

Ex nummis lux

STUDIES IN ANCIENT NUMISMATICS

IN HONOUR OF

DIMITAR DRAGANOV



EDITED BY
DILYANA BOTEVA

Bobokov Bros.  *Foundation*



All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of the Bobokov Bros. Foundation.

Printed in Bulgaria

© 2017

Bobokov Bros. Foundation

73 Borisova Street

7000 Ruse

Bulgaria

© Dilyana Boteva, editor

© Authors

© Grigor Draganov, pre-press processing and cover design

ISBN: 978-954-9460-07-0

Ex nummis lux

STUDIES IN ANCIENT NUMISMATICS
IN HONOUR OF DIMITAR DRAGANOV



EDITED BY

DILYANA BOTEVA

Bobokov Bros.  *Foundation*

Sofia
2017

CONTENTS

PREFACE	9
Ursula Kampmann For my Bulgarian friend Dimitar Draganov	11
	
Olivier Picard Thasos et les Thraces: Une vue d'ensemble	17
Valentina Grigorova-Gencheva, Ilya Prokopov New hoards with small denomination coins of the island of Thasos (6th – 5th century BC): Context, interpretation and dating	29
Gabriel Talmaçchi About the chronology of monetary signs based on the last results of the Dobrudjan archaeological researches	49
Evgeni Paunov The tetradrachm coinage of Apollonia Pontica: Iconography, issues and magistrates	59
Hristina Ivanova Three deposits of Apollonian silver and their historical embedment	89
Boryana Ruseva The Seleucid bronze coins from “emporion Pistiros”	105
Metodi Manov The earliest bronze coins of the king Kavaros	113
Mariusz Mielczarek Leucon II, king of Bosphorus, Polyaeus and pseudo-Aristoteles	123
Emanuel Petac, Aurel Vîlcu “Tomis” or Asia Minor? About the Alexander the Great type tetradrachms Price 1211-1213	129
Greg Terzian Black Sea tetradrachms with grape bunch symbol: A supplement to Price	139
François de Callataÿ Overstrikes of late Mesambrian Alexanders: The great unbalance of their distribution and what they tell us about the logic behind	145
Igor Lazarenko Lead weights of Lysimacheia from Southeastern Bulgaria	163

CONTENTS

Aurel Vîlcu, Eugen Nicolae Nouvelles données sur la pénétration des monnaies grecques en Bessarabie aux IV^e-I^e siècles av. J.-C.	169
Constantin Marinescu The Lysimachi coinage of Cius, Bithynia	177
Dinçer Savaş Lenger Not Thymbra in Troad but Thyessos in Lydia	221
Petar Delev Cotys son of Seuthes	229
Rodolfo Martini Countermarks with “god standing” and “spiked helmet” types struck in Sicily on Rome-minted Augustan sesterces from the Moesia-Thrace region: New evidence of legionary movements in Julian-Claudian times	235
Dario Calomino The coinage of Dionysopolis and the system of coin production in Moesia Inferior at the end of the Severan age	261
Kevin Butcher Arbitrary standards on the so-called four-and-a-half assaria coins of Tomis, and value marks on coins of Moesia and Thrace	273
Michel Amandry Térée et Procné représentés sur le monnayage de Bizye ?	291
Yannis Stoyas Where swallows fear to tread: Kapaneus <i>teichomaches</i> on coins of Bizye	299
Lily Grozdanova “Caracalla or Elagabalus ?” again – the case of Pautalia	313
Ulrike Peter Der Senatskaiser Pupienus in Thrakien ? Zu einem Medaillon aus Perinth	319
Dilyana Boteva Gordian III and Philip II on coin obverses with two face-to-face busts depicting Sarapis / Theos Megas	327
Alessandro Cavagna Le monete Provincia Dacia del III anno	339
Cristian Găzduc Memoria sociale e statuto. Monete romane in tombe medievale del necropoli da Noşlac, Romania	349

CONTENTS

Radu Ardevan A preliminary presentation of the late Roman coin hoard of Radimna (4th century AD)	359
David Macdonald Ancient weight alterations of silver and gold coins	369
Holger Komnick Anmerkungen zur Goldquinarprägung der valerianischen Zeit	379
Wolfgang Leschhorn Die Beamtennamen auf den Münzen Thrakiens in vorrömischer Zeit	395
Karsten Dahmen King in a small world: Depictions of Alexander the Great on his shields and armour	413
Julia Tzvetkova Jewellery on Greek coins from Thrace	421
Maria Cristina Molinari, Valentino Piva A collection of coins from the Northern Black Sea in the Capitoline Coin Cabinet	427
Sergei Kovalenko Vasilii Rozanov's collection of ancient coins	441
Elena Stolyarik Historiography of the ancient Scythian kingdom of Scythia Minor	449
Yannis Hourmouziadis Crimean Peninsula and the Cimmerian Bosphorus: 2500 years of history and numismatics	455
	
Selected bibliography of the writings of Prof. Dr. Dimitar Draganov	469
Authors	477



Dimitar Draganov, born 3.12.1952

PREFACE

This volume is dedicated to the 65th anniversary of Professor Dr. Dimitar Draganov, the eminent Bulgarian numismatist, who is currently the director of the Numismatic Museum – Ruse (Bulgaria).

