

# NOTAE NUMISMATICAE

---

# ZAPISKI NUMIZMATYCZNE



Tom XVII

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

Kraków 2022



NOTAE NUMISMATICAE  

---

ZAPISKI NUMIZMATYCZNE

Tom XVII

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

Kraków 2022

**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. Andrew Meadows, Prof. Mariusz Mielczarek, Dr 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 Hab. Katarzyna Balbuza, Dr Roger Bland, Dr Hab. Tomasz Bochnak, Prof. Kevin Butcher, Dr Lilia Dergaciova, Dr Hab. Arkadiusz Dymowski, Dr Wolfgang Fischer-Bossert, Prof. Peter Guest, Dr Helle Horsnaes, Dr Krzysztof Jarzęcki, Dr Piotr Jaworski, Dr Hab. Agata Kluczek, Prof. Koray Konuk, Dr Hab. Mirosław Piotr Kruk, Dr Hab. Barbara Lichočka, Dr Kris Lockyear, Dr Lucian Munteanu, Dr Kyrillo Myzgin, Prof. Marek Olbrycht, Dr Hab. Judyta Rodzińska-Nowak, Dr David Wigg-Wolf, Dr Hab. Marcin Wołoszyn, Dr Dmitriy Yanov, Dr Bernward Ziegau

**Redaktorzy prowadzący / Managing Editors:**

Barbara Zajac, Anna Kowalczyk, Dorota Malarczyk

**Tłumaczenia / Translations:**

Piotr Godlewski, Marcin Fijak

**Korekta / Proofreading:**

Aeddan Shaw

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

Luiza Berdak

**Skład i łamanie / Typesetting and page layout:**

Knight Press Dariusz F. Jasek

**Adres redakcji / Address of the Editorial Office:**

Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie  
ul. Marszałka Józefa Piłsudskiego 12, 31-109 Kraków  
tel. (+48) 12 433 58 50, e-mail: notae@mnk.pl  
<http://mnk.pl/notae-numismaticae-zapiski-numizmatyczne-1>

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

Wersją pierwotną *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne* jest wersja elektroniczna.  
The electronic edition of the *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne* is treated as its original version.

© Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie i Autorzy, 2022

ISSN 1426-5435

## SPIS TREŚCI / CONTENTS

- 9 Od redakcji  
10 From the Editors

## ARTYKUŁY / ARTICLES

- 13 WILHELM MÜSELER  
“Out of Area” : The Involvement of Non-Local Powers in Lycian Affairs between the 5<sup>th</sup> and the 4<sup>th</sup> Centuries BC  
*„Poza obszarem”. Zaangażowanie zewnętrznych potęg w sprawy Licji między V a IV w. p.n.e.*
- 43 ŁUKASZ BUL  
The Development of Krakow Type Staters  
*Ewolucja staterów typu krakowskiego*
- 75 ADAM JEGLIŃSKI  
The Imperial Eastern Bronze Coinage of CA/AVGVSTVS, SC, OB CIVIS SERVATOS Types Issued under Augustus. Chronology and Political, Economic, Propaganda Contexts  
*Wschodni cesarski pieniądz brązowy typu CA/AVGVSTVS, SC, OB CIVIS SERVATOS za panowania Augusta. Chronologia oraz konteksty polityczny, gospodarczy i propagandowy*
- 115 JAROSŁAW BODZEK  
A Note on the Cypriote GIC 603 and GIC 38 Countermarks  
*Notatka na temat cypryjskich kontramarek GIC 603 i GIC 38*
- 127 JAROSŁAW BODZEK, IWONA LEWOC, KYRYŁO MYZGIN  
A Coin in the Name of the Bosporan Ruler Cotys Found in the Suburbs of Augustów  
*Znalezisko monety z imieniem władcy Królestwa Bosporańskiego Kotysa w Augustowie*
- 145 DAWID MACIEJCZUK, KRZYSZTOF JAWORSKI  
Votive Offering or Accidental Loss? Finds of Roman Coins in the Sudetes in the Context of Medicinal Springs: A Case Study of Recent Finds from Stare Rochowice (Bolków-Zdrój)  
*Dary wotywnie czy przypadkowe zguby? Sudeckie znaleziska monet rzymskich w kontekście źródeł leczniczych – studium przypadku na tle najnowszych znalezisk ze Starych Rochowic (Bolkowa-Zdroju)*

- 159 SZYMON JELLONEK  
Final Chapter of Roman Colonial Coinage (AD 235–275): Reminiscence of *Romanitas*  
*Końcowy rozdział rzymskiego mennictwa kolonialnego (235–275). Reminiscencja Romanitas*
- 199 KYRYŁO MYZGIN  
New Finds of Gold Coins of Magnentius from Ukraine: The Short Report  
*Nowe znaleziska złotych monet Magnencjusza z Ukrainy. Krótkie doniesienie*
- 221 VITAL SIDAROVICH  
A Solidus of Valentinian III Found near the Village of Roŭnaje Pole in Belarus: An Unusual Find from the Belarusian-Lithuanian Borderland  
*Solid Walentyniana III znaleziony w pobliżu wsi Roŭnaje Pole na Białorusi – niezwyčajne znalezisko z białorusko-litewskiego pogranicza*
- 235 YURIY ZAYONCHKOVSKIY, ANDREI BOIKO-HAHARIN  
The Silver Coins of “Prince Simeon’s People”: An Unknown Part of the Numismatics of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania  
*Srebrne monety „ludu księcia Symeona” – nieznaną część numizmatyki Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*
- 247 ARKADIUSZ DYMOWSKI  
A Graphical Method for Analysing Chronological Patterns of Coin Sets  
*Graficzna metoda analizy profili chronologicznych zestawów monet*

## POLEMIKI / POLEMICS

- 261 ANDREW M. CHUGG, ELENA VAROTTO, MICHAEL E. HABICHT, FRANCESCO M. GALASSI  
Holt’s Fourth Porus Chariot-Type Medallion: A Point-by-Point Rebuttal  
*Czwarty „medallion Porusa z rydwanem” Holta. Odpowiedź punkt po punkcie*

## RECENZJE / REVIEWS

- 269 SZYMON JELLONEK  
JIŘI MILITKÝ, MICHAL MAŠEK, *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. Czech Republic. Vol. I, part 10: Bactria and India (Early Bactria, Graeco-Bactrian and Indo-Greek Coins, Imitations, Indo-Scythians)*, National Museum, Prague 2019

- BARBARA ZAJĄC  
272 SVITLANA A. BULATOVICH, EVGENIA F. REDINA, *Elektrovyye monety Kizika v sobranii Odesskogo arkeologicheskogo muzeya NAN Ukrainy. Katalog / Electrum Coins of Cyzicus in the Collection of the Odessa Archaeological Museum. Catalogue*, edited by M. MIELCZAREK and J. BODZEK, TEC, Odessa 2021
- GRZEGORZ SOCHACKI  
277 JIŘI MILITKÝ, LUBOŠ KRÁL, *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. Czech Republic. Vol. IV: The Luboš Král Collection. Egypt: Roman Provincial Coinage*, National Museum, Prague 2021

## KRONIKA / CHRONICLE

- MATEUSZ WOŹNIAK  
285 Kronika Gabinetu Numizmatycznego Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie (2021)  
290 *The Chronicle of the Numismatic Cabinet of the National Museum in Krakow (2021)*





Szanowni Państwo,

oddajemy w Państwa ręce tom XVII *Notae Numismaticae – Zapisków Numizmatycznych*. Zgodnie z przyjętymi przez nas zasadami wszystkie teksty publikujemy w językach kongresowych, z angielskimi i polskimi abstraktami. Zawartość całego 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.

Rok 2022 był wyjątkowy dla całego środowiska numizmatyków w Polsce. Pierwszy raz w historii naszego kraju, a ujmując rzecz szerzej – w krajach Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej – odbył się XVI Międzynarodowy Kongres Numizmatyczny, najważniejsze spotkanie numizmatyków z całego świata, organizowane co sześć lat pod auspicjami International Numismatic Council. Wybór Polski, jako miejsca organizacji Kongresu traktujemy jako wielkie wyróżnienie. Głównym organizatorem tego wydarzenia był Uniwersytet Warszawski, a w przygotowaniach uczestniczyły również Muzeum Narodowe w Warszawie, Zamek Królewski w Warszawie, Polskie Towarzystwo Numizmatyczne, Narodowy Bank Polski oraz Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie. W tym ostatnim przypadku szczególnie zaangażowani w prace nad XVI INC byli pracownicy Gabinetu Numizmatycznego. Całością działań kierował profesor Aleksander Bursche z Wydziału Archeologii Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, pomysłodawca organizacji Kongresu w Polsce, którego wspierał Komitet Organizacyjny reprezentujący wszystkie najważniejsze polskie ośrodki numizmatyczne. Obrady kongresowe — które zgromadziły ponad 600 uczestników, czy to na miejscu w Warszawie, czy też w mniej licznych przypadkach, dzięki transmisji na żywo, w miejscach ich zamieszkania — uzupełniały liczne wydarzenia towarzyszące: wystawy, koncerty i spotkania.

Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie przygotowało z tej okazji specjalną wystawę: „Medal prywatnie. Medale w I Rzeczypospolitej (od XVI do XVIII wieku)”, której kuratorem była Agnieszka Smołucha-Sładkowska. Jednocześnie we współpracy z Uniwersytetem Jagiellońskim, krakowskim oddziałem Polskiego Towarzystwa Numizmatycznego, Królewską Biblioteką w Brukseli i Królewskim Towarzystwem Numizmatycznym w Belgii zorganizowano poprzedzającą właściwe obrady Kongresu międzynarodową sesję „Joachim Lelewel and Numismatics in the Nineteenth Century”. W ramach kongresu tradycyjnie opracowany został również Survey of Numismatic Research za lata 2014–2020, w prace nad którym aktywnie zaangażowani byli pracownicy Gabinetu Numizmatycznego: Jarosław Bodzek, Dorota Malarczyk i Barbara Zając. Co więcej, Gabinet Numizmatyczny Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie był silnie reprezentowany w obradach Kongresu, w czasie których wymienione powyżej osoby wygłosiły referaty. Kongres zakończył się wielkim sukcesem i stanowił znakomitą wizytówkę polskiej numizmatyki.

