 23–24; MQ: nos. 182–184.

²⁰ WYSSMANN 2019 does not include IC-5 in his analysis of Samarian coins iconography, as according to his methodology it is unclear whether the coin was indeed minted in Samaria. Other Samarian coins depicting similar female heads wearing a crown are assigned by him tentatively to the third minting stage dated 360–350.

²¹ SHARPE 1838: 187–192.

²² CPE I: 256, no. 39, Pl. 3.

²³ CPE I: 258, nos. 40–44, Pl. 4, Alexandria 312/11 – ca. 306.

²⁴ CPE I: 275, no. 128, Pl. 9.

²⁵ All but Cat. no. 3 seems to represent hemiobols. Cat. no. 4 weighs 0.56 g. and may represent an obol. However, since Cat. no. 4 and Cat. no. 5 are both struck from the same pair of dies and have the same diameter of 10 mm, they probably represent the same denomination of a hemiobol as they were minted *al marco* rather than *al peso*.

²⁶ PRICE 1991: *passim*; CPE I: 594–618.

²⁷ See e.g., CPE I: 302, Cat. nos. 244–245.

IC-5 and its variants (see below).²⁸ A club also appears on a Samarian coin where a figure identified with Heracles is sitting on a rock and holding a club.²⁹ This coin type was part of the Nablus 1968 Hoard and thus its attribution to Samaria is relatively secure.³⁰ However, the appearance of the club as a secondary symbol on Cat. nos. 7–14 is different, as it does not form a part of the main motif and possibly signifies a separate emission within the mint. Its precise significance on IC-5 variants, however, remains to be explained. As stated above, the obverse of the club variant is almost identical to IC-5 except for the lack of a necklace on several of the specimens. The obverse iconography of these coins and their fabric are reminiscent of late Persian period coinage, while their reverse iconography is early Hellenistic. IC-5 and club variants, most probably therefore, belong to a transitional phase between these two periods.

WHO COULD HAVE ISSUED IC-5 AND ITS VARIANTS?

IC-5 and variants were not found in the three main “assemblages” known to contain Samarian coins. The coins were not part of the Samaria Hoard and the Nablus Hoard, which helped define Samarian coinage.³¹ This is not surprising as the Samaria and Nablus hoards have suggested burial dates which predate the supposed minting date of these coins – the Samaria Hoard was probably buried ca. 352 and the Nablus Hoard was probably buried during 332/1 or even slightly later).³² Both hoards were thus buried in the last two decades of the Persian period and could not be expected to contain early Hellenistic coins.

More significantly, these coin types were not found among the 24 late Persian Samarian coins found during the Mount Gerizim excavations,³³ or among the multiple early Ptolemaic coins found at the site.³⁴ Almost all coins from auctions and local collections, linked with IC-5, are attributed to Samaria suggesting (in

²⁸ Several crude Alexander fractions bearing a club and a bow might have also been imitative issues minted in Samaria (see e.g., CHL 181 = CNG M.B 69, 639). These imitative issues resemble authentic Alexander issues such as Price nos. 3706, 3729, 3739, 3744 but differ from the latter in certain details such as the lack of monogram within the wreath on the reverse. Further analysis of these types is beyond the scope of this paper.

²⁹ MQ: 109, no. 139.

³⁰ GITLER and TAL 2019: Cat. nos. 463–464.

³¹ CS; GITLER and TAL 2019. Both hoards do not come from controlled archaeological excavations. Since they contained several coins bearing the toponym Šmryn in Aramaic, they were the main catalysts in defining a coinage of Samaria (CS; MQ).

³² Based upon the latest dated coin in the Nablus hoard, a Sidonian fraction dated to the twenty-first year of Mazday (353–333), the hoard was buried sometime after 333/2 (GITLER and TAL 2019: 5–6, Cat. no. 115). An even later date may be suggested by the generic Athenian-styled small denominations within the hoard and by a Yehud coin of *YEḤIZQIYAH HA-PEHAH* which is dated to the Macedonian period (GITLER and TAL 2017: 5–7, 35–46). The Samaria hoard has an earlier burial date of ca. 352, some 21 years prior to the burial date of the Nablus hoard (GITLER and TAL 2019: *passim*; EIDEM 2020: 178).

³³ BIJOVSKY 2021: 84–85, 131–132, Cat. nos. 11–34.