Professor Dimitar Draganov has been working devotedly in the field of ancient numismatics during his entire scientific career. His books

- *The Coinage of Cabyle* (Sofia 1993, in Bulgarian with detailed summary in English);
- *The Coins of the Macedonian Kings, Part I: From Alexander I to Alexander the Great* (Jambol 2000, in Bulgarian);
- *The Coins of the Macedonian Kings, Part II: From Philip Arrhidaeus to Perseus* (Jambol 2001, in Bulgarian);
- *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, Bulgaria, Ruse, Bobokov Bros. Collection, Thrace & Moesia Inferior, Volume 1: Deultum* (Sofia 2005);
- *The Coinage of Deultum* (Sofia 2007)
(Bulgarian version: Монетосеченето на Деултум. София, 2006);
- *The Coinage of the Scythian Kings in the West Pontic Area* (Sofia 2015);
- *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, Bulgaria. Numismatic Museum Ruse Collection. Thrace & Moesia Inferior, Vol. 2: Apollonia Pontica* (Sofia, 2017),

and numerous articles have contributed enormously to the modern knowledge of ancient coins and their testimony of the respective history, covering a large chronological timespan between 6th century BC and 4th century AD. He is Honorary fellow of the Romanian Numismatic Society – Bucharest (since 2011) and a fellow of the Royal Numismatic Society – London (since 1991).

Special acknowledgements are due to all the contributors for their ready collaboration during the entire undertaking and for the patient support despite their own busy schedule.

Our greatest gratitude is however to the Jubilee himself, for both being the inspiration for the volume and for the irreplaceable practical help and advice.

The common wish, of the contributors and editor, is to present this *miscellanea numismatica* to the scholar and friend Dimitar Draganov, offering to the public new material and further ideas.

Sofia
Summer 2017

Dilyana Boteva

DARIO CALOMINO

THE COINAGE OF DIONYSOPOLIS AND THE SYSTEM OF COIN PRODUCTION IN MOESIA INFERIOR AT THE END OF THE SEVERAN AGE

Among the different aspects of the study of ancient numismatics to which Dimitar Draganov has greatly contributed during his academic career, which is being celebrated in this volume, the analysis of the Roman provincial coinages in the Balkan regions is the one that has more directly influenced my research and understanding of this topic, as well as of many other scholars who have investigated this particular category of coins in the last decades. With his work on the Thracian mint of Deultum,¹ Draganov has enriched the long-standing tradition of studies in this field initiated by other eminent numismatists of the past, like Moushmov, Ruzicka and Jurukova.² Alongside the series of volumes published by Schönert-Geiss in the second half of the last century, these publications have covered the coinage of almost all the provincial cities of Thrace,³ providing an invaluable resource for understanding the monetary and socio-cultural history of this region. Yet the majority of the civic coinages produced in the adjacent Roman province of Moesia Inferior, which also stretched largely across the territories of modern Bulgaria and Romania, still await a rigorous academic study. The lack of coverage for this crucial area of the Balkans is a major gap in our knowledge of provincial coinages. In the absence of new monographic studies on the individual cities of this region, this gap can be only partially filled by the catalogues of *Roman Provincial Coinage* currently in progress (also available as online databases),⁴ which cover the period of most intensive coin production in the province, from the Antonine age to the second half of the 3rd century AD.

As my work on forthcoming *Roman Provincial Coinage* VI (from Elagabalus to Maximinus Thrax, AD 218-238) is now well-advanced, I will draw upon my catalogue to discuss some aspects of the coinage of the Moesian cities in the 3rd century AD as my personal contribution to the volume in honour of Professor Draganov. I shall focus in particular on the cities of the Black Sea region during the reign of Severus Alexander (AD 222-235), and especially on the coinage of Dionysopolis, to which Draganov himself devoted a small study exactly twenty years ago.⁵

The ancient city (modern Balchik, in Bulgaria) lies on the Black Sea's western coast between Callatis in the North and Odessus in the South. In the Roman period, Dionysopolis struck coins from Antoninus Pius to Gordian III.⁶ As opposed to other coastal cities, especially Marcianopolis, Tomis and Odessus, its coinage seems to have been fairly small in scale, as suggested by the limited number of dies and coin types employed. This makes Dionysopolis an easier case-study than other contemporary issuing cities, not only for reconstructing the structure of its own coinage, but also for understanding the general process of coin production in this region. Evidence has been found, although very little so far, for the existence of a system of workshops involved in the minting process of this period in the European provinces of Achaëa, Macedonia, Thrace and Moesia Inferior,⁷ which can be compared to the phenomenon documented on a much larger scale in the Asia Minor provinces (from Bithynia-Pontus and Asia, to Lycia-Pamphylia and

1 Draganov 2007.

2 Cf. especially Moushmov 1926a and 1926b, Ruzicka 1915 and 1933, Jurukova 1987. See also more recently Karayotov 2009.

3 See especially Schönert-Geiss 1965 and Schönert-Geiss 1972.

4 So far the following volumes have been published: RPC I to III (covering the coinage from Augustus to Hadrian), RPC VII for the province of Asia under the Gordians, RPC IX (from Trajan Decius to Aemilianus), besides three supplements. RPC IV (the Antonines) is currently in progress and available as an online database. Cf. <http://rpc.ashmus.ox.ac.uk>.

5 Draganov 1997.

6 The standard reference for this mint is still Pick's catalogue in *AMNG* I (Pick 1898), which was partially integrated by Draganov 1997 with some unpublished types.

7 On the cities of Peloponnesus in Achaëa, see Flament 2007. On Epirus, see Calomino 2012, p. 106. On Macedonia, see Calomino 2014, 207-8. About examples in Thrace and Moesia, see below.

Cilicia).⁸ This system hinged on a network of local workshops that served multiple cities at the same time, supplying the dies used to produce the coins of each city, and perhaps also finalizing the minting process by actually striking the coins on behalf of the cities themselves. Some essential logistic aspects of this process are still obscure, like the way in which the dies and/or the struck coins were moved from one place to another, perhaps depending on whether these workshops operated autonomously from the cities or were subordinated to their administrations.