Redakcja

Dear Readers,

It is with great pleasure that we present volume 17 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 whole of the present volume can be found as PDF's on the website of the National Museum in Krakow (<https://mnk.pl/notae-numismaticae-zapiski-numizmatyczne-1>), 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.

2022 was a special year for the entire numismatic community in Poland. It saw the XVI International Numismatic Congress being held in Warsaw, marking the first time that this most important meeting of numismatists from all over the world, organised every six years under the auspices of the International Numismatic Council, had been held in our country, or more generally in a country from Central and Eastern Europe. The choice of Poland as the venue for the Congress was a great honour. The main organiser of the event was the University of Warsaw, and also involved in its organisation were the National Museum in Warsaw, the Royal Castle in Warsaw, the Polish Numismatic Society, the National Bank of Poland, and the National Museum in Krakow. In this last case, the staff of the Museum's Numismatic Cabinet were particularly active in the work on the INC 2022. In charge of all activities was Professor Aleksander Bursche of the Faculty of Archaeology at the University of Warsaw, who was the driving force behind the organisation of the Congress in Poland, and who was supported in his role by the Organising Committee, representing all major Polish numismatic centres. The congress proceedings, which attracted more than 600 participants, either on-site in Warsaw or, in lesser numbers, thanks to live streaming, were complemented by a wide range of accompanying events, including exhibitions, concerts, and meetings.

The National Museum in Krakow organised a special exhibition for the occasion: "Private medal. Private medals in the 1<sup>st</sup> Republic of Poland (from the 16<sup>th</sup> to the 18<sup>th</sup> century)", curated by Agnieszka Smołucha-Sładkowska. At the same time, an international session on "Joachim Lelewel and Numismatics in the Nineteenth Century", preceding the Congress proper, was organised in cooperation with the Jagiellonian University, the Krakow Branch of the Polish Numismatic Society, the Royal Library of Brussels, and the Royal Numismatic Society of Belgium. As part of the Congress, the Survey of Numismatic Research for the years 2014–2020 was traditionally produced, with Jarosław Bodzek, Dorota Malarczyk and Barbara Zajac of the Numismatic Cabinet actively involved in its preparation. The Numismatic Cabinet of the National Museum in Krakow was also strongly represented in the proceedings of the Congress, where the abovementioned staff delivered papers. The congress was a great success and a real showcase for Poland.

The Editors

WILHELM MÜSELER

Independent Researcher

ORCID: 0000-0002-6401-786X

## “Out of Area”: The Involvement of Non-Local Powers in Lycian Affairs between the 5<sup>th</sup> and the 4<sup>th</sup> Centuries BC

**ABSTRACT:** The discovery of yet another stater in the name of an Anatolian *karanos* struck in Lycia, in this case of the Lydian satrap Autophradates (after ca. 370 BC), has induced the author to a reappraisal of the participation of different hegemonial powers from outside in internal Lycian conflicts between ca. 430 and 360 BC. Occasionally, Athenians and Spartans as well as the Persian overlords of the region themselves made use of various rivalries among local dynastic clans to protect their own strategic and political interests in the general area.

**KEY WORDS:** Dynastic Lycia, Achaemenid Administration, Semi-autonomy, Proxy-wars

**ABSTRAKT:** „*Poza obszarem*”. Zaangażowanie zewnętrznych potęg w sprawy Licji między V a IV w. p.n.e.

Odkrycie kolejnego statera wybitego w Licji w imieniu anatolijskiego *karanosa*, w tym przypadku lidyjskiego satrapy Autofradatesa (po ok. 370 r. p.n.e.), skłoniło autora do ponownej oceny udziału różnych zewnętrznych potęg w wewnętrznych konfliktach licyjskich między ok. 430 a 360 r. p.n.e. Ateńczycy i Spartanie, a także sami perscy władcy regionu co jakiś czas wykorzystywali rywalizację pomiędzy lokalnymi klanami dynastycznymi, aby chronić własne strategiczne i polityczne interesy na tym obszarze.

**SŁOWA KLUCZOWE:** dynastyczna Licja, administracja achemenidzka, częściowa autonomia, wojny zastępcze

## AVANT-PROPOS: ON THE PITFALLS IN THE ARBITRARY “RECONSTRUCTION” OF HOARDS BY THE APPEARANCE OF COINS AT THE MARKET

Undoubtedly, the joint occurrence of a variety of coins in “hoards” has a considerable impact on the dating and interpretation of the respective monetary issues within their historical context. However, deposits that can be attributed to a definite location and secured in their original volume and composition are rather rare. Most coins which have emerged from the ground at some time in the past have either come to light as single finds or as part of complexes, whose original location was deliberately hidden and which were divided up immediately after their discovery to be channelled into trade over a number of intermediate stations.<sup>1</sup>

In the attempt to make up for this unsatisfactory situation it has become a habit among scholars and researchers in the field of ancient numismatics to assign internally related groups of coins, that were offered at the market either at a certain date in one and the same place or by a number of dealers over a limited period of time, to a common origin from a presumed hoard. However, as a rule, the size, original composition and exact findspot of such hypothetical complexes remain a matter of speculation or at best of hear-say. Of course, theoretical constructions of the kind are not generally illegitimate: Often enough at least a part of the coins in question may in fact be well attributable to a common archaeological background.<sup>2</sup> But there is no way to prove such a common origin with any certainty; therefore statements concerning the presence of certain issues in such a presumed hoard compared with the apparent absence of others can only be made with strong reservations and must be treated with the utmost care. In some cases, for example when questions of cultural property are concerned, speculations regarding the archaeological origin of certain coins may even become outright hazardous.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> This is of course a most regrettable situation: But it is in the first line caused by a completely failed legislation concerning the ownership of archaeological objects and the division of finds between the state and private individuals in the countries, where most of such discoveries occur. To limit the general right of possession of such objects and to prosecute collectors and dealers of the respective artefacts all over the world is not only demonstrably counterproductive: Where “archaeological objects of uncertain origin” are excluded from a study by certain radical scholars, accepting deliberate blind spots in research for the sake of a misunderstood “moral integrity”, the whole matter is nothing more than a relapse to the darkest middle-ages with research controlled and limited by religious beliefs which must be considered as simply lunatic nowadays.

<sup>2</sup> At least some parts of groups, that appear together in trade, may occasionally have a common background: The assumption that the core of the so-called Wekhssere-Hoard published by VISMARA 1988, i.e. just the series clearly attributable to the elder Wekhssere, belong to one and the same archaeological context cannot *per se* be dismissed. But any deductions from such a hypothesis still require extreme caution.

<sup>3</sup> Within the framework of the cursed debate over national cultural property of recent decades, even only the assumed provenances of certain objects have repeatedly led to problematic “claims for restitution” of dubious legitimacy.

A recent article on the coinage of the so-called “Harpagid dynasty” or “dynasty of Xanthos” by Jonathan Kagan repeatedly refers to “hoards” of precisely such a hypothetical nature.<sup>4</sup> Although due caution is admitted, and the arguments are not exclusively based upon the composition of the presumed deposits, a number of questions concerning the inner structure of the groups presented here still remain open:<sup>5</sup> According to Kagan, coins of a “dumpy fabric”, i.e. with rather thick flans and of a somewhat smaller diameter in the names of the elder Wekhsere and of Kherēi appear repeatedly together in hoards, while coins with flatter and broader flans struck from larger dies in the names of Kheriga (and of Kherēi) seem to be lacking in the respective groups. Allegedly, coins with such a fabric can only be found in groups containing clearly later material such as issues in the names of Wakhsseppdimi and of Ddēntimi from Tlos, of Ddeneweale from Tlos and from Xanthos or of Ddeneweale and of Erbbina from Telmessos. Evidence for this assertion is drawn from the famous “Tissaphernes-Fund”, published by Silvia Hurter in 1979,<sup>6</sup> the rather controversial “Lycia 1987 Hoard”, which has been entirely pieced together from coins seen at different and not clearly connected occasions and places in trade,<sup>7</sup> and from a hitherto unknown group called the “Unknown Satrap Hoard” by Jonathan Kagan and published at the beginning of his article.

Kagan’s underlying hypothesis derives from an observation made by Colin M. Kraay with regard to the 5<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> century coinages of Pamphylia and of Cilicia.<sup>8</sup> In his publication on the Kelenderis-Hoard of 1962, Kraay demonstrated that the chronological sequence of the issues apparently corresponds to a change in the fabric of the various coins from comparatively thick and bulky flans, usually struck with images in comparatively high relief and set in a deep incuse, to broader and flatter flans with a more even surface and with images of a less protruding relief set in rather truncated incuses. Kagan wishes to transfer this phenomenon to Lycian coinages of the late 5<sup>th</sup> and the early 4<sup>th</sup> centuries BC. He assumes that the Xanthian coins in the name of Kheriga with their large and seemingly flat flans cannot precede the greatest part of Kherēi’s issues with their rather “dumpy fabric”. On the other hand, he admits that the Central Lycian issues of “dumpy fabric” in the

<sup>4</sup> KAGAN 2021.

<sup>5</sup> The assertion of having seen a certain group of coins «in an uncleaned state» on the trays of dealer XY at Z (as for example made by SPIER 1991: 233–234), even if used by a normally reliable witness, has no scientific force whatsoever.

<sup>6</sup> HURTER 1979.

<sup>7</sup> KAGAN 2021: 34 sqq. Kagan has added the group in question as a second appendix to his cited article (KAGAN 2021: 59 sqq). However, the character of the assemblage as an original hoard can hardly be proved. It is mainly composed of a group seen by Jeffrey Spier at Numismatik Lanz in Munich (see SPIER 1991: *loc. cit.*) combined with a number of additional coins sold by Leu Numismatik of Zurich to the ANS during about the same period – a construction of very limited reliability, to say the least!