³⁴ *Ibidem*: Cat. nos. 84–147.

a manner which may be tautological) a probable southern Levantine source. However, two specimens connected with IC-5 and its variants were recently suggested by commercial literature to have a different origin. One specimen was attributed “almost certainly” to Cyprus, while another specimen was attributed to “Samaria or Cilicia”. These commercial attributions and an unsuggested attribution to Tyre are discussed in more detail below.

ATTRIBUTION TO THE MINT OF TYRE?

Since the club (which is a customary attribute of Tyrian Heracles) is known as a mintmark of Tyre, an attribution of Cat. nos. 7–14 to the Phoenician city must be considered. Tyrian coins attributed to Ptolemy I which portray an eagle standing on a thunderbolt and a club on the reverse are relatively few.³⁵ More common are coins from the reign of Ptolemy II (282–246) which portray such reverses (Pl. 1, Fig. 17).³⁶

Evidently, Tyrian coins circulated widely in Samaria already in the late Persian period as demonstrated by the Nablus and Samaria Hoards.³⁷ This might explain a southern Levantine find spot for IC-5 variants even if they were indeed minted in Tyre. Yet, Tyrian coins may be differentiated on several grounds from Cat. nos. 7–14. First, Phoenicia started issuing bronze coins during the early 4th century. Subsequently, no small denominational silver coins are known to be issued by the Tyrian mint during the early Hellenistic period. Second, all eagles appearing on Tyrian coins (both in precious metal and bronze) are facing to the l. while the eagle on IC-5 and variants is turned to the r. Accordingly, all Tyrian club mint marks appear on the l. of the eagle (as on Pl. 1, Fig. 17) and not on the r. as on IC-5 variants. Third, early Ptolemaic Tyrian issues are epigraphic and display further monograms and sometimes dates.³⁸ Fourth, no known Tyrian issues from the late Persian and early Hellenistic periods portray a female head on the obverse. Thus, although the club is a known mintmark of Tyre, it seems less likely that the club appearing on IC-5 variants stands for the same. It appears more likely that the club on IC-5 variants was used to mark a separate emission from the same issuer (minting authority) rather than to signify a Tyrian source. Accordingly, although an attribution to Tyre cannot be ruled out entirely, substantial, and stylistic differences suggest the possibility is remote.

³⁵ CPE I: 302, Cat. nos. 244–245.

³⁶ CPE I: Cat. nos. 551–636.

³⁷ GITLER and TAL 2019: Cat. nos. 131–268; CS: Cat. nos. 237–268.

³⁸ See CPE I: Cat. nos. 551–636 for coins of Ptolemy II.

SUGGESTED ATTRIBUTION TO CYPRUS (PAPHOS)

Recently, a coin from the same type as IC-5 (Cat. no. 4) was attributed “almost certainly” to the Cypriot mint of Paphos.³⁹ The coin was dated to “after 294” to the reign of Ptolemy I Soter and was described as “Apparently unpublished and unknown”. Based on its resemblance to a series of known Paphian bronzes (Pl. 1, Fig. 18 below),⁴⁰ the coin was attributed by the auction house to the Paphian mint.

Regarding the similarity to CPE B118, there are several characteristics differentiating between the Paphian bronzes and IC-5 and its variants. First, all known Paphian bronzes are epigraphic and bear the inscription ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ in Greek. Second, on all known Paphian coins the eagle on the reverse is turned to the l., unlike on IC-5 and variants where the eagle always turns to the r. Third, no Cypriot silver obols are known to portray similar iconography and no secondary/auxiliary symbol of a club is known from Paphian coins minted during this period.⁴¹ Furthermore, the text and reasoning accompanying the attribution itself reveals several other inaccuracies which should be noted. First, contrary to the claim of the auction house, the coin type is not unpublished (see Cat. nos. 1–3, 5–6). Thus, IC-5 which is a relatively obscure coin, was most probably overlooked by the auction house. Likewise, the coin is not a “discontinued trial issue” as several other specimens and variants of this coin type are known. No other similar specimen has been reported from Cyprus or attributed to Cyprus. It may also be noted that no Paphian coins appear in the Israel Antiquities Authority’s collection, making the reported finds from the southern Levant less likely to come from Paphos.⁴² Although there is sometimes an affinity between certain Cypriot coins and Samaritan coins from the late Persian period, it seems unlikely that IC-5 and variants were issued by a Paphian or by another Cypriot mint.