Yet, some elements of this puzzle are definite. The most apparent result of this network-production is that each workshop's style can be recognised and often tracked down throughout the coinages of different cities, and that sometimes one or more obverse dies were used on coins of different cities under the same emperor. Evidence of die-sharing in Thrace has been found only sporadically, dating back to as early as the late Antonine Age between Hadrianopolis and Plotinopolis, and then between Perinthus and Bizye on coins of Caracalla as Caesar.⁹ Die-sharing is also attested in Moesia Inferior from the Severan Age. Even though only few examples are known, some clues suggest that there was more regular interaction between workshops in this province than in Thrace, and the fact that every die-linkage discovered so far involved coins of Marcianopolis seems to indicate that the workshop responsible for this city's coinage, one of the most prolific in the Balkans, had a leading role in the Black Sea region. Die-sharing is attested under Septimius Severus between the coinages of Marcianopolis and of Anchialus, in Thrace.¹⁰ Under Gordian III, Marcianopolis also shared dies with Odessus, Tomis and Dionysopolis, whose coinage we are considering here.¹¹ I will now look more closely at the coinage of Dionysopolis in the late Severan Age to point out some characteristic features of its production that result from the influence of the system of workshops operating in the Black Sea region. These features are the stylistic pattern of die-engraving, the pattern of coin denominations and the extent of die-sharing with coinages of other cities.

Tracking significant changes in the stylistic pattern of the coinage of Dionysopolis, which resulted from the turnover of engravers (or of workshops) in its mint production, can help resolving problems of questioned identities amongst members of the imperial family portrayed on its coins. This is particularly the case with the often problematic distinction between Caracalla and Elagabalus,¹² who bore the same imperial name (Marcus Aurelius Antoninus) and whose portraits were often similar to each other. Under the Severans, coins were issued for Septimius Severus, Julia Domna, Caracalla and Geta. Afterwards, no coinage was produced either for Macrinus and Diadumenianus, or, in my opinion, for Elagabalus. Very few issues of the early Severan Age are included in *Die Antiken Münzen Nord-Griechenlands* volume I and in *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum* volumes, for example SNG Schweiz 217, of Julia Domna, and Grose 1926, no. 4351 of Geta. Caracalla's issues are basically unpublished in the main corpora. However, two books in Bulgarian on the coinage of Dionysopolis have been published in recent years, Jekov 2003 and Tachev 2016. Although drawing almost exclusively upon public and private collections in Bulgaria, they have shed light on a much more comprehensive sample of materials than previous academic publications.¹³ Both catalogues include a number of issues in the name of Elagabalus (obverse legend AYTΘ KAIC M AYPO – *sic* – ANTΩNEINOC) that I believe should be assigned in fact to Caracalla on

8 Cf. Kraft 1972, Johnston 1974, Johnston 1983, Spoerri-Butcher 2006 and Johnston 2012. On the workshop system in Syria, see Butcher 2004, pp. 242-5. A very thorough study on the system of die and coin production in Pamphylia and Cilicia has been recently completed by G.C. Watson at Cambridge University in the form of a PhD dissertation that will become an important publication on this subject in the near future.

9 See Peter 2005, p. 112, note 64, and Draganov 2007, p. 162.

10 Peter 2005, p. 112, note 64.

11 Calomino 2013; Peter 2005, p. 112.

12 See Johnston 1982.

13 Jekov 2003 is essentially a catalogue of types, which provides no information on the specimens and no general commentary, so it can be consulted as an archive of images (see also Varbanov 2005, although only partially illustrated). Tachev 2016 is a more accurate study (a reduced version of the author's academic dissertation that includes a die-study, hereby cited as Tachev 2014), which draws upon a very important sample of coins from the Historical Museum in Balchik (ancient Dionysopolis), the Archaeological Museum in Varna (ancient Odessus) and the Regional Historical Museum in Dobrich, but not from most of the core public numismatic collections in Europe and the USA.

the basis of the stylistic characteristics of their imperial portraits (*cat. no. 1*).¹⁴ Within the coinage of Septimius Severus and his family, two different styles, resulting from the hands of different engravers, can be easily distinguished and assigned to separate periods of production. In both periods there is a number of issues that can be assigned to Caracalla in the light of the resemblance of his portrait to that of his brother Geta. The coins incorrectly ascribed to Elagabalus belong to the first period, in which Geta is regarded as Caesar, so they loosely range from AD 198 to AD 209 (*cat. nos. 1-2*).¹⁵ In the second period, Geta has the title of Augustus, so his coinage and that of Caracalla can be probably dated to AD 209-211/212 (*cat. nos. 3-4*).¹⁶ The coins in the first group show a youthful imperial portrait, those from the second a slightly more mature one. The engraving style in either group is consistent with the corresponding coinages of Septimius Severus and Julia Domna, and is completely different from that of Severus Alexander. So all these coins belong to Caracalla, and there was no coinage for Elagabalus.

Together with Callatis, Dionysopolis was the only city of Moesia Inferior that did not have a coinage for Elagabalus, whereas all the other cities, and particularly Nicopolis ad Istrum and Marcianopolis, had a very large production in his name.¹⁷ Such a hiatus, which was not an uncommon feature of the civic coinage in the provinces, may have depended on the availability of resources destined by the city to the minting activity in a particular period, and perhaps also by the volume of coinage that had remained in circulation from previous years, making the minting of further issues unnecessary. The coinage of Dionysopolis resumed under Severus Alexander before the last civic issues were struck in the name of Gordian. Coins were issued in the name of Alexander, of his mother Julia Mamaea and, most significantly, of his grandmother Julia Maesa (*cat. nos. 5-6*), who usually featured on the coinage issued under Elagabalus rather than of his successor (which probably caused the misattribution of some Caracalla's issues). However, the coins of Julia Maesa are stylistically very different from those of the early Severan age, while they fit in well with the pattern of the coinage of Alexander and Julia Mamaea; this suggests that they were issued after Elagabalus' death in AD 218 and supports the assumption that no coinage was made during his reign. There is another Moesian city that celebrated Julia Maesa under Severus Alexander, showing their busts facing each other on the obverse of some of its coins, Marcianopolis (*cat. no. 11*); its coinage was closely connected to that of Dionysopolis, as I shall discuss in the last part of this contribution.