<sup>8</sup> KRAAY 1962: 7.

name of Kheriga and of Kherēi are clearly connected to each other as well as to the earlier coinages in the name of Teththiweibi from Phellos and from Kandyba and should therefore be dated nearer to the middle of the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC (Figs. 1–7).<sup>9</sup> He is implying a linear development of the flans used for Kherigas various coinages along a definite timeline, which reaches from the thirties down to the last decade of the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC.<sup>10</sup>

For this reason Kagan proposes a modified chronology for the reigns of the brothers Kheriga and Kherēi in Central Lycia and in the Xanthos-valley.<sup>11</sup> According to his reconstruction it was Kherēi, who had expelled the elder Wekhssere (called with this name on most of his coins but with the name Wakhsepddimi in the inscription on the southern side of the Xanthos-Stele<sup>12</sup>) from the Xanthos valley during the late thirties and the early twenties of the 5<sup>th</sup> century, and who had subsequently replaced the local coinages in the name of Wekhssere with the huge and manyfold series in his own name from a variety of western mints. Meanwhile Kheriga had remained in Central Lycia, where he continued with his own coinages at Phellos, Kandyba, Tymnessos and possibly an unknown mint.<sup>13</sup> Only many years later, after Kherēi had been succeeded or rather deposed by Ddenewele, who is apparently seen by Kagan as nothing other than another usurper just like his contemporary Erbbina, Kheriga occupied Xanthos and struck his coinage of the “Seated Athena Type” there – an event, which Kagan wishes to place around the turn from the 5<sup>th</sup> to the 4<sup>th</sup> centuries BC. But since there is also an issue in the name of Kherēi, which is clearly derived from the series in the name of Kheriga and should therefore be placed somewhat later, this model requires in addition the assumption of yet another reign of Kherēi at Xanthos.<sup>14</sup>

Although Kagan himself has underlined the prevalence of “numismatic (as opposed to art historical)” concepts such as the analysis of coin-flan development, his construction is based upon a misconception of a technical nature: Kherigas

<sup>9</sup> 1. Kheriga, Stater of bulky fabric, Phellos. 9.75 g. MÜSELER 2016: V/44; 2. Kheriga, Stater of bulky fabric, Kandyba. 8.42 g. MÜSELER 2016: V/47; 3. Kheriga, Stater of bulky fabric, Tymnessos. 8.48 g. SNG Cop. Suppl. 441; 4. Kheriga, Stater of bulky fabric, Tymnessos. 8.12 g. SNG Cop. Suppl. 442; 5. Kherēi, Stater of bulky fabric, Phellos. 9.58 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/1; 6. Teththiweibi, Stater of bulky fabric, Phellos. 9.65 g. BM 1934, 0611.3; 7. Teththiweibi, Stater of bulky fabric, Kandyba. 8.21 g. SNG Cop. Suppl. 427.

<sup>10</sup> KAGAN 2021: 32 sqq.

<sup>11</sup> See the resulting chronological construction of Kagan as opposed to that of Müseler: KAGAN 2021: 31, Tab. s 1 + 2.

<sup>12</sup> For the name-form in the coin legends see VISMARA 1989; for the spelling on the Xanthos Stele see TL 44 a, 49. The question, whether these are just name-forms referring to the same person or whether the coins and the inscription are to be related to different agents has been repeatedly discussed: See in particular MÜSELER 2019a: 27–30 contra KONUK 2016, SCHÜRR 2018 and KOLB 2018.

<sup>13</sup> By this Kagan ignores the growing influence of the dynast Khinakha from Limyra in the central highlands and in particular in the Kasaba-Valley during the final decades of the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC: Cf. MÜSELER 2018a: 21 sqq.

<sup>14</sup> KAGAN 2021: 50 with Fig. 25a. This would actually imply a second and even still later minting-period at Xanthos for Kherēi. See also above note 11.

coins of the alleged later fabric, which not only appear at Xanthos but at Phellos and at Kandyba as well, have visibly been struck on flans, whose original design had not been flatter and broader from the start but which have been reworked and hammered into their present shape with the intent of extinguishing their previous images completely and making the flans reusable for an entirely different type of coinage (Figs. 8–11).<sup>15</sup> The obverses of the re-hammered flans are slightly cone-shaped with mechanically re-flattened areas gradually sloping down from the centre to the rim, while the reverses are completely planar.<sup>16</sup> Therefore the impressions made by the obverse dies are often incomplete, lacking at least the outer frames or sometimes even parts of the central images, while the impressions made by the equally large reverse-dies are usually visible in their entirety. This is a clear sign that these pieces have been thoroughly worked over and then restruck with new (and somewhat larger) dies. In contrast, pieces of a genuine flat fabric, whose flans were prepared from the very beginning for the impression of relatively large dies, display much more even fields and do not show the same pictorial deficiencies (Figs. 12–15).<sup>17</sup>

As yet we do not know of any specimen among the Kherigas reworked coins where the tooling of the flan has remained incomplete so that traces of the previous type are still visible. It may, however, very well be the fact that the original types were in fact struck in the name of the elder Wekhsere, which would actually make some sense before the presumable economic background of the conflict over the control of Xanthos as well.<sup>18</sup>

Kagan’s attempt to secure a later dating of the Xanthian coinage of Kheriga and his assumption of two separate phases for the coin-production in the name of this dynast based upon coin-flan development does not seem tenable upon closer inspection. Thus also the postulated character of the group presented at the beginning of his article as a genuine archaeological find becomes rather dubitable. The alleged hoard would contain Xanthian coins from the thirties together with Xanthian and Tloan issues from the very end of the 5<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 4<sup>th</sup> centuries BC and would be closing with the “Unknown satrap stater”, which

<sup>15</sup> 8. Kheriga, Stater on reworked flan, Phellos. 9.51 g. SNG Cop. Suppl. 440; 9. Kheriga, Stater on reworked flan, Kandyba. 9.31 g. SNG Cop. Suppl. 443; 10. Kheriga, Stater on reworked flan, Xanthos. 8.55 g. KAGAN 2021: 27, 9; 11. Kheriga, Stater on reworked flan, Xanthos. 8.17 g. MÜSELER 2016: V/50.

<sup>16</sup> Occasionally this method was even used in the production of smaller denominations like drachms: In those cases the flans were first flattened and then trimmed in order to reduce their weight (see for example Fig. 20).

<sup>17</sup> 12. Kherēi, Stater of flat fabric, Xanthos. 8.62 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/5; 13. Hñtruma, Stater of flat fabric, Kadyanda. 8.44 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/99; 14. Erbbina, Stater of flat fabric, Telmessos. 8.25 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/83; 15. Artumpara, Stater of flat fabric, Xanthos. 8.07 g. MÜSELER 2016: VIII/28. – Kagan actually makes use of a specimen with a visibly re-hammered flan, the number 10 from his “Unknown Satrap Hoard”, as an example for a coin of flat flan struck in the name of Kheriga (cf. KAGAN 2021: 34 with Fig. 5).

<sup>18</sup> For the possible financial squeeze, in which Kheriga may have found himself at the time of his conquest of Xanthos see below the following section.



– as will be shown further below<sup>19</sup> – must be dated to around 361 BC, while completely lacking specimens of the vast coinage in the name of Kherēi from the period between ca. 430 and 410 BC and of most later coinages belonging to successors of the Xanthian dynasty in the Lycian West from the first half of the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC. This leaves two huge lacunae in the contents of the assumed complex which defy any rational explanation. In fact, it appears quite an odd composition for an archaeological deposit, in particular when compared with other, much more homogenous groups such as Silvia Hurters “Tissaphernes-Fund”<sup>20</sup> or even Novella Vismaras “Wekhssere-Hoard” of 1988<sup>21</sup> (once stripped of a number of obvious intrusions). Therefore, the coins introduced by Kagan at the beginning of his article most probably do not belong to one and the same archaeological context.

However, an indisputable merit of the article consists in its publication of another, hitherto unknown satrapal issue from Lycia. This coin enhances our understanding of the conflict between the Persians and Perikle and the ultimate defeat of the latter.

#### THE RACE FOR ATHENIAN SUPPORT AND THE LYCIAN EXPEDITION OF MELESANDROS

During the later years of Kuprllis reign there had been a rather good relationship between the dynasts ruling the western part of the Lycian peninsula and the naval confederation under the hegemony of Athens, whose influence on the Anatolian coast had been constantly growing even before the transfer of the federal treasury from Delos to Athens in 454 BC. Notwithstanding the fact that Lycia was officially still part of the Persian Empire, Telmessos and a number of other Lycian settlements had even begun to pay contributions to the confederate fund on a fairly regular basis,<sup>22</sup> and though such payments are no longer recorded from 442/1 BC onwards, there is no reason to believe that the good relationship between the Athenians and Wekhssere, apparently first the partner and later on the immediate successor of Kuprlli as the ruler of Telmessos and of the towns in the Xanthos-Valley,<sup>23</sup> deteriorated after the end of Kuprlli’s regency. To the contrary: One of the principal coin series in the name of Wekhssere, certainly struck at the Xanthos mint under his sole rule, was a direct adaptation of contemporaneous Athenian coin-types, and this is certainly to be seen as quite an unambiguous political statement (Fig. 16).<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> For an interpretation and date of this issue see the section below on Autophradates and Artuṃpara.

<sup>20</sup> HURTER 1979.

<sup>21</sup> VISMARA 1988.

<sup>22</sup> MERRITT, WADE-GERY and MCGREGOR 1939–1953: I, 25 and 27; II, 81 and 83; III, 334–335 and 447.

<sup>23</sup> MÜSELER 2019b; IDEM 2021: 101–109.

<sup>24</sup> 16. Wekhssere I, Stater, Xanthos. 8.38 g. MÜSELER 2016: V/7.