SUGGESTED ATTRIBUTION TO AN UNCERTAIN MINT IN CILICIA

Several Samaritan coins have an iconographic affinity to coins from Cilician mints, especially but not exclusively to coins issued by the Tarsus mint.⁴³ Another coin belonging to the club variant of IC-5 (Pl. 1; Cat. no. 14), was recently attributed

³⁹ Nomos, 22, lot 259, 22 June 2021.

⁴⁰ CPE B118; Svoronos: Cat. no. 74.

⁴¹ Paphian bronzes do have auxiliary symbols such as wreath, star, a letter, or a monogram in the field, which are probably used to distinguish and define separate emissions as was customary on other early Hellenistic coins.

⁴² I wish to thank Dr. Robert Kool, head of the Israel Antiquities Authority’s coin department, for supplying me with this data.

⁴³ MQ: 32–50; JOHANANOFF 2021: 25–26. Cilician influence may be seen on certain coins of Yehud as well (GITLER, LORBER and FONTANILLE 2023: 340).

to “either Samaria or Cilicia”.⁴⁴ Although similar motifs do appear in Cilicia, these issues (Pl. 1, Figs. 19a–b) can be differentiated from IC-5 and its variants.

First, the obverse of these coins portrays a male head to l. with curly hair rather than a female head wearing a *polos* to r. (Pl. 1, Figs. 19a–b). Second, the eagle on the reverse of the Cilician coins is turned to the l., rather than to the r. as on IC-5 and its variants. Third, on the Cilician issues the eagle is portrayed with wings spread unlike on IC-5 and club variants. Fourth, the eagle on Cilician issues is not standing on a thunderbolt but is standing on a lion, severing the link between the Cilician issues and Ptolemaic iconography. Fifth, on the Cilician coins there is a dotted square border on the reverse and not a dotted circular border. Sixth, certain Cilician variants (Pl. 1, Fig. 19b) have a letter B inscribed on the reverse under the club and above the lion. Such Cilician coins are occasionally attributed to Balakros, satrap of Cilicia ca. 333–323, suggesting the issues belong to the late Persian rather than to the early Hellenistic period. Sixth, the Cilician types are of a slightly heavier obol standard than the southern Levantine coins (the average weight of Cat. nos. 7–14 is ca. 0.39 g while the Cilician issues weigh typically over 0.7 g). A different Cilician coin type (Pl. 1, Fig. 19c) portrays on the reverse a female head turned to l. and wearing a decorated flat crown. Accordingly, although there is some iconographic affinity between Cilician types and IC-5 and its variants, a Cilician source based on these affinities seems questionable and should be doubted.

ATTRIBUTION TO MANBOG (HIERAPOLIS-BAMBYKE)?

The 4th century coins of Syrian Manbog (Hierapolis-Bambyke) portray a mix of regional motifs and have several similarities with Samaritan issues.⁴⁵ To date, however, it is mostly the large denominations of Manbog coins which are known, while fractions are relatively few.⁴⁶ No coins attributed to the mint have been found in controlled excavations.⁴⁷ Andrade, who published the most recent study of the city’s coinage in 2017, only defined two fractional types while cataloguing some 59 didrachm/Šql types and 5 uncertain attributions.⁴⁸ Some of the attributions to the mint are based on epigraphy and distinct iconography, while other types bear a special U-shaped sign, which probably represents a mintmark.⁴⁹ An iconographic characteristic of Manbogian coinage which may be linked

⁴⁴ Goldberg 112, lot 1534, 3 September 2019.

⁴⁵ ANDRADE 2017: 18; JOHANANOFF 2021: 27, note 45.

⁴⁶ MILDENBERG 1999 was a prior systematic attempt to describe the coinage of Syrian Manbog. However, the study concentrated on the large denominations issued by the minting authority and did not describe any fractions issued by the mint.

⁴⁷ ANDRADE 2017: 2.

⁴⁸ *Ibidem*: 23–27.