Another aspect of the coinage of Dionysopolis that may have been influenced by the city's participation in the network of workshops is the structure of its monetary system. From the time of Septimius Severus, the large majority of Dionysopolis issues were marked with a Greek numeral on the reverse indicating the denomination to which they corresponded.¹⁸ The issues of Severus Alexander's reign can be arranged in five groups:

1. Five assaria bronzes marked with an E (around 28 mm and c. 12.5 g) (*cat. no. 7*);
2. Four assaria bronzes marked with a Δ (around 26 mm and c. 9.5 g) (*cat. nos. 8*);
3. Three assaria bronzes (of Julia Maesa) marked with a Γ (around 24 mm and c. 7.5 g) (*cat. no. 5*);
4. Two assaria bronzes (of Julia Mamaea) marked with a Β (around 21 mm and c. 5 g) (*cat. no. 6*);
5. Small unmarked bronzes measuring around 17 mm and weighting around 2.8 g, which were possibly worth one and a half or one assarion (*cat. nos. 9-10*).

The same value marks were adopted in this period also at Tomis, Callatis, Istrus and occasionally also at Marcianopolis. The existence of a shared conventional system for identifying bronze coin denominations within such a geographically limited area, which in the past has also been regarded as the result of a 'monetary League',¹⁹ finds few parallels in the Roman provincial world. This may have resulted from an agreement between the civic administrations aiming to establish a 'unified' regional

14 Jekov 2003, nos. 24-25 = Tachev 2014, p. 512, nos. 1-5, pl. 21. Jekov 2003, no. 26 = Varbanov 2005, no. is an apparently unique specimen in a very small denomination from a private collection, which cannot be judged on the basis of the only published poor quality photo.

15 Jekov 2003, no. 23 = Tachev 2014, p. 509, nos. 1-5, pl. 19.

16 Jekov 2003, nos. 20-22 = Tachev 2014, p. 510, nos. 1-15, pl. 20.

17 On Marcianopolis, see Pick 1898, nos. 810-981. On Nicopolis, see Pick 1898, nos. 1893-2039.

18 Cf. Johnston 2007, p. 201.

19 Cf. Gardner 1876 and Schönert-Geiss 1985.

monetary pattern that would possibly facilitate price stability, currency conversion and perhaps also coin circulation beyond each city's territory. The establishment of a regional monetary system was probably a product of a network of diplomatic, economic and cultural relations between different communities that were promoted by their provincial elites. If the same coin workshops were serving the cities of the Black Sea region, this may have facilitated or even fostered the decision to adopt a joint denominational system that could be more easily implemented if the value marks were impressed at the same time on the coins of different cities. The fact that Nicopolis ad Istrum was the only city in Moesia Inferior that had no value marks on its coins in this period probably depended on its geographical position in the western inland part of the province, being somehow isolated from the rest of the coastal centres in the East. Perhaps Nicopolis belonged not only to a different economic 'district' but also to another workshop's area of influence. Being the only other major issuing city of Moesia Inferior alongside Marcianopolis (Tomis being third in rank, but not as productive as these two centres), it is possible that Nicopolis needed a dedicated supplier to satisfy its very large demand of coin production.²⁰

The third aspect of the workshop-coin-production at Dionysopolis that I want to discuss in this contribution is the die-sharing. At least one obverse die used on Severus Alexander's coins of Dionysopolis was also used on coins of Marcianopolis. This is so far the only case attested in Moesia Inferior for this period that I am aware of. This die was used in both of the two known issues of the four assaria denomination (a sestertius), which was probably produced on a larger scale than the other denominations, being the most common in circulation (*cat. nos.* 12-13). Only three or four obverse dies can be identified within the production of this denomination, and another four dies are definitely attested within the five assaria bronzes. Additionally, around five more obverse dies are currently known for the production of the other three denominations (two for Julia Maesa, one for Julia Mamaea and two for Severus Alexander in the smallest denomination). Overall, the ratio of dies shared with Marcianopolis in the coinage of this period is 1:13, possibly 1:15 if we round this up allowing for the existence of a minimum number of further obverse dies hitherto not identified. This same die is attested in no fewer than four issues at Marcianopolis (*cat. nos.* 14-17), whose coinage was much larger in scale. If we consider only the coins featuring the portrait of Severus Alexander as Augustus (i.e. omitting the ones on which he is portrayed with Julia Maesa or Julia Mamaea), the number of obverse dies definitely identified is thirty-seven, which gives a possible ratio of 1:40 as opposed to that of approximately 1:10 for the Dionysopolis coins featuring the Emperor. These figures suggest that the extent of die-sharing between Marcianopolis and Dionysopolis was minimal and perhaps incidental.²¹ We can envisage a scenario whereby the workshop in charge of supplying dies for Marcianopolis provided Dionysopolis with few dies too, as required by the much smaller volume of production of this city, and it is logical to assume that the shared obverse was used at Marcianopolis first and then re-used at Dionysopolis until it wore out. However, this same picture can also be interpreted in a different way.