However, the balance of political power in Western and Central Lycia had significantly changed after the end of Kuprllis regency. Where there had been perhaps not a solid monarchic structure but at least a rather stable temporary alliance between different regions of the Lycian peninsula with their ruling dynastic clans under the hegemony of a dominant leading figure,<sup>25</sup> the various heirs and successors to Kuprllis “realm” soon got in conflict with each other over the division of territories or zones of influence. Among them were the brothers Kheriga and Kherēi, the offspring of a certain Harpagos, whose clan had settled in the area of Phellos and the Kasaba-Valley and who had become the son in law of Kuprlli.<sup>26</sup> Apparently not content with his inherited lot in the Central Lycian highlands, Kheriga, probably the elder of the two brothers, launched an attack against the fertile lower valley of the Xanthos river with the homonymous city, in order to reconquer that stronghold from the elder Wekhssere and his clan who had established themselves there.

The attack brought forward via the mountain fortress of Tymnessos between Phellos and Xanthos appears to have been successful, although the political position of Kherigas remained somewhat precarious since Wekhssere was not completely ousted from the Xanthos-Valley. Instead he took refuge and entrenched himself at Tlos, some distance up the river (Figs. 17–18).<sup>27</sup> Moreover Kherigas’ financial situation must have been rather tight from the very beginning of the whole campaign: There is hardly any other Lycian dynast important enough to have his name set on more than one coin-issue, for whom the percentage of reused and rather hastily worked-over flans is so high in relation to the grand total of all extant coinages in his name. This actually points to a situation of penury.

Evidently Kheriga was in need of support from the outside in order to consolidate his newly conquered position at the Xanthos estuary and apparently the Persians were unwilling or unable to intervene in Lycia at this point. Therefore the obvious choice for Kheriga was to endear himself with the other hegemonial power in the region, Athens with its naval confederation, and to alienate his rival from the Athenians. Kherigas overstruck coin-issues from Xanthos and his introduction of a denominational sequence copied from the coinage of the Athenians<sup>28</sup> bear clear witness to this political agenda. In particular the design of the reverses with the figure of Pallas Athene in full armour seated on a rock and holding a small

<sup>25</sup> MÜSELER 2021: 110 sqq.

<sup>26</sup> See MÜSELER and SCHÜRR 2018: 384–388.

<sup>27</sup> 17. Wekhssere I, Stater, Tlos. 8.24 g. MÜSELER 2016: V/12; 18. Wekhssere I, Stater, Tlos. 8.54 g. Auction Roma XVI, 2018, 314. – For the sequence of events, the conquest of the Xantos valley by Kheriga and by Kherēi in two separate phases, see also MÜSELER 2020.

<sup>28</sup> In the Xantos-Valley the traditional Lycian denominations of stater, third stater and sixth stater got replaced by the Attic system of stater, drachm and hemidrachm by Kheriga. This innovation was kept even after the subsequent falling-out with Athens.

owl on her outstretched left hand, which was without any precedent among Lycian coinages and for which even the work of foreign die-cutters might have been employed,<sup>29</sup> was apparently meant to send a message to the Athenians (Figs. 19–20).<sup>30</sup> It showed that Kheriga was at least as capable and as willing as the previous agent at Xanthos to protect the political concerns of Athens at the outer border of the naval confederation and to act as a sentinel against foreign warships approaching the entrance to the Aegean from the East.<sup>31</sup> It would therefore be in the best interest of Athens to back him as the new ruler.

The Athenians, however, made a different choice and apparently decided to aid Wekhssere in the attempt to regain his previous position. Although the official pretext for the detachment of a small squad of warships with soldiers under the command of Melesandros to Lycia in the spring of 429 BC had been the collecting of outstanding contributions to the treasury of the confederation and the mitigation of piracy along the main trade route between the Aegean and the Levant conducted by “Peloponnesians”,<sup>32</sup> the further course of the events as related in part by Thucydides but mainly by the account on the Xanthos-Stele clearly reveals the real purpose of the whole operation. As Antony Keen has already pointed out, the unit was far too small to have any notable effect in single combat or to be successful in hunting down any pirates.<sup>33</sup> It must rather have been a group of military advisors of some sort, sent out to reinforce an existing army on the spot. The expedition-corps landed on the southern coast of Lycia, met there with local reinforcements and marched inland. But it was intercepted near the Central-Lycian town of Kyaneai by troops under the command of a certain Trbbenimi and annihilated before it could unite with the main-body of Wekhssere’s army.<sup>34</sup> The latter force was subsequently met and defeated at Tlos by an army led by Kherēi, either having already succeeded Kheriga, or acting as a deputy for his brother.<sup>35</sup> This eventually led to the ultimate demise of Wekhssere.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>29</sup> For the possible employment of foreign designers and die-cutters for the project of innovative coin-types at somewhat remote mint-places see now also MÜSELER 2022a.

<sup>30</sup> 19. Kheriga, Stater on reworked flan, Xanthos. 8.25 g. Museum of Fine Arts Boston 2088; 20. Kheriga, Halfstater (Drachm) on reworked flan, Xanthos. 3.63 g. SNG Ashmolean 1183.

<sup>31</sup> Although it may not have been part of an official bilateral agreement between Persia and Athens, there can be hardly any doubt that the Athenians tried to enforce a ban on Persian warships sailing beyond the eastern coast of the Lycian peninsula in the direction of the Aegean basin after 449/448 BC. For this purpose, a certain Lycian cooperation was certainly required. See also KEEN 1998: 118.

<sup>32</sup> Thuc. II.69.1.

<sup>33</sup> KEEN 1998: 129.

<sup>34</sup> Thuc. II.69.2 and TL 44, a 44–46; the Trbbenimi mentioned by the inscription can hardly have been the money-issuing dynast of the early 4<sup>th</sup> century BC, but he might have been a member of the same Limyrean clan, which came to the aid of the Harpagids in fending off the Athenian invasion force.

<sup>35</sup> TL 44, a 46–47.

<sup>36</sup> TL 44, a 48–50.

Kherēis harsh reaction to this “betrayal” of the Athenians can likewise be deduced from his coinage as the sole ruler of the entire Xanthos-Valley (Figs. 21–26).<sup>37</sup> While the helmeted head of Athena (or rather of her Lycian counterpart Malja<sup>38</sup>) is kept as obverse-type, on the reverse of almost all the coins struck at Xanthos, Tlos and Pinara the bust or head of a bearded man wearing the head-dress of a Persian official is depicted. This is most certainly meant to be a portrait of Kherēi, but here the dynast appears no longer in the guise of a Lycian military leader with the Thracian or Corinthian helmet of a στρατηγός like some of his predecessors<sup>39</sup> but is explicitly styled as an exponent of the administrative hierarchy of the Achaemenid empire – a clear statement of his political allegiance.<sup>40</sup> This reverse-type was also adopted by most of the successors to his rule at Xanthos, by Ddenewele, by the younger Wekhssere and by Artuṃpara (Figs. 27–30),<sup>41</sup> who apparently all defined themselves as part of the Persian imperial administration and kept good relations with the Great King and with their immediate superiors, the satraps of Lydia and Caria. Evidently the Athenians never got another chance to interfere with internal affairs of the Lycian peninsula.

#### TISSAPHERNES AND DDENEWELE: AN ATTEMPT TO FEND OFF A SPARTAN-BACKED USURPATION?

Probably sometime during the last decade of the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC Kherēi was succeeded by Ddenewele, who might have commissioned most of the inscriptions on the Xanthos-Stele and who may himself be mentioned in the first few lines of the text at the northern flank of the monument.<sup>42</sup> The sequence of the events following his accession is clearly demonstrated by die-links between a number of different coin-series from the mint of Telmessos: Obverse dies from coins in the name of Ddenewele are first reused for issues of Erbbina and later, after some

<sup>37</sup> 21. Kherēi, Stater, Xanthos. 8.48 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/38; 22. Kherēi, Stater, Xanthos. 8.42 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/25; 23. Kherēi, Halfstater (Drachm), Xanthos. 4.20 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/30; 24. Kherēi, Stater, Tlos. 8.48 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/41; 25. Kherēi, Halfstater (Drachm), Tlos. 4.14 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/42; 26. Kherēi, Stater, Pinara. 8.60 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/48.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. SERANGELI 2015.

<sup>39</sup> See Figs. 3–4. There is also an earlier series in the name of Kuprlli showing the head of a bearded man wearing a Thracian helmet, which has been suspected to be an image of the dynast himself: Cf. MÜSELER 2016: IV/22–23.

<sup>40</sup> The later coins of the seated Athena type in the name of Kherēi and of Artuṃpara (Fig. 12 and Fig. 15) have apparently just been issued to commemorate the historical victory of Kheriga at Xanthos and have no longer any significance for the current political situation.

<sup>41</sup> 27. Ddenewele, Stater, Xanthos. 8.51 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/69; 28. Ddenewele, Stater, Tlos. 8.28 g. Bode Museum Berlin – Münzkabinett 18200165; 29. Wekhssere II (?), Stater, Xanthos. 8.37 g. BM 1877.0508.1; 30. Artuṃpara, Stater, Xanthos (?). 8.15 g. MÜSELER 2016: VIII/29.

<sup>42</sup> It seems remarkable that the account suddenly changes into direct speech making use of the first person singular when the role of the main person as a mediator on behalf of Tissaphernes is related (cf. TL 44 c, 4).

repair, for issues bearing the name Aruwātijesi (Figs. 31–35).<sup>43</sup> It must therefore have been Ddeneuwele and not Kherēi, who was attacked and eventually defeated, when Erbbina had taken the town of Telmessos by force and started to undertake violent raids into the Xanthos-Valley from that position.<sup>44</sup>

But who was Erbbina? The inscriptions left by him at the sanctuary of Letoon between Xanthos and the seashore name him as the son of a certain Kheriga.<sup>45</sup> This ancestor has been taken unscrutinised by most scholars as the previous regent of Xanthos, the brother of Kherēi, since this would lend a certain legitimacy to Erbbinas claim to rule in the Lycian West.<sup>46</sup> On the other hand, Erbbina prides himself in the very same documents as having subdued the cities under his control by military force and coerced their populations into obedience by sheer terror. Any pretender concerned with his own legitimacy and the public acknowledgement of his entitlement to power would at least not openly brag about such a thing.<sup>47</sup> Erbbina, who directly denotes himself as a ruthless tyrant in a religious dedication, is rather to be seen as a usurper coming from outside than as a disinherited member of the Harpagid clan.