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*: 5.

with IC-5 and variants is the flat *polos* crown which appears on several of the coins issued by this minting authority and which is portrayed adorning a locally venerated female deity identified as Atargatis/Atarateh.⁵⁰ Recently, an unpublished and possibly unique fraction (Pl. 1, Fig. 20) from the antiquity market and was attributed to Manbog. On its obverse is a female head to r. wearing a flat *polos*, while on its reverse appears an eagle turned to r., similar to the eagle appearing on IC-5. Several differences between this unpublished fraction and IC-5 and variants should be noted: first, the eagle is not portrayed on a thunderbolt, thus severing the unambiguous link to an early Ptolemaic minting date.⁵¹ Second, no U-shaped sign appears on IC-5 and variants, and it is only the existence of this distinctive sign which allows for the attribution of the unpublished fraction to Manbog. Thus, although the unpublished and possibly unique fraction shares several characteristics with IC-5 and variants, it may still be distinguished and attributed to the Manbogian mint in a relatively secure manner.

RECONSIDERATION OF THE SUGGESTED ATTRIBUTION TO SAMARIA

Isolated (commercial) suggestions concerning Cypriot and Cilician attributions were discussed as well as the yet unsuggested theory that the coins may have been issued by the Tyrian or Manbogian minting authorities. It was suggested that IC-5 and variants are probably not Cilician, Cypriot, Tyrian or Manbogian in origin. It seems even more unlikely, that these coin types were issued by another southern Levantine mint such as a Philistian mint, the Yehud mint or by Edom or Dor as the output of these mints differs from IC-5 and variants in several aspects such as iconography, style, and metrology. A different Phoenician source (i.e., not a Tyrian one) for these coins is also unlikely on similar grounds. These coin types seem to follow the southern Levantine (and particularly the mountain region's) preference for small denominational silver coinage. The obverse of the coins is similar in style to other Samarian coins as was demonstrated above (Pl. 1, Figs. 16a–b). Comparable female heads wearing similar *polos* crowns appear on Samarian coins bearing the toponym ŠMRYN. The reverse of IC-5 and its variants is essentially Ptolemaic, but it is executed in a manner and fabric reminiscent of late Persian period southern Levantine coins. Although an attribution to Samaria is based partly on circumstantial evidence, no better suggestion currently exists, particularly if

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*: no. 61 (fraction series 2).

⁵¹ According to ANDRADE 2017, minting in Manbog is currently understood as having continued during the early Macedonian period, but probably ceased well before the Ptolemaic period.

some weight is given to the relatively large number of specimens allegedly coming from a southern Levantine origin. The question remains, under what circumstances could IC-5 and variants be minted by a Samaritan mint? Post Macedonian conquest minting in Samaria should be reconciled with historical sources regarding the fate of Samaria after the conquest of Alexander. The suggestion that minting took place in Samaria in the decades after the conquest goes *prima facie* against the view that minting in the city/province ended in 332.⁵² According to this, Samaria's economical system was integrated at the time into the imperial monetary system, depending solely on the coins of the main imperial administrative centers.

Curtius Rufus is the only source to give an account of Samaria's uprising after Alexander's conquest. According to Rufus, Alexander severely punished Samaria after his return from Egypt in the spring of 331 in retribution for the burning of Andromachos, Alexander's appointed governor to the area.⁵³ Rufus was, however, a 1st century CE historian who relied on earlier sources. It is probable that Samaria's local nobility were the only ones to pay the price for their rebellion and the city/province were not destroyed (as was the case during earlier Assyrian and Babylonian conquests). There is no information in Rufus regarding the demise of the rest of Samaria's population. It may be assumed that Alexander indeed introduced socio-political changes bearing consequences for the rest of the period, but it may also be assumed that the city and province remained an important administrative center during the early Hellenistic period.⁵⁴ Samaria was struck twice during the Diadochic wars – in 311 and 296 by Ptolemy I and Demetrius Poliochretes respectively. Ptolemy apparently brought destruction to the city when retreating to Egypt in 311 after the battle of Gaza in 312, employing a scorched earth tactic and possibly deporting some of the population of Samaria to Egypt.⁵⁵ After a decade of Antigonid rule over Samaria between 311–301 in 302/1 Ptolemy again took possession of the southern Levant after the Battle of Ipsos. Samaria suffered a second destruction by Demetrius Poliochretes in 296 but the city remained under Ptolemy's control in the aftermath. It is against this backdrop of events that IC-5 and its variants should be interpreted. It may be speculated that at a certain time under unclear circumstances (between 311–296?), a local mint was reactivated and issued these coin types. It is equally feasible that the coins were issued post 294 after the conquest of Cyprus by

⁵² MQ: 71.