The reason why the proportion of shared dies is so small may be that only the dies used in the four assaria denomination were suitable for the coinages of both cities. On the obverses of the five assaria coins, Marcianopolis adopted a design featuring the bust of Severus Alexander facing either that of Julia Maesa or of Julia Mamaea (cf. *cat. no.* 11). Conversely, at Dionysopolis Maesa and Mamaea were portrayed alone on the three and two assaria bronzes respectively. Also, at Marcianopolis the smallest denomination was only struck for Severus Alexander as Caesar under Elagabalus, before Dionysopolis resumed its own coinage after Elagabalus' death. This alternative scenario prompts further thoughts. If on the one hand the workshop's task was to provide the technical expertise and skills to mint, on the other, the selection of the coin designs depended primarily on the city's will. It would have been much easier for the workshop to supply the same obverse design for each denomination to both cities, but

²⁰ Some clues suggest that Nicopolis had its 'own' workshop. If we look for example at the period covered by RPC VI, the portrait of Elagabalus on its coins is stylistically different from that on the coins of Marcianopolis, Odessus and Istrus. It is also notable that unlike most of the other Moesian cities, Nicopolis had no coinage for Severus Alexander (except for an extremely small and 'anomalous' bilingual production); cf. Calomino 2014, pp. 212-5. Under Gordian III, even though more similarities in the style and production can be found with the coinage of the other Black Sea cities, Nicopolis did not participate in the joint celebratory 'medallions' issued by Odessus, Marcianopolis and Tomis to honour the Emperor (see below). Cf. Calomino 2013, p. 109.

²¹ Cf. Draganov 2007, p. 163.

this probably clashed with the cities' own preferences on which member of the imperial family was to be honoured on each denomination. In the light of this consideration, one may infer that the proportion of coins struck from a shared obverse die could actually be high, as this was used on both issues of the only denomination in which it would fit.

Some more general considerations can be made in conclusion about the relation between Marcianopolis and Dionysopolis, and more broadly about the coin production in Moesia Inferior at the end of the Severan Age.

That a special connection existed between the coinages of these two cities is indicated by two elements. Firstly, the shared obverse die of Severus Alexander was most probably cut by the same engraver who produced some other dies for Marcianopolis and for Dionysopolis, also in the other denominations, while we do not recognize this same hand on coins of Severus Alexander struck elsewhere in Moesia. This is suggested not only by the striking similarity between the imperial portraits used on these two coinages, but also by the fact that some of the dies which were not shared by them are almost identical to each other (*cat. nos.* 18-20). Secondly, there is an element of continuity over time. Episodes of die-sharing between these coinages are attested also under Gordian III, both on some exceptional 'medallic' bronzes issued (also by Odessus and Tomis) possibly to celebrate Gordian's journey through the Balkans on his way to Asia Minor in AD 242,²² and on the peculiar five assaria series featuring the obverse facing busts of the Emperor and Sarapis (also issued at Odessus).²³

These observations, alongside the ones made before, suggest that the coinage of Dionysopolis was intertwined with that of Marcianopolis in as much as both cities relied on the same workshop, which served primarily Marcianopolis (perhaps because it was based there) and more sporadically also Dionysopolis, on specific demand. The fact that Dionysopolis had a much smaller production than Marcianopolis and perhaps depended on this city's workshop did not affect its ability to choose its own coin designs and denominations. Also, the existence of such a close relation between them does not mean that the other cities in the Black Sea region were not part of this same network. It may be that one main workshop (or group of workshops connected to each other) was operating in this area, as suggested by the fact that all the civic coinages of this period show a very consistent pattern of production (fabric, overall style and shared denominations). Small stylistic differences between each city's portraits of the same Emperor may just depend on the hands of different engravers, who may have worked specifically on the coinage of one or two cities each, as suggested for example by stylistic similarities between issues of Istrus and Odessus, of Tomis and Callatis, and of Marcianopolis and Dionysopolis, as discussed here.

This particular case study also gives food for thought on the general system of coin production in the province. Within the linked coinages of these two cities, we can identify at least two different patterns of behaviour.

1. Die-sharing could result from the collaboration of two or more cities that agreed to produce joint issues to celebrate a special public event involving their communities and the province in general. This appears to be an exceptional circumstance, as attested by the series of bronze medallions issued by Odessus, Marcianopolis and Tomis to honour Gordian III, all sharing one single obverse die.
2. Die-sharing also resulted from two or more cities sharing the same workshop in one or more periods of their ordinary coin production. This was a more regular network that probably did not require the civic administrations to stipulate any mutual agreement. Die-sharing may be an accidental consequence of this system, or a practical device to optimize the production and the use of dies for multiple cities at the same time, conforming to their own needs and availability of resources.

These patterns may or may not apply also to the workshop-systems of other European provinces, or Asia Minor and the Levant. Yet it seems that the general rule is that there was not strict rule: the system varied from one place to another and over time in the same place because civic administrations were responsible for their own coinages.

²² Calomino 2013. Cf. also Draganov 2007, p. 163.

²³ Peter 2005, p. 112.

CATALOGUE²⁴

1

Dionysopolis, Caracalla (c. AD 198-209)

Obv.: ΑΥΤΟ ΚΑΙC Μ ΑΥΡΟ (sic) ΑΝΤΩΝΕΙΝΟC
Laureate, draped and cuirassed bust, r.

Rev.: ΔΙΟΝΥCΟΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ

Dionysos standing facing, head l., holding long thyrsus and kantharos over panther at his feet, l., head r.; to r., E

Bibl.: cf. Moushmov 1912, no. 97 (as Caracalla); Jekov 2003, nos. 24-25 (as Elagabalus); Varbanov 2005, no. 480 (as Caracalla); Tachev 2016, no. 177 (as Elagabalus)

Photo: Rauch EA 12, March 2013, lot 905 (AE 26 mm, 11,69 g; published as Elagabalus)



2

Dionysopolis, Geta (c. AD 198-209)

Obv.: Κ Α CΕΠ ΓΕΤΑC

Bare-headed, draped and cuirassed bust, r.

Rev.: ΔΙΟΝΥCΟΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ

Lighted torch

Bibl.: cf. Grose 1926, no. 4351; Draganov 1997, no. 48; Hristova-Jekov 2003, no. 23; Tachev 2016, no. 171

Photo: CNG EA 216, August 2009, lot 281 (AE 17 mm, 2.17 g, 12h)



3

Dionysopolis, Caracalla (c. AD 209-211/212)

Obv.: ΑΥ Κ Μ ΑΥ ΑΝΤΩΝΙΝΟ

Laureate, draped and cuirassed bust, r.

Rev.: ΔΙΟΝΥCΟΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ

Great God of Odessus standing facing, head l., holding cornucopia and patera; to l., Δ

Bibl.: cf. Moushmov 1912, no. 96; Jekov 2003, no. 19; Tachev 2016, nos 169 (this coin)-170

Photo: J. Hourmouziadis Coll. (AE 25 mm, 7.59 g, 1h)



4

Dionysopolis, Geta (c. AD 209-211/212)

Obv.: ΑΥ Κ Π CΕΠ ΓΕΤΑC

Laureate, draped and cuirassed bust, r.

Rev.: ΔΙΟΝΥCΟΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ

Demeter standing facing veiled, head l., holding long torch and ears of grain; to l., Γ

Bibl.: cf. Draganov 1997, no. 49; Jekov 2003, nos 20-22; Tachev 2016, nos 174-6 (this coin no. 175)

Photo: Lanz 112, November 2002, lot 697 (AE 22 mm, 3.90 g)



²⁴ Photo credits. For the use of images in this article I wish to thank the following museum curators: M. Dotkova - Sofia, National Archaeological Institute (S); A. Dowler - London, British Museum (L); V. Heuchert and J. Mairat - Oxford, Ashmolean Museum (O); A. Popescu - Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum (C); P. Van Alfen - New York, American Numismatic Society (NY); K. Vondrovec - Vienna, Kunsttortisches Museum (V); B. Wieland - Freiburg, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität (F). I shall also acknowledge the following auction firms and collectors for making their images available on www.coinarchives.com: Classical Numismatic Group, Lancaster-London (CNG); Numismatik Lanz, München (Lanz); Dr. Busso Peus Nachfolger, Frankfurt am Main; Auktionshaus H.D. Rauch GmbH, Wien (Rauch); Y. Hourmouziadis (<http://hourmo.eu/index.html>). Further thanks go to colleagues who have provided very useful information on the materials discussed in this article: E. Stolyarik, New York (American Numismatic Society); E. Paunov, Vienna; I. Varbanov, Burgas.



5

Dionysopolis, Julia Maesa (c. AD 222-224)

Obv.: IOYΛΙΑ MAICA CEB
Diademed and draped bust, r.

Rev.: ΔΙΟΝΥCΟΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ
Demeter standing facing veiled, head l., holding long torch and ears of grain;
to r., Γ

Bibl.: cf. AMNG 379; Jekov 2003, no. 27; Tachev 2016, no. 180 (this coin)

Photo: Lanz 109, May 2002, lot 687 (AE 25 mm, 7.06 g)



6

Dionysopolis, Julia Mamaea (c. AD 222-235)

Obv.: IOYΛΙΑ MAMAIA CEB
Diademed and draped bust, r.

Rev.: ΔΙΟΝΥCΟΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ
Heracles standing facing, head r., resting on club and holding apples and lion skin;
to l. B

Bibl.: cf. Moushmov 1912, no. 108; Jekov 2003, no. 32; Tachev 2016, no. 179

Photo: CNG Mail Bid Sale 76, September 2007, lot 1000 (AE 21 mm, 5.30 g, 12h)



7

Dionysopolis, Severus Alexander (c. AD 222-235)

Obv.: ΑΥΤ Κ Μ ΑΥΡ CΕΥΗ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟC
Laureate, draped and cuirassed bust, r.

Rev.: ΔΙΟΝΥCΟΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ
Dionysos standing facing, head l., holding long thyrsus and kantharos over
panther at his feet, l., head r.; to r., E

Bibl.: cf. Moushmov 1912, no. 104; Jekov 2003, no. 28; Tachev 2016, nos 181-2

Photo: O (AE 28 mm, 12.65 g, 7h)



8

Dionysopolis, Severus Alexander (c. AD 222-235)

Obv.: ΑΥΤ Κ Μ ΑΥΡ CΕΥΗ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟC
Laureate, draped and cuirassed bust, r.

Rev.: ΔΙΟΝΥCΟΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ
The Great God of Odessus standing facing, head l., wearing kalathos, holding
cornucopia and patera over lighted altar at his feet; to r., Δ

Bibl.: cf. AMNG 381.13; Moushmov 1912, no. 107; Jekov 2003, no. 30; Tachev 2016, nos 183-5

Photo: V-GR.07826 (AE 27 mm, 13.28 g, 6h)





9



Dionysopolis, Severus Alexander (c. AD 222-235)

Obv.: ΑΥΤ Κ Μ Α{ΥΡ} CEY ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟC
Laureate head, r.

Rev.: ΔΙΟΝΥCΟΠΟΛΕΙΤ{ΩΝ}
Lighted torch

Bibl.: cf. AMNG 382; Moushmov 1912, no. 105; Jekov 2003, no. 31; Tachev 2016, no. 186

Photo: CNG EA 216, August 2009, lot 284 (AE 18 mm, 3.27 g, 6h)



10



Dionysopolis, Severus Alexander (c. AD 222-235)

Obv.: ΑΥΤ Κ Μ Α{ΥΡ} CEY ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟC
Laureate head, r.