Koray Konuk has collected indicators for the assumption that Erbbina had originally invaded northwestern Lycia from the Carian city of Kaunos,<sup>48</sup> a fact already suspected but at the time not sufficiently substantiated by Jean Bousquet.<sup>49</sup> His main piece of evidence, a South Carian stater apparently bearing the Carian legend *'rbn*, is however to be dated considerably earlier and can hardly have had any direct relation to the Lycian affair of the early 4<sup>th</sup> century BC.<sup>50</sup> But still some coins in the name of the usurper Erbbina from Telmessos display Carian characters

<sup>43</sup> 31. Ddeneuwele, Stater, Telmessos. 8.59 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/82; 32. Erbbina, Stater, Telmessos. 8.53 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/89; 33. Aruwātijesi, Stater, Telmessos. 8.23 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/98; 34. Erbbina, Stater, Telmessos. 8.38 g. BN btv1b8534803c; 35. Aruwātijesi, Stater, Telmessos. 7.91 g. BN btv1b85348553.

<sup>44</sup> Kagan's assumption (cf. KAGAN 2021: 30) that Kherēi was deposed rather than peacefully succeeded by Ddeneuwele, necessitating a reconquest of Xanthos for the Harpagids by Kheriga during the last decade of the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC, which is mainly based upon the evidence of his so-called "Unknown satrap hoard" and his erroneous theories regarding flan-development within the coinages of Kheriga, lacks every substantial foundation. See instead MÜSELER 2017.

<sup>45</sup> The inscriptions for Erbbina found at the Letoon actually name a certain "Gergis" as his father. That this must be a Greek version of the Lycian name Kheriga is nothing than a conjecture (cf. BOUSQUET 1975 and BOUSQUET 1992).

<sup>46</sup> According to the longer of the two poems inscribed on the statue-base dedicated to Leto Erbbina was at the time of his successful conquests in the Xanthos-Valley just twenty years old (cf. BOUSQUET 1992: 157, B3). That makes the dynast Kheriga, whose reign (and life?) has probably ended by the early twenties of the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC, not a very likely candidate for the fatherhood of Erbbina!

<sup>47</sup> The shorter of the two Greek poems in praise of Erbbina on the same statue-base contains the remarkable line "πολλοῖσιν Λυκίοισι φόβον παρέχων ἐτυρά[νναι]" (cf. BOUSQUET 1992: 156, A7). Not even the self-appointed leaders of Donezk and Luhansk in Ukraine have characterized themselves in such a cynical way.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. KONUK 2009.

<sup>49</sup> BOUSQUET 1992: 175 sqq and 180 sq.

<sup>50</sup> See MÜSELER 2019b: 361 sq.

in the field hinting at some kind of connection to that region (Figs. 36–37).<sup>51</sup> At least those issues require an appropriate explanation.

Since the final phase of the Peloponnesian war, the city and the port of Kaunos had been within the range of the Spartan war fleet patrolling the eastern waters of the Aegean and beyond. One of the main bases of the Lacedaemonian navy was actually situated on the island of Rhodes, whose ruling oligarchic government had strong ties with Sparta, and lay directly opposite to Kaunos. Though the town and its harbour were under Persian control political influence of the naval forces dominating the sea between the island and the Anatolian coast on Kaunos and its citizens must have been considerable.

Of course, this had not been any problem as long as Sparta and the Persians had been close allies. But soon after the ultimate victory over the Athenians and after the revolt of the younger Cyrus against his half-brother Artaxerxes II (where the Spartans had apparently made a bet on the wrong horse) hostilities broke out between the former allies, who could not reach an agreement about the future status of Greek settlements in Western Anatolia. Repeatedly envoys from Sparta made use of animosities between Greek city-states and the satrapal administration of a coastal province, rivalry between different officials of the Achaemenid empire, or even of political disagreements between various groups of citizens within one *polis* in order to bring the respective communities under Spartan control, before finally sending a large invasion force into Ionia and Lydia under the command of the newly appointed king Agesilaos II in 396 BC to settle the conflict with the Persians once and for all. It would have been completely in line with the earlier strategy of the Lacedaemonians of unhinging and gradually winning over formerly Persian controlled territories by rather indirect means to dispatch a troublemaker to Lycia with the mission of destabilizing and eventually removing the Persian-friendly Harpagid dynasty in the Xanthos-Valley.

One more hint in the same direction might be the rather strange decision of the otherwise fairly able and experienced naval commander Konon in Persian service to set out with not more than a handful of refurbished battle-ships to Kaunos in the summer of 397 BC, long before his future main-force had left the Phoenician and Cypriote shipyards, where he was promptly blocked and locked in for several months by the much larger Lacedaemonian fleet under the command of Pharax.<sup>52</sup> There must have been an emergency at Kaunos, which made the immediate presence and intervention of a however small Persian force necessary, notwithstanding the considerable risk connected with such a step.

<sup>51</sup> 36. Erbbina, Stater with Carian letters, Telmessos. 8.39 g. Auction Leu Winterthur 6, 2020, 232; 37. Third stater (Tetrobol) with Carian letter, Telmessos. 3.19 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/85.

<sup>52</sup> Diod. Sic. XIV, 39, 4; XIV, 79, 4–5; *Hell. Oxy.* 12, 1–3. See also MÜSELER 2018b: 53, sq.

There is no conclusive evidence, of course, for all these events having been interconnected. However, in the end the Persian side obviously came to the aid of the embattled dynast Ddenewele in the person of Tissaphernes, the *karanos* and satrap of Lydia. Whether the assistance lent by Tissaphernes was of military or just of financial nature is not sure. Anyway, the announcement made by the monetary-issue in his name from Xanthos with the image of a Persian official on horseback, which is otherwise directly related to the regular series of Ddenewele, is hardly to be misunderstood (Figs. 38–39).<sup>53</sup> But whatever it was, that Tissaphernes could actually do for Ddenewele – it was either too little or too late or both. Soon the *karanos* himself got under massive pressure from the invading force of Agesilaos II culminating in the defeat of his troops at the Paktolos, whereupon Tissaphernes got accused of treason and then arrested and murdered by the chiliarch Tithraustes under somewhat dubious circumstances.<sup>54</sup> In the Xanthos-Valley Erbbina apparently prevailed – at least for the time being.

How and when exactly (though probably only a short time later after the decisive naval battle off Knidos and the end of the Spartan supremacy in Western Anatolia) it came to the downfall of Erbbina and to his eviction from Telmessos by dynasts from Central-Lycia, Aruwâtijesi and possibly also the younger Wekhssere (Figs. 40–43),<sup>55</sup> as yet remains an open question.

#### ALL THE KINGS MEN: AUTOPHRADATES AND ARTUÑPARA AGAINST PERIKLE

Recent numismatic discoveries have thrown new light on the question of whether Persia had interfered more directly with Lycian affairs between the beginning of the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC and the ultimate integration of the peninsula in the Carian satrapy by Maussollos after 361 BC. Apart from the famous Xanthian stater in the name of Tissaphernes treated in the previous section, it was mainly the appearance of names with an Iranian rather than an indigenous Lycian origin like Mithrapata or Artuñpara on dynastic Lycian coins, which had instigated the speculation that rulers from the traditional dynastic clans of Lycia had been gradually replaced by officers sent in from Persia.<sup>56</sup>

<sup>53</sup> 38. Satrap Tissaphernes, Stater, Xanthos. 8.42 g. SNG Cop. Suppl. 460; 39. Ddenewele, Stater, Xanthos. 8.44 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/70.

<sup>54</sup> For the questions regarding the fall and execution of Tissaphernes see WESTLAKE 1981: 268 sqq.

<sup>55</sup> 40. Wekhssere II, Third stater (Tetrobol), Zagaba. 2.79 g. MÜSELER 2016: VII/2; 41. Wekhssere II, Stater, Tymnessos. 8.40 g. SNG Cop. Suppl. 437; 42. Wekhssere II, Stater, Tlos. 8.52 g. MÜSELER 2016: VII/11; 43. Wekhssere II, Stater, Patara. 8.11 g. MÜSELER 2016: VII/49.

<sup>56</sup> Thus for example CHILDS 1981: 76; BRYCE 1986: 162; ZIMMERMANN 1992: 34; KEEN 1998: 149 sqq; however, KOLB 2018: 118, has approached the matter with some more caution and rather doubted a direct interfering of Persian agents in Lycian affairs before the military campaign of 361 BC.





the riders face there seems to be the Lycian character E.<sup>62</sup> On the reverse there is a seated figure to the left wearing the same Persian headdress and a long himation slung over the right shoulder in a flat rectangular incuse. At its side it is carrying a sheathed sword and it is holding a bow (or a bow and an arrow) in its hands. In the upper left field there seems to be a long, slightly curved object, which might, however, also be the result of a partial die-fissure. The image has got absolutely nothing to do with the semi-nude kneeling-running huntress from the earlier coins from Ançhiale and from Soloi in Cilicia; it is rather a homage of the representation of a seated satrap on the coins in the name of Tarkumuwa / Datames from Tarsos in Cilicia struck during his rebellion against Artaxerxes II.<sup>63</sup> Moreover the attire and the attributes of the seated figure correspond to the representation of the satrap and karanos Autophradates on the west side of the Payawa tomb from Xanthos. All these elements place the coin rather firmly in the mid-sixties of the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC.