⁵³ *Curt. Hist.* 4.8.9–11.

⁵⁴ According to HERVÉ and MENDOZA 2020, changes in Samaria after the Macedonian conquest were less radical than might have been assumed. They theorize that until the city was struck in 311 and 296, changes in the local administration were mainly the establishment of a garrison in the city and the appointment of a foreign governor. The archaeological record cannot currently corroborate this. The existence of a garrison in Samaria after its refoundation is logical but remains conjectural.

⁵⁵ *Diod. Bib. Hist.* 19.93.7.

the Ptolemies, a fact that would explain the resemblance between Paphian bronzes, minted after 294 and between IC-5 and its variants.⁵⁶

Recently, Gitler, Lorber and Fontanille suggested that the small denominational Yehud coinage might have been minted to provide daily state payments to low level guards manning garrisons within the province or to other least well remunerated employees of the provincial administration.⁵⁷ It is unclear if this was indeed the case as archaeological evidence is lacking. It is preferable, at least for Samaria, to conclude that the local practice of using small change minted in silver was merely maintained. The coins were meant for local use and formed part of the transitional period between the end of autonomous civic minting and the opening of three local royal mints in 261/60. If the population of Samaria indeed changed after the Macedonian conquest, it is likely that deportees and veterans made only the minority of the population and there is no reason to assume that IC-5 and its variants were minted for their use. The Macedonian colony mentioned by Rufus might simply be the refoundation of the city/province as a Graeco-Macedonian entity as was later also the case in many other Levantine cities.⁵⁸ The minting of small denominations such as IC-5 and its variants was characteristic of the southern Levant and the mountain region as is evidenced by the minting of small denominations in Yehud during the early Hellenistic period and the continued minting (or at least the circulation) of generic Athenian-styled fractions in Philistia as suggested by Gitler and Tal.⁵⁹ The portrayal of Ptolemaic iconography on the reverse of IC-5 and its variants could have been a manifestation of allegiance to Ptolemy who controlled the area at the time. Until further specimens are found in controlled archaeological contexts or as part of a hoard, it may be impossible to ascertain the exact circumstances under which these coin types were issued or for that matter to categorically refute theories that they were minted elsewhere.

CONCLUSION

IC-5 was noted as most probably being a Samaritan coin by Meshorer and Qedar in 1999. Further specimens connected to IC-5 have surfaced since, but all unfortunately come from non-archaeological sources. The minting of these small denominational silver coins during the early Hellenistic period should be viewed as another attestation to the dominance of silver in the partially monetized southern

⁵⁶ The Paphian Aphrodite/eagle bronzes were dated to 311/10–306 by Svoronos due to the lack of royal title on the coins. However, since Ptolemy struck his coinage in the name of Alexander during his satrapy, a date after 294 should probably be preferred.

⁵⁷ GITLER, LORBER and FONTANILLE 2023: 330–333, 349–351.

⁵⁸ TAL 2011: 242–254.

⁵⁹ GITLER and TAL 2017: 35–46.

Levant at the time, corresponding to the late adoption of bronze coins in this area in comparison with neighboring Phoenicia and Asia Minor. Questions may thus be raised regarding whether the monolithic view concerning the cessation of coin minting in Samaria in 332/1 should be categorically upheld. This is especially so, considering intermittent minting after the Macedonian conquest has already been demonstrated regarding other southern Levantine mints in Yehud and arguably Philistia. Multiple dies used to strike IC-5 and its variants (at least 5 obverse and 5 reverse dies for IC-5 and at least 7 obverse and 6 reverse dies for the club variant) suggest that the coins were minted over a period. However, the current number of known specimens and their state cannot conclusively support an inference about the total size of these issues and the period for which they circulated. In conclusion, although it is impossible to rule out entirely that these coin types might have been issued by a different Levantine mint, numismatic analysis suggests that the most likely source of these coins remains the Samaritan minting authority as was previously suspected. If this is indeed the case and Samaria was responsible for issuing IC-5 and its variants, then the coins should probably be interpreted in the same manner as the small generic Philistia Athenian-styled coins, which were circulating, most probably, with a goal of bridging a gap formed by the cessation of regular outputs of certain civic autonomous mints at the end of the Persian period and the beginning of regular emissions from local royal mints opening in 261/60. As a matter of caution, however, attribution of these types to Samaria should remain tentative until further evidence is presented.