Rev.: ΔΙΟΝΥCΟΠΟΛΕΙΤ{ΩΝ}
Bunch of grapes

Bibl.: AMNG 383 = Moushmov 102 (this coin); cf. Jekov 2003, no. 29; Tachev 2016, no. 187

Photo: S-488 (16 mm, 2.96 g)



11



Marcianopolis, Severus Alexander and Julia Maesa (c. AD 222-224)

Obv.: ΑΥΤ Κ Μ ΑΥΡ CEYΗ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟC ΙΟΥΛΙΑ ΜΑΙCΑ
Facing busts of Severus Alexander, r. laureate, draped and cuirassed, and Julia Maesa, l., diademed and draped

Rev.: ΗΠΙ ΤΙΒ ΙΟΥΛ ΦΗCΤΟΥ Μ{ΑΡ}ΚΙΑΝΟΠΟΛΙΤ{ΩΝ}
Homonoia standing facing, head l., wearing kalathos, holding cornucopia and patera; to l., E

Bibl.: cf. Varbanov 2005, no. 1825

Photo: CNG EA 328, June 2014, lot 270 (AE 29 mm, 17.13 g, 7h)



12



Dionysopolis, Severus Alexander (c. AD 222-235)

Obv.: ΑΥΤ Κ Μ ΑΥΡ CEYΗ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟC
Laureate, draped and cuirassed bust, r.

Rev.: ΔΙΟΝΥCΟΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ
The Great God of Odessus standing facing, head l., wearing kalathos, holding cornucopia and patera over lighted altar at his feet; to r., Δ

Bibl.: BMC 1 = AMNG 381.8

Photo: L (AE 26 mm, 10.22 g, 12h)



13

Dionysopolis, Severus Alexander (c. AD 222-235)

Obv.: ΑΥΤ Κ Μ ΑΥΡ ΚΕΥΗ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟC
Laureate, draped and cuirassed bust, r.

Rev.: ΔΙΟΝΥCΟΠΟΛΙΤΩΝ

The Great God of Odessus standing facing, head l., holding cornucopia and patera over lighted altar at his feet; to r., Δ

Bibl.: Grose 1926, no. 4352

Photo: C (AE 26 mm, 9.99 g, 1h)



14

Marcianopolis, Severus Alexander (c. AD 222-235)

Obv.: ΑΥΤ Κ Μ ΑΥΡ ΚΕΥΗ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟC
Laureate, draped and cuirassed bust, r.

Rev.: {ΗΓ}{ΟΥ}Μ ΤΕΡΕΒΕΝΤΙΝ{ΟΥ} Μ{ΑΡ}ΚΙΑΝΟΠΟΛΙΤ{ΩΝ}

Homonoia standing facing, head l., wearing kalathos, holding cornucopia and patera over lighted altar at her feet

Bibl.: cf. AMNG 1035

Photo: NY-1944.100.15308 (AE 26 mm, 11.58 g, 12h)



15

Marcianopolis, Severus Alexander (c. AD 222-235)

Obv.: ΑΥΤ Κ Μ ΑΥΡ ΚΕΥΗ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟC
Laureate, draped and cuirassed bust, r.

Rev.: {ΗΓ}{ΟΥ}Μ ΤΕΡΕΒΕΝΤΕΙΝ{ΟΥ} Μ{ΑΡ}ΚΙΑΝΟΠΟΛΙΤ{ΩΝ}

Hera(?) standing facing, head l., holding cornucopia and long sceptre

Bibl.: cf. AMNG 1024

Photo: CNG EA 268, November 2011, lot 200 (AE 25 mm, 7.61 g, 12h)



16

Marcianopolis, Severus Alexander (c. AD 222-235)

Obv.: ΑΥΤ Κ Μ ΑΥΡ ΚΕΥΗ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟC
Laureate, draped and cuirassed bust, r.

Rev.: {ΗΓ}{ΟΥ}Μ ΤΕΡΕΒΕΝΤΙΝ{ΟΥ} Μ{ΑΡ}ΚΙΑΝΟΠΟΛΙΤ{ΩΝ}

Zeus(?) standing facing in long chiton, head l., holding patera and long sceptre

Bibl.: cf. AMNG 1023

Photo: Peus 384, November 2005, lot 796 (AE 26 mm, 10.39 g)





17



Marcianopolis, Severus Alexander (c. AD 222-235)

Obv.: ΑΥΤ Κ Μ ΑΥΡ ΣΕΥΗ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ
Laureate, draped and cuirassed bust, r.

Rev.: {ΗΓ}{ΟΥ}Μ ΤΕΡΕΒΕΝΤΕΙΝ{ΟΥ} ΜΑΡΚΙΑΝΟΠΟΛΙΤΩΝ
Demeter(?) standing facing, head l., holding ears of grain and long torch

Bibl.: cf. Hristova, Jekov 2009, no. 6.32.51-3

Photo: O (AE 26 mm, 9.75 g, 12h; traces of tooling)



18



Marcianopolis, Severus Alexander (c. AD 222-235)

Obv.: ΑΥΤ Κ Μ ΑΥΡ ΣΕΥΗ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ
Laureate, draped and cuirassed bust, r.

Rev.: ΥΠΙ ΤΙΒ ΙΟΥΛ ΦΗΣΤΟΥ ΜΑΡΚΙΑΝΟΠΟΛΙΤΩΝ
Homonoia standing facing, head l., holding cornucopia and patera

Bibl.: cf. Hristova, Jekov 2009, no. 6.32.36.1

Photo: CNG EA 318, January 2014, lot 392 (AE 24 mm, 11.39 g, 12h)



19



Marcianopolis, Severus Alexander (c. AD 222-235)

Obv.: ΑΥΤ Κ Μ ΑΥΡ ΣΕΥ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ
Laureate, draped and cuirassed bust, r.