Of the reverse-legend, only the presumed beginning and end on the left side of the coin is visible; the small middle part, which must have been placed at the right side behind the seated figure, is completely blurred. The legend probably starts in the upper left corner with what appears to be the Lycian letter F. The larger part in the lower section of the left field below the long object or die-crack reads upwards as  $\Gamma\text{P}\text{P}\Delta\text{F}$ ; the very last letter is somewhat damaged but may well have been a f. The amended legend therefore probably has to be read as W[ATA]PRADA[T]. This rather looks like a Lycian transcription of the Iranian name Autophradates, which is spelled in a similar way in the dating-formula of a Lycian rock-tomb near Sebeda.<sup>64</sup>

In analogy to the earlier issue in the name of Tissaphernes, this coin is probably to be seen as a document of the support extended by the Lydian satrap and karanos Autophradates to an embattled ally or subordinate in Lycia. Given the presumptive date of the issue, the latter can hardly have been anybody else than Artuṃpara. As a Lycian dynast, this agent has always been a somewhat enigmatic figure.<sup>65</sup> Apparently he controlled most of the mints in the Lycian West, Telmessos, Tlos, Xanthos and Patara for quite some time and had a large variety of coins

<sup>62</sup> In analogy to the Xanthian stater of Tissaphernes there should rather be the name of the mint on this side of the coin. However, the few letters still clearly readable do not allow an attribution to any known location. A possibility would be  $\text{P}\text{P}\text{X}\text{X}\text{E}$ , the name of the small settlement Araxa on the upper flow of the Xanthos river, which has in fact become a mint-place late during the dynastic period (cf. for example SNG Cop. Suppl. 490). This could at least explain the presence of the letter E in the upper left field of the obverse.

<sup>63</sup> SNG BN 282–289; these coins should be dated to the mid-sixties of the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC, when Datames was in revolt against Artaxerxes II and had beaten the army under the command of Autophradates sent out against him: see BING 1998, WIESEHÖFER 2003 and MÜSELER 2018b.

<sup>64</sup> TL 61, 2.

<sup>65</sup> See SCHÜRR 2012. For a general treatment of the coinage related to Artuṃpara see VISMARA 2014 and MÜSELER 2019a: 61 sqq.



in his name struck at these places (Figs. 48–51<sup>66</sup> in addition to Fig. 15 and Fig. 30). However, the types of all the series in question are more or less copied from strikings of earlier dynasts from the very same mints, which had partly even been made a rather long time ago. On those derivative issues, elements of different origin, whose meaning was apparently no longer well understood, were occasionally mixed.<sup>67</sup> The main purpose of Artuñpara’s issues seems to have been an emphasis on the embedment of his rule in the Lycian tradition, which might not have exactly matched the factual situation.

None of the Lycian inscriptions mentioning Artuñpara denote this ruler with the traditional title *khñtawati*, which is regularly conceded to his direct rival Perikle and once even to the satrap Autophradates after his ultimate victory over the dynast from Limyra.<sup>68</sup> Instead, the military title *telēzi* is used in connection with Artuñpara’s name.<sup>69</sup> Moreover, Lycia was apparently not the only field of activity for the *telēzi*: The central piece of evidence is a coin from Side in Pamphylia, which has once been part of the von Aulock Collection but is at present in Copenhagen and can roughly be dated to the seventies of the 4<sup>th</sup> century (Fig. 52).<sup>70</sup> With its weight of 3.78 g it corresponds to a tetrobol of the Persian standard used in Pamphylia. On the obverse there is a standing statue of Athena to the left with a small figure of Nike on the extended right arm and a pomegranate in the left field like on all contemporaneous staters in the name of this Pamphylian port-town. But on the reverse there is the head of a bearded man to the right set in a deep circular incuse and wearing a helmet of Korinthish style. The legend in the field is not Pamphylian but Lycian and reads [ΠΤ]ΟΧΥΡΡ. Whatever the reason for this most unusual issue was and whatever place in the career of Artuñpara should be assigned to

<sup>66</sup> 48. Artuñpara, Stater, Telmessos. 8.45 g. SNG Cop. Suppl. 458; 49. Artuñpara, Stater, Tlos. 8.11 g. MÜSELER 2016: VIII, 31; 50. Artuñpara, Stater, uncertain mint (Xanthos?). 8.31 g. SNG Cop. Suppl. 457; 51. Artuñpara, Stater, Patara or Kadyanda. 8.15 g. BM 1897,0104.297

<sup>67</sup> Artuñpara has made repeatedly use of pictorial elements and of linear symbols on his coins, that were copied from issues of highly respected predecessors but that had obviously lost their previous significance: He employs for instance the *diskeles*, emblem of the indigenous Wakhssa-Clan, not only on his strikings at Telmessos (cf. Fig. 48) but even on his series from Xanthos commemorating the victory of Kheriga over this very dynasty (cf. Fig. 15). A similar anachronism may be at the root of the strange addition of the Lycian letter Ψ, once used on coins from Phellos to make issues of Kheriga discernible from the ones of his predecessor Tethtuweibi, on a coin from Pinara without mention of any personal name. The coin has been attributed to Kherēi by KONUK 2017 although it clearly belongs to the later 4<sup>th</sup> century BC; it may well have been struck by Artuñpara.

<sup>68</sup> The inscription on the rock-tomb at Sebeda TL 61. already quoted in note 48 above, makes use of the name of Autophradates in connection with the traditional dating formula *ēnē khñtawata* ... normally related to the reign of indigenous dynasts.

<sup>69</sup> NEUMANN 2007: 345; SCHÜRR 2012: 36 sqq.

<sup>70</sup> 52. Artuñpara, Third stater (Tetrobol) of Pamphylian standard, Side. 3.78 g. SNG Cop. Suppl. 459. For the first publication and interpretation of this remarkable issue see ATLAN 1958 and 1967.

it<sup>71</sup> – the striking of coins by a provincial governor beyond his proper area cannot have happened without the consent if not the direct promotion by higher ranks of the Achaemenid administration. The coin is pointing therefore in the same direction as the newly discovered Lycian stater of Autophradates. There was evidently a connection between the satrapal government and the *telēzi* Artuṃpara, that was far more complex and had more political implications than the normal relationship between an average dynastic ruler from Lycia and the satrap or karanos in charge.

Despite all of his efforts, Artuṃpara was ultimately defeated and probably killed by the advancing dynast Perikle, as described and illustrated by the inscription and the relief above the entrance to the rock-tomb of Tebursseli in Limyra.<sup>72</sup> This prompted the decision of Autophradates and Maussollos to intervene in Lycia with the full power of their own armies and to destroy the forces of Perikle once and for all. But also after his death Artuṃpara was held in high esteem by the people in the Xanthos-Valley, and Autophradates, who – after the final defeat of Perikle – took over the direct administration of Lycia himself for a certain timespan, granted special honours to the surviving followers of the *telēzi* and had a special burial-compound for Artuṃpara and his officers reserved on the acropolis of Xanthos.<sup>73</sup>

The new discoveries actually add to the arguments in favour of a hypothesis which was rejected by the present author for a lack of material evidence in his 2016 book:<sup>74</sup> The assumption that the Persians had begun, presumably around the beginning of the seventies of the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC, to send special appointees into Lycia with the commission of gradually replacing the system of dynastic rule based upon the traditional tribal organization of Lycian society, which had led to so much unrest and civil strife in the recent past, with a number of loyal deputies directly accountable towards the satrapal administration at Sardeis. Perhaps the previous position of the author regarding this question has to be revised.

---

<sup>71</sup> However, that Artuṃpara was first expelled from the Xanthos-Valley by Perikle and fled to Side in order to gather new mercenary troops in Pamphylia to accompany him on his return to Lycia, where he was ultimately defeated and killed, is only one of the possible solutions.

<sup>72</sup> SCHÜRR 2012: 19 sqq quoting BORCHARDT 1993 and TL 104 b, 4.

<sup>73</sup> TL 40 b as discussed by SCHÜRR 2012: 26 sqq.

<sup>74</sup> MÜSELER 2016: 66.

## APPENDIX: AN AUXILIARY MISSION OF LYCIAN TROOPS IN THE MAEANDER-VALLEY

Early in 2022 a new specimen of an extremely rare and presumably early issue in the name of Kherēi appeared on the international market (Fig. 53).<sup>75</sup> Before this, only two staters and one tetrobol of this particular series had been known at all (Figs. 54–55<sup>76</sup> in addition to Fig. 5). The obverses of the coins show the head of a young woman with a rather elaborate hairdo adorned with pearled bands and a flower turned to the left; on the reverse there is an owl standing to the left with the head turned in a frontal position set in a deep incuse square. In the left field of the square there is the legend [V]↑PΥE to be read upwards and in the right field the legend F↑+IT to be read in the opposite direction.<sup>77</sup> According to the legend, the coins had been struck at the mint of Phellos; they are directly related to earlier issues from the same place in the names of Teththiweibi and of Kheriga, which are likewise extremely rare (Fig. 6 and Fig. 1).

The coins of the respective series in the name of Kherēi, which had been known up to that point, were all aligned to the heavy eastern weight standard of Lycia, which was still used by the mint at Phellos, when a lighter standard had already been introduced in the area.<sup>78</sup> But the new coin, which contrary to the remark of the cataloguer was not necessarily struck from the same obverse-die as the other staters of the series,<sup>79</sup> has a weight of 7.46 g or approximately 2 g lighter than the normal pieces from Phellos but it also undercuts the weight of all other issues of Kherēi by almost 1 g. Such a huge difference can hardly have been due to simple wear or to an accidental error of the mint.

The most outstanding feature of the new coin, however, consists in the fact that it is countermarked, which is highly unusual for any coin of the dynastic period from Lycia. In the centre of the obverse, precisely on the cheek of the female head, there is a rectangular countermark with an uncertain design. The cataloguer has simply described it as a “geometrical pattern”, but upon closer inspection the central design appears similar to the body and the legs of an insect placed between

<sup>75</sup> 53. Kherēi, Stater of Ionian standard (?) with countermark, Phellos or uncertain mint. 7.46 g. Auction Triton XXV, 2022, 283. This coin has been noted and commented by MÜSELER 2022b: 4 sq as well.