The contribution of this paper should be more than the conditional reinforcement of the uncertain attribution suggested by Meshorer and Qedar 1999. Rather, it should be in the methodological implications which may be gained by the above analysis. It seems that the best way of tackling the multiple uncertain attributions of mainly anepigraphic Levantine fractions, hinges on the ability to distinguish between the distinctive characteristics of the different Levantine mints by traditional numismatic analysis. Such cross-regional case by case analysis, as in the example of IC-5 and variants, may not always provide certain attributions, but holds the key to eliminating attributions which seem less likely, and thus result in a “most probable” attribution as in the case at hand. It makes clear the need to study Levantine coinages from the period in a holistic way and as a collective regional phenomenon. It may thus provide an additional tier to the stop-gap solution embodied in the “Middle Levantine” category suggested by Fischer-Bossert.⁶⁰

⁶⁰ CHL: 205.

ABBREVIATIONS

CHL = Y. MESHORER, G. BIJOVSKY and W. FISCHER-BOSSERT, *Coins of the Holy Land: The Abraham and Marian Sofaer Collection at the American Numismatic Society and the Israel Museum*, vols. 1–2, Ancient Coins in North American Collections 8, New York 2013.

CNG = Classical Numismatic Group, LLC.

CPE = C.C. LORBER, *Coins of the Ptolemaic Empire*, part I: *Ptolemy I through Ptolemy IV*, vol. 1: *Precious Metal*, vol. 2: *Bronze*, New York 2018.

CS = Y. MESHORER and S. QEDAR, *The Coinage of Samaria in the Fourth Century BCE*, Jerusalem 1991.

Gemini = Gemini Numismatic Auctions, LLC.

Goldberg = Goldberg Coins and Collectibles, Inc.

IMJ = Israel Museum, Jerusalem.

JC = David and Jemimah Jeselsohn Collection of Coins of the Holy Land (Switzerland).

Leu = Leu Numismatik AG.

ML = Menashe Landman Collection (Israel).

MQ = Y. MESHORER and S. QEDAR, *Samarian Coinage*, Numismatic Studies and Researches 9, Jerusalem 1999.

Nomos = Nomos AG.

PC = Unnamed Private Collection (Israel).

Roma = Roma Numismatics Ltd.

Svoronos = J.N. SVORONOS, *Ta Nomismata tou Kratous ton Ptolemaion*, vols. 1–4, Athens 1904.

REFERENCES

ANDRADE, N.J. 2017. “The Silver Coinage of Syrian Manbog (Hierapolis-Bambyke)”, *American Journal of Numismatics* 29: 1–46, Pls. 1–5.

ARIEL, D.T. 2016. “The Circulation of Locally Minted Persian-Period Coins in the Southern Levant”, *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne* 11: 13–62. DOI: 11.12797/ZP.11.2016.11.01

BIJOVSKY, G. 2021. “The Coins from the Excavations at Mount Gerizim”. In: Y. MAGEN, G. BIJOVSKY and Y. TZIONIT (eds.), *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, vol. 3: *The Coins*, Judea and Samaria Publications 19, Jerusalem: 79–271.

GITLER, H., JESELSON, D., JOHANANOFF, M. and TAL, O. 2024. *The Jeselsohn Collection of Coins of the Holy Land*, vol. 1: *Persian and early Hellenistic Coinage*. Jerusalem.

GITLER, H., LORBER, C. and FONTANILLE, J.-P. 2023. *The Yehud Coinage: A Study and Die Classification of the Provincial Silver Coinage of Judah*, Numismatic Studies and Researches 12, Jerusalem.

GITLER, H. and TAL, O. 2006. *The Coinage of Philistia of the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC: A Study of the Earliest Coins of Palestine*, Collezioni numismatiche 6, Milano–New York.

GITLER, H. and TAL, O. 2014. “More Than Meets the Eye: Athenian Owls and the Chronology of Southern Palestinian Coinages of the Persian Period”, *Israel Numismatic Research* 9: 15–27.