Rev.: ΥΠΙ ΦΙΡ ΦΙΛΟΠΑ{ΠΠ}ΟΥ ΜΑΡΚΙΑΝΟΠΟΛΙΤΩΝ
Homonoia standing facing, head l., holding cornucopia and patera

Bibl.: cf. Varbanov 2005, no. 1815

Photo: Rauch, September 2007, lot 814 (AE 25 mm, 11.08 g)



20



Dionysopolis, Severus Alexander (c. AD 222-235)

Obv.: ΑΥΤ Κ Μ ΑΥΡ ΣΕΥ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ
Laureate, draped and cuirassed bust, r.

Rev.: ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ
The Great God standing facing, head l., wearing kalathos, holding cornucopia and patera over lighted altar at his feet; to r., Δ

Bibl.: cf. AMNG 381

Photo: F-11433 (AE 25 mm, 9.62 g, 12h)

Bibliography

- Butcher K. 2004, *Coinage in Roman Syria. Northern Syria, 64 BC - AD 253*, London.
- Calomino D. 2012, Actia Nicopolis. Coinage, Currency and Civic Identity (27BC - AD268), in Sanchez F.L. (ed.), *The City and the Coin in the Ancient and Early Medieval Worlds*, Oxford, 103-115.
- Calomino D. 2013, Die-sharing in Moesia Inferior under Gordian III, *Numismatic Chronicle* 173 (2013), 105-26.
- Calomino D. 2014, Bilingual coins of Severus Alexander in the Eastern provinces, *American Journal of Numismatics* 26 (2015), 199-222.
- Draganov D. 1997, The Bronze Coinage of Dionysopolis, in Kluge B. and Weisser B. (eds), *Proceedings of the XIIth International Numismatic Congress, Berlin 1997, Vol. I, Berlin 2000*, 275-279 (also published in *Numismatic Circular* 10 (December), 1997, 371-7).
- Draganov D. 2007, *The Coinage of Deultum*, Sofia.
- Flament C. 2007, Die et engraver-sharing dans le Péloponnèse entre le règne d'Hadrien et celui de Septime Sévère, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 131 (2007), 559-614.
- Gardner P. 1876, A monetary league on the Euxine Sea, *Numismatic Chronicle* 16 (1876), 307-14.
- Grose S.W. 1926, *Fitzwilliam Museum Catalogue of the McClean Collection of Greek Coins, Volume II*, Cambridge.
- Hristova H., Jekov G. 2006, *The local coinage of the Roman Empire – Moesia Inferior, I-III A.D., Marcianopolis, Blagoevgrad*.
- Jekov G. 2003, *The Local Coinage of the Roman Empire. Moesia Inferior I - III c. A.C., Dionysopolis, Blagoevgrad*.
- Johnston A. 1974, New problems for old: Konrad Kraft on die-sharing in Asia Minor, *Numismatic Chronicle* 134 (1974), 203-7.
- Johnston A. 1982, Caracalla or Elagabalus? A case of unnecessarily mistaken identity, *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* 27 (1982), 97-147.
- Johnston A. 1983, Die sharing in Asia Minor: the view from Sardis, *Israel Numismatic Journal* 6-8 (1982-3), 59-78.
- Johnston A. 2007, *Greek Imperial Denominations, ca 200-275: a Study of the Roman Provincial Bronze Coinages of Asia Minor*, London.
- Johnston A. 2012, The provinces after Commodus, in Metcalf W. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Coinage*, Oxford, 453-467.
- Jurukova J. 1987, *Le monnayage des villes en Mésie Inférieure et en Thrace pendant le II^e - III^e s. Hadrianopolis*, Sofia.
- Karayotov I. 2009, *The Coinage of Mesambria. Vol. II. Bronze Coins of Mesambria*, Sozopol.
- Kraft K. 1972, *Das System der kaiserzeitlichen Münzprägung in Kleinasien*, Berlin.
- Moushmov N.A. 1912, *Anti'nitë moneti na Balkanskija poluostrov i monetitë na bulgarskitë care (Ancient Coins of the Balkan Peninsula and the Coins of the Bulgarian Monarchs)*, Sofia.
- Moushmov N.A. 1926a, *Les monnaies antiques de Philippopolis*, Sofia 1926.
- Moushmov N.A. 1926b, *Les monnaies et les ateliers monétaires de Serdica*, Sofia.
- Peter U. 2005, Religious-cultural identity in Thrace and Moesia Inferior, in Howgego C., Heuchert V., Burnett A. (eds), *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, Oxford, 107-14.
- Pick B. 1898, *Die Antiken Münzen Nord-Griechenlands, I. Die Antiken Münzen von Dacien und Moesien*, Berlin.
- Ruzicka L. 1915, *Die Münzen von Serdica*, *Zeitschrift für Numismatik* 48 (1915), 1-82.
- Ruzicka L. 1933, *Die Münzen von Pautalia*, Sofia.
- Schönert-Geiss E. 1965, *Die Münzprägung von Perinthos*, Berlin.
- Schönert-Geiss E. 1972, *Die Münzprägung von Byzantion*, Berlin.
- Schönert-Geiss E. 1985, Zur Existenz der pontischen Münzliga, *Klio* 67 (1985), 466-70.
- Schultz H.D. 1999, "Die-Sharing" in Thrakien, *Annotazioni Numismatiche* 36 (December 1999), 829-33.
- Spoerri-Butcher M. 2006, L'organisation de la production monétaire au sein de la province d'Asie à l'époque de Gordien III (238-244), *Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau* 85 (2006), 97-130.
- Tachev Y. 2016, *The Coinage of Dionysopolis, IV century BC – II century AD*, Sofia.
- Varbanov I. 2005, *Greek Imperial Coins and their values. Vol. I, Dacia, Moesia Superior, Moesia Inferior*, Bourgas.
- Watson G.C. 2016, *Die and Coin Production in Southern Asia Minor, AD 218-276: Numismatic and Historical Perspectives*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Cambridge University.