<sup>76</sup> 54. Kherēi, Stater of bulky fabric, Phellos. 9.47 g. Winsemann-Falghera 167; 55. Kherēi, Third stater (Tetrobol) of bulky fabric, Phellos. 3.22 g. Auction NAC 116, 2019, 196.

<sup>77</sup> The monogram in the field before the owl has only been added on the stater of the Winsemann-Falghera collection and on the tetrobol.

<sup>78</sup> Already under Teththiweibi and Kheriga the coins struck in Kandyba had been aligned to a considerably lighter standard than the ones from nearby Phellos. See MÜSELER 2016: 14 sqq.

<sup>79</sup> The present author does not feel able to endorse this assertion of the cataloguer without a closer inspection of the coin in question.

two round objects. It could actually be seen as a somewhat sketchy version of a bee in top-view placed between two spirals, known from Ephesian didrachms circulating in the Maeander-Valley around the mid-5<sup>th</sup> century BC.<sup>80</sup> The average weight of those coins was quite precisely 7.4 g. In theory the countermarked piece, though of Lycian type and origin, could easily have been utilized for payment at any market in the Maeander-Valley without requiring complicated conversions by local money-changers.

The Lycian text on the southern side of the Xanthos-Stele reports a military operation led by the Persian commander Amorges near Mount Thorax at the upper reaches of the Maeander in the list of achievements of Kherēi, thereby implying the participation of Lycian troops in the campaign.<sup>81</sup> This has probably been the rebuff of an Athenian invasion force under the command of Lysikles into the Carian hinterland in 428 BC, immediately following the attack on Lycia led by Mellesandros one year earlier.<sup>82</sup> The epigraphical arguments for the identification of this event with the respective passage of the inscription have been laid out in detail by Diether Schürr und by Peter Thonemann and need not therefore be repeated here.<sup>83</sup> But if the assumption is correct that auxiliary forces of Lycian origin had participated in the battle of Mount Thorax, the coin under discussion may actually be understood as a document of this fact. The countermark could either have been applied in the Maeander-Valley to demonstrate the acceptance of the coin as legal tender in the local markets, or already at the original mint in order to mark the difference between the lighter versions made for use abroad and the much heavier specimens dedicated for circulation within Lycia.

This is, however, not more than a hypothesis (and as such even quite a daring one). Hopefully further discoveries made in the future can throw more light on the character and function of this strange issue.

## ABBREVIATIONS

BM = British Museum, Dept. of Coins and Medals.

BN = Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Cabinet des Médailles.

SNG Ashmolean = R. ASHTON and S. IRELAND (eds), *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum Britain*, vol. V: *Ashmolean Museum Oxford, Part XI, Asia Minor; Caria to Commagene (except Cyprus)*, Oxford 2013.

---

<sup>80</sup> See KARWIESE 2019: 28 sqq. Since the present author has not been able to inspect the coin and its countermark directly but had to rely on the photograph of the catalogue, his interpretation of the design in question is rather to be seen as an educated guess.

<sup>81</sup> TL 44 a, 50–55.

<sup>82</sup> Thuc. III, 19, 1–2.

<sup>83</sup> SCHÜRR 1998: 151–155; THONEMANN 2012: 174 sqq.

- SNG BN = E. LEVANTE (ed.), *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum France 2, Cabinet des Médailles, Cilicie*, Paris–Zürich 1993.
- SNG Cop. Suppl. = S. SCHULTZ and J. ZAHLE (eds), *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum Danmark, The Royal Collection of Coins and Medals, Danish National Museum, Supplement Acquisitions 1942–1996*, Copenhagen 2002.
- TL = E. KALINKA, *Tituli Asiae Minoris*, vol. I: *Tituli Lyciae*, Wien 1901.
- Winsemann-Falghera = N. VISMARA, *Monetazione arcaica della Lycia II, La collezione Winsemann-Falghera*, Milano 1989.

## REFERENCES

- ADIEGO, I. “A new Lycian ruler”. In *The Luwic dialects of the Anatolian Group, Proceedings of the 7<sup>th</sup> Luwic workshop*, Santiago de Compostela 2022 (forthcoming).
- ATLAN, S. 1958. “Eine in Side geprägte lykische Münze”, *Anatolia* 3: 89–95. DOI: 10.1501/andl\_0000000040
- ATLAN, S. 1967. *Untersuchungen über die Sidetischen Münzen des V. und IV. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Ankara.
- BING, J.D. 1998. “Datames and Mazaeus: The Iconography of Revolt and Restoration in Cilicia”, *Historia* 47 (1): 41–76.
- BORCHHARDT, J. 1993. *Die Steine von Zēmuri – Archäologische Forschungen an den verborgenen Wassern von Limyra*, Wien.
- BOUSQUET, J. 1975. “Arbinas, fils de Gergis, dynaste de Xanthos”, *Comptes rendus des séances de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 119 (1): 138–148. DOI: 10.3406/crai.1975.13101
- BOUSQUET, J. 1992. “Les inscriptions du Létôon en l’honneur d’Arbinas, et l’épigramme grecque de la stèle de Xanthos”. In H. METZGER (ed.), *Fouilles de Xanthos*, vol. IX: *La région Nord du Létôon – les sculptures – les inscriptions gréco-lyciennes*, Paris: 155–199.
- BRYCE, T. 1986. *The Lycians I: The Lycians in Literary and Epigraphic Sources*, Copenhagen.
- CHILDS, W. 1981. “Lycian Relations with Persians and Greeks in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries Re-Examined”, *Anatolian Studies* 31: 55–80. DOI: 10.2307/3642758
- HURTER, S. 1979. “Der Tissaphernes-Fund”. In O. MØRKHOLM and N. WAGGONER (eds), *Greek Numismatics and Archaeology. Essays Presented to Margaret Thompson*, Wetteren: 97–108.
- KAGAN, J. 2021. “Return to Xanthos: New Numismatic Light on the Harpagid Dynasty of Western Lycia”. In A. MEADOWS and U. WARTENBERG (eds), *Presbeus: Studies in Ancient Coinage Presented to Richard Ashton*, New York: 25–64.
- KARWIESE, S. 2019. *Die Münzprägung von Ephesos 2: Prägeserien 7 bis 11 (5.–4. Jh. v. Chr.)*, Wien.
- KEEN, A.G. 1998. *Dynastic Lycia: A Political History of the Lycians and Their Relations with Foreign Powers, c. 544–362 BC*, Leiden. DOI: 10.1163/9789004351523
- KOLB, F. 2018. *Lykien – Geschichte einer antiken Landschaft*, Darmstadt.
- KONUİK, K. 2009. “Erbbina in Caria?”. In O. TEKIN (ed.), *Ancient History, Numismatics and Epigraphy in the Mediterranean World. Studies in Memory of Clemens E. Bosch and Sabahat Atlan and in Honour of Nezahat Baydur*, Istanbul: 193–199.
- KONUİK, K. 2016. “On Some New Lycian Coin Types”, *Philia* 2: 20–27.
- KONUİK, K. 2017. “A New Lycian Coin Type of Pinara”, *Philia* 3: 97–98.
- KRAAY, C.M. 1962. “The Celenderis Hoard”, *The Numismatic Chronicle* 2: 1–15, Pl. I–II.
- MERRITT, B., WADE-GERY, H.T. and MCGREGOR, M.F. 1939–1953. *The Athenian Tribute Lists I–III*, Cambridge, MA.
- MÜSELER, W. 2016. *Lykische Münzen in europäischen Privatsammlungen*, Istanbul.