GITLER, H. and TAL O. 2016. “Reclassifying Persian-Period Philistian Coins: Some New Identifications”, *Israel Numismatic Research* 11: 11–22.

GITLER, H. and TAL, O. 2017. “Circulation of Southern Palestinian Athenian-Styled Fractions after the Conquest of Alexander the Great”, *Israel Numismatic Research* 12: 35–46.

GITLER, H. and TAL, O. 2019. *The Nablus 1968 Hoard: A Study of Monetary Circulation in the Late Fourth and Early Third Centuries BCE Southern Levant*, Numismatic Notes and Monographs 171, New York.

- GITLER, H. and TAL, O. 2020. “More on the Samaria Hoard (CH 9·413 Samaria, before 1990): coins, jewelry and the Samaritan *sheqel* weight standard”, *Revue belge de Numismatique* CLXVI: 176–197.
- GITLER, H. and TAL, O. 2022. “Indigenous Coinages in Palestine: Towards an Understanding of the Persian – Hellenistic Transitional Phase of Money Use”, *Phoenix* 76: 250–260. DOI: 10.1353/phx.2022.a914297
- GITLER, H., TAL, O. and VAN ALFEN, P. 2007. “Silver Dome-shaped Coins from Persian-period Southern Palestine”, *Israel Numismatic Research* 2: 47–62.
- HERVÉ, G. and MENDOZA, M. 2020. “‘What Have the Macedonians Ever Done for Us?’ A Reassessment of the Changes in Samaria by the Start of the Hellenistic Period”. In B. HENSEL, D. NOCQUET and B. ADAMCZEWSKI (eds.), *Yahwistic Diversity and the Hebrew Bible Tracing Perspectives of Group Identity from Judah, Samaria, and the Diaspora in Biblical Traditions*, Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2, Reihe 120, Tübingen: 169–230.
- JOHANANOFF, M. 2021. “From Sidon to Samaria: Fourth-Century BCE Autonomous Coins of Samaria with Sidonian Motifs”, *Israel Numismatic Research* 16: 3–34.
- JOHANANOFF, M., GITLER, H. and TAL, O. *A Corpus of Samaritan Coinage* (forthcoming).
- MILDENBERG, L. 1999. “A Note on the Coinage of Hierapolis-Bambyce”. In M. AMANDRY and S. HURTER (eds.), *Travaux de numismatique grecque offerts à Georges Le Rider*, London: 276–284, Pls. 27–28.
- PRICE, M.J. 1991. *The Coinage in the Name of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaeus: A British Museum Catalogue*, vols. 1–2, London–Zürich.
- QEDAR, S. 2000–2002. “Tissaphernes at Dor?”, *Israel Numismatic Journal* 14: 9–14.
- SHARPE, S. 1838. “The Eagle and Thunderbolt on the Coins of Rome and Syria”, *The Numismatic Chronicle* 1: 187–192.
- TAL, O. 2007. “Coin Denominations and Weight Standards in Fourth-Century BCE Palestine”, *Israel Numismatic Research* 2: 17–28.
- TAL, O. 2011. “‘Hellenistic Foundations’ in Palestine”. In L.L. GRABBE and O. LIPSCHITS (eds.), *Judah Between East and West: The Transition from Persian to Greek Rule (ca. 400–200 BCE)*, Library of Second Temple Studies 75, New York–London: 242–254.
- TAL, O. 2012. “Greek Coinages of Palestine”. In W.E. METCALF (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Coinage*, Oxford: 252–274. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195305746.013.0015

Author’s address:

Mati Johananoff
 Department of Archaeology and Ancient Near Eastern Cultures
 Tel Aviv University, IL-6997801 Tel Aviv, Israel
 johananoff@gmail.com