- MÜSELER, W. 2017. “Ddeneuwele. Der vergessene Dynast vom Xanthos-Tal und das Nereiden-Monument”, *Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte* 67: 13–30.
- MÜSELER, W. 2018a. “Beyond the Xanthos-Valley: Rulers and Mints in Eastern and Central Lycia at the Time of the ‘Dynasty of Xanthos’”, *Gephyra* 15: 11–27. DOI: 10.37095/gephyra.337919
- MÜSELER, W. 2018b. “Das Geld der Strategen – Pharnabazos und die Finanzen der persischen Kriegsflotte”, *Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte* 68: 47–129.
- MÜSELER, W. 2019a. “Opponents and Successors of the Xanthian Dynasty in Western Lycia: The Weϣssere Questions Reconsidered”, *Gephyra* 17: 29–81.
- MÜSELER, W. 2019b. “Beyond the Xanthos-Valley II – Lycian Rulers at Telmessos and in the Carian Borderland around the Middle of the 5th Century BC”. In: M. NOLLÉ, P. ROTHENHÖFER, G. SCHMIED-KOWARZIK, H. SCHWARZ and H.CH. von MOSCH (eds), *Pangeyrikoï logoi. Festschrift für Johannes Nollé zum 65. Geburtstag*, Bonn: 361–370.
- MÜSELER, W. 2020. “Kheriga and Kherëi in Central-Lycia and in the Xanthos-Valley: The rise of a migrant dynasty”, *Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau* 98: 57–90. DOI: 10.5169/seals-919540
- MÜSELER, W. 2021. “Der Dynast Kuprlli und seine Zeitgenossen: Rivalität und Kooperation im subachaemenidischen Lykien – Prolegomena zu einem künftigen Corpus der lykischen Münzen des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.”, *Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte* 71: 25–116.
- MÜSELER, W. 2022a. “Geteilte Bilderwelten: Kopierte Motive, wandernde Stempelschneider oder zentrale Prägestätten – Vier Fallstudien”, *Schweizer Münzblätter* 72: 51–71.
- MÜSELER, W. 2022b. “Numismatic News from Lycia”, *Gephyra* 24: 133–142. DOI: 10.37095/gephyra.1202007
- MÜSELER, W. and SCHÜRR, D. 2018. “Zur Chronologie in den Inschriften auf dem Agora-Pfeiler von Xanthos (TL 44), den betroffenen Dynasten und ihren Münzen”, *Klio* 100 (2): 381–406. DOI: 10.1515/klio-2018-0101
- NEUMANN, G. 2007. *Glossar des Lykischen*, ed. J. TISCHLER, Wiesbaden.
- SCHÜRR, D. 1998. “Kaunos in lykischen Inschriften”, *Kadmos* 37 (1–2): 143–162. DOI: 10.1515/kadm.1998.37.1-2.143
- SCHÜRR, D. 2012. “Der lykische Dynast Arttumbara und seine Anhänger”, *Klio* 94 (1): 18–44. DOI: 10.1524/klio.2012.0002
- SCHÜRR, D. 2018. “Weϣssere und so weiter: Vom zögerlichen Auftauchen einer lykischen Dynastie”, *Philia* 4: 96–102.
- SERANGELI, M. 2015. “Heth. *Maliya*, lyk. *Maliya* und griech. *Athena*”. In: Z. and M. ZINKO (eds), *Der antike Mensch im Spannungsfeld zwischen Ritual und Magie*, 1: *Grazer Symposium zur indogermanischen Altertumskunde*, Graz: 376–388.
- SPIER, J. 1991. “Review of N. Vismara, *Monetazione arcaica della Lycia I, Il dinasta Wekhssere I*, (Glaux, Collana di Studi e Ricerche di Numismatica 2), 1989 Milan and N. Vismara, *Monetazione arcaica della Lycia II, La collezione Winsemann-Falghera*, (Glaux, Collana di Studi e Ricerche di Numismatica 3), 1989 Milan”, *The Numismatic Chronicle* 151: 232–237.
- THONEMANN, P. 2009. “Lycia, Athens and Amorges”. In: J. MA, N. PAPA ZARKADAS and R. PARKER (eds), *Interpreting the Athenian Empire*, London: 167–194. DOI: 10.5040/9781472540751.ch-007
- VISMARA, N. 1988. “Un ripostiglio di monete della Lycia di recente acquisizione privata”, *Rassegna di Studi del Civico Museo Archeologico e del Civico Gabinetto Numismatico di Milano* 41–42: 1–7.
- VISMARA, N. 1989. *Monetazione arcaica della Lycia I, Il dinasta Wekhssere I*, Milano.
- VISMARA, N. 2014. “Status quaestionis su Artumpara dal punto di vista della Numismatica”. In: A. LEMAIRE (ed.), *Phéniciens d’orient et d’occident. Mélanges Josette Elayi*, Paris: 205–224.
- WESTLAKE, H.D. 1981. “Decline and Fall of Tissaphernes”, *Historia* 30 (3): 257–279.

WIESEHÖFER, J. 2003. “Tarkumuwa und das Farnah”. In. W.F.M. HENKELMAN and A. KUHRT (eds), *A Persian Perspective – Essays in memory of Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg*, Leiden: 173–187.

ZIMMERMANN, M. 1992. *Untersuchungen zur historischen Landeskunde Zentrallykiens*, Bonn.

Author’s address:

Wilhelm Müseler  
83 Wettsteinallee  
4058 Basel, Switzerland  
wilhelmmueseler@gmail.com

- 
- PLATE 1
- Fig. 1. Kheriga, Stater of bulky fabric, Phellos. 9.75 g. MÜSELER 2016: V/44  
Fig. 2. Kheriga Stater of bulky fabric, Kandyba. 8.42 g. MÜSELER 2016: V/47  
Fig. 3. Kheriga, Stater of bulky fabric, Tymnessos. 8.48 g. SNG Cop. Suppl. 441  
Fig. 4. Kheriga, Stater of bulky fabric, Tymnessos. 8.12 g. SNG Cop. Suppl. 442  
Fig. 5. Kherēi, Stater of bulky fabric, Phellos. 9.58 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/1  
Fig. 6. Teththiweibi, Stater of bulky fabric, Phellos. 9.65 g. BM 1934,0611.3  
Fig. 7. Teththiweibi, Stater of bulky fabric, Kandyba. 8.21 g. SNG Cop. Suppl. 427  
Fig. 8. Kheriga, Stater on reworked flan, Phellos. 9.51 g. SNG Cop. Suppl. 440
- PLATE 2
- Fig. 9. Kheriga, Stater on reworked flan, Kandyba. 8.31 g. SNG Cop. Suppl. 443  
Fig. 10. Kheriga, Stater on reworked flan, Xanthos. 8.55 g. KAGAN 2021: 27, 9  
Fig. 11. Kheriga, Stater on reworked flan, Xanthos. 8.17 g. MÜSELER 2016: V/50  
Fig. 12. Kherēi, Stater of flat fabric, Xanthos. 8.62 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/5  
Fig. 13. Hñtruma, Stater of flat fabric, Kadyanda. 8.44 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/99  
Fig. 14. Erbbina, Stater of flat fabric, Telmessos. 8.25 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/83  
Fig. 15. Artuñpara, Stater of flat fabric, Xanthos. 8.07 g. MÜSELER 2016: VIII/28  
Fig. 16. Wekhssere I, Stater, Xanthos. 8.38 g. MÜSELER 2016: V/7
- PLATE 3
- Fig. 17. Wekhssere I, Stater, Tlos. 8.24 g. MÜSELER 2016: V/12  
Fig. 18. Wekhssere I, Stater, Tlos. 8.54 g. Auction Roma XVI, 2018, 314  
Fig. 19. Kheriga, Stater on reworked flan, Xanthos. 8.25 g. Museum of Fine Arts Boston 2088  
Fig. 20. Kheriga, Halfstater (Drachm) on reworked flan, Xanthos. 3.63 g. SNG Ashmolean 1183  
Fig. 21. Kherēi, Stater, Xanthos. 8.48 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/38  
Fig. 22. Kherēi, Stater, Xanthos. 8.42 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/25  
Fig. 23. Kherēi, Halfstater (Drachm), Xanthos. 4.20 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/30  
Fig. 24. Kherēi, Stater, Tlos. 8.48 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/41  
Fig. 25. Kherēi, Halfstater (Drachm), Tlos. 4.14 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/42  
Fig. 26. Kherēi, Stater, Pinara. 8.60 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/48
- PLATE 4
- Fig. 27. Ddenewele, Stater, Xanthos. 8.51 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/69  
Fig. 28. Ddenewele, Stater, Tlos. 8.28 g. Bode Museum Berlin – Münzkabinett 18200165  
Fig. 29. Wekhssere II (?), Stater, Xanthos. 8.37 g. BM 1877,0508.1  
Fig. 30. Artuñpara, Stater, Xanthos (?). 8.15 g. MÜSELER 2016: VIII/29  
Fig. 31. Ddenewele, Stater, Telmessos. 8.59 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/82  
Fig. 32. Erbbina, Stater, Telmessos. 8.53 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/89  
Fig. 33. Aruwatjesi, Stater, Telmessos. 8.23 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/98  
Fig. 34. Erbbina, Stater, Telmessos. 8.38 g. BN btv1b8534803c  
Fig. 35. Aruwatjesi, Stater, Telmessos. 7.91 g. BN btv1b85348553  
Fig. 36. Erbbina, Stater, Telmessos. 8.39 g. Auction Leu Winterthur 6, 2020, 232  
Fig. 37. Erbbina, Third stater (Tetrobol), Telmessos. 3.19 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/85



---

PLATE 5

- Fig. 38. Satrap Tissaphernes, Stater, Xanthos. 8.42 g. SNG Cop. Suppl. 460  
Fig. 39. Ddenewele, Stater, Xanthos. 8.44 g. MÜSELER 2016: VI/70  
Fig. 40. Wekhssere II, Third stater (Tetrobol), Zagaba. 2.79 g. MÜSELER 2016: VII/2  
Fig. 41. Wekhssere II, Stater, Tymnessos. 8.40 g. SNG Cop. Suppl. 437  
Fig. 42. Wekhssere II, Stater, Tlos. 8.52 g. MÜSELER 2016: VII/11  
Fig. 43. Wekhssere II, Stater, Patara. 8.11 g. MÜSELER 2016: VII/49  
Fig. 44. Ddeñtimi, Stater, Tlos. 8.12 g. SNG Cop. Suppl. 464  
Fig. 45. Wekhssere II, Stater (Diskelophoros), Xanthos. 8.17 g. MÜSELER 2016: VII/31  
Fig. 46. Arssama, Eighth stater (Trihemiobol), Xanthos. 0.86 g. MÜSELER 2016: VII/35  
Fig. 47. Satrap Autophradates, Stater, uncertain mint in the Xanthos-Valley (Araxa?).  
8.39 g. KAGAN 2021: 28, 13

PLATE 6

- Fig. 48. Artuñpara, Stater, Telmessos. 8.40 g. SNG Cop. Suppl. 458  
Fig. 49. Artuñpara, Stater, Tlos. 8.11 g. MÜSELER 2016: VIII, 31  
Fig. 50. Artuñpara, Stater, uncertain mint (Xanthos?). 8.31 g. SNG Cop. Suppl. 457  
Fig. 51. Artuñpara, Stater, Patara or Kadyanda. 8.15 g. BM 1897,0104.297  
Fig. 52. Artuñpara, Third stater (Tetrobol) of Pamphylian standard, Side. 3.78 g.  
SNG Cop. Suppl. 459  
Fig. 53. Kherēi, Stater of Ionian standard (?) with countermark, Phellos (or uncertain  
mint). 7.46 g. Auction Triton XXV, 2022, 283  
Fig. 54. Kherēi, Stater of bulky fabric, Phellos. 9.47 g. Winsemann-Falghera 167  
Fig. 55. Kherēi, Third stater (Tetrobol), Phellos. 3.22 g. Auction NAC 116, 2019, 196



1



2



3



4



5



6



7



8







17



18



19



20



21



22



23



24



25



26





27



28



29



30



31



32



33



34



35



36



37





38



39



40



41



42



43



44



45



46



47





48



49



50



51



52



53



54



55