TABLE 1

Catalogue of Specimens of IC-5 and Variants with Club

PLATE 1

- Fig. 1. Half m'h, IC-5, MQ 126, Pl. 31 (0.31 g, 8 mm, 2 h)
 Fig. 2. Half m'h, IC-5, CNG 512, 234, 2022 (0.34 g, 8.5 mm, 5 h)
 Fig. 3. Half m'h, IC-5, CNG 118, 452, 2021 (0.42 g, 8.5 mm)
 Fig. 4. Half m'h or m'h, IC-5, Nomos 22, 259, 2021 (0.56 g, 10 mm, 6 h)
 Fig. 5. Half m'h, IC-5, CNG 538, 228, 2023 (0.46 g, 10 mm, 10 h)
 Fig. 6. Half m'h, IC-5, NAC 123, 852, 2021 (0.46 g, 9 mm, 10 h)
 Fig. 7. Half m'h, IC-5 (club), ML 231 (0.41 g, 8.5 mm, 12 h)
 Fig. 8. Half m'h, IC-5 (club), JC Samaria 378 (0.38 g, 8 mm, 6 h)
 Fig. 9. Half m'h, IC-5 (club), IMJ 2013.039.34503 (0.48 g, 10 mm, 6 h)
 Fig. 10. Half m'h, IC-5 (club), ML 235 (0.24 g)
 Fig. 11. Half m'h, IC-5 (club), Nomos Obolos 1, 240, 2015 (0.45 g, 9 mm, 9 h)
 Fig. 12. Half m'h, IC-5 (club), PC 38
 Fig. 13. Half m'h, IC-5 (club), CNG M. B. 64, 2003 (0.46 g)
 Fig. 14. Half m'h, IC-5 (club), Goldberg 112, 1534, 2019 (0.35 g)
 Fig. 15. Drawing and description of IC-5 after MQ: 126
 Fig. 16. Late Persian period Samarian coins portraying a similar female head to IC-5 and variants
 Fig. 16a. M'h type MQ no. 93 (ŠMRYN), JC Samaria 159 = Samaria Hoard 155 (0.72 g, 9 mm, 9 h)
 Fig. 16b. Anepigraphic Half M'h type MQ no. 94, JC Samaria 160 (0.34 g, 7 mm, 3 h)
 Fig. 17. Tetradrachm of Ptolemy II, Tyre mint, Leu 18, 1602, 2021, Type CPE 591 (13.89 g, 27.5 mm, 12 h)
 Fig. 18. Bronze coin from Cyprus, Paphos, type CPE B118, Svoronos 74. Leu 13, 573, 2020 (8.99 g, 20 mm, 12 h)
 Fig. 19. Coins from Cilicia with similar iconography to IC-5 and club variants
 Fig. 19a. Goldberg 75, 2477, 2013 (0.8 g)
 Fig. 19b. Leu 14, 497, 2020 (0.72 g, 10 mm, 10 h)
 Fig. 19c. Gemini VI, 222, 2010 (0.79 g)
 Fig. 20. Unpublished silver fraction of Manbog, Roma XXVII, 358, 2023 (0.60 g, 9 mm, 3 h)

Catalogue of IC-5 and Variants (PLATE 1, Figs. 1–14)

No.	Type	Source	Dimensions	Comments
Pl. 1.1	IC-5	MQ: 126, Pl. 31	0.31 g, 8 mm, 2 h	
Pl. 1.2	IC-5	CNG 512, 234 (2022)	0.34 g, 8.5 mm, 5 h	
Pl. 1.3	IC-5	CNG 118, 452 (2021)	0.42 g, 8.5 mm	
Pl. 1.4	IC-5	Nomos 22, 259 (2021)	0.56 g, 10 mm, 6 h	Paphos (?) Obol (?)
Pl. 1.5	IC-5	CNG 538, 228 (2023)	0.46 g, 10 mm, 10 h	
Pl. 1.6	IC-5	NAC 123, 852 (2021)	0.46 g, 9 mm, 10 h	
Pl. 1.7	IC-5 (club)	ML 231	0.41 g, 8.5 mm, 12 h	
Pl. 1.8	IC-5 (club)	JC Samaria 358	0.38 g, 8 mm, 6 h	
Pl. 1.9	IC-5 (club)	IMJ 2013.039.34503	0.48 g, 10 mm, 6 h	
Pl. 1.10	IC-5 (club)	ML 235	0.24 g	
Pl. 1.11	IC-5 (club)	Nomos Obolos 1, 240 (2015)	0.45 g, 9 mm, 9 h	
Pl. 1.12	IC-5 (club)	PC 38	–	
Pl. 1.13	IC-5 (club)	CNG M. B. 64 (2003)	0.46 g	
Pl. 1.14	IC-5 (club)	Goldberg 112, 1534 (2019)	0.35 g	Cilicia (?)

