

The Coinage of Latmos¹

Until recently, the Carian city of Latmos was not known to have minted coins, unlike its successor Herakleia which produced a noticeable coinage in the Hellenistic period.² A small series of fractional silver coins, which have come to light in recent years, can now be attributed with certainty to Latmos. The specimens known to me are as follows:

Die-catalogue of the five known tetartemoria (quarter obols), pl. ?

Issue A

Obv. Bearded male head to left (1.) or right (2.).

Rev. Monogram:

O1 – R1

1. 0.13g 03 Cambridge, The Fitzwilliam Museum; *The Fitzwilliam Museum, Annual Report 1996* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 22.

O2 – R2

2. 0.15g 12 Private collection; Hauck & Aufhäuser, auction 14 (Munich, 6-7 October 1998), no. 159.

Issue B

Obv. Female head to right.

Rev. Monogram:

O3 – R3

3. 0.17g Private collection; Hauck & Aufhäuser, auction 14 (Munich, 6-7 October 1998), no. 160.

O3 – R4

4. 0.15g 09 Private collection; Troxell and Kagan, *Cilician and Neighbors*, no. 24.

Issue C

Obv. Female head to right.


Rev. Monogram:

O4 – R5

5. 0.16g 12 Private collection; Hauck & Aufhäuser, auction 14 (Munich, 6-7 October 1998), no. 158.

¹ I am very grateful to Richard Ashton for his useful comments and to Alois Wenninger for his assistance.

² S. Lavva, *Zur Silberprägung von Herakleia am Latmos*, in: *Chiron* 23 (1993), pp. 391-414; for some corrections, see P. Kinns, *CH* 8, 474: *Milesian Silver Coinage in the Second Century BC*, in: R. Ashton and S. Hurter (ed.), *Studies in Greek Numismatics in Memory of Martin Jessop Price* (London, 1998), p. 182.

The first specimen to have been published was part of a group of 81 silver fractions from southwest Asia Minor that were acquired by various private collectors in 1984 and 1985 and published by Hyla Troxell and Jonathan Kagan in 1989.³ Although they could not make precise mint attributions, it was clear that many of these coins, of which 53 were catalogued in the article, originated from Cilicia and Caria.⁴ They came in five lots and at least part appeared to derive from a single hoard. The coins in Lot D, which comprised the specimen attributable to Latmos and 23 other fractions, were, according to Troxell and Kagan, very probably from the hoard. Of these 24 coins, 6 are definitely from Carian mints while the remainder are probably from Cilicia. The silver fraction listed as no. 24, weighing 0.15g with a die-axis at 09, was described as bearing on the obverse a beardless head to right with the hair rolled up behind; and on the reverse, the letter T above an uncertain object drawn like thus: , which was described as a possible noose, or snare. It was also suggested that the letter T might have indicated the denomination: a tertartemorion (quarter obol). In the absence of other evidence no attribution was attempted.

The second specimen to surface was acquired in 1996 by the Department of Coins and Medals of the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge. It was part of a group of silver fractions from Asia Minor, mainly from Ionia, Caria and Cilicia, offered for sale to the Museum by Spink of London. Among the group, some 43 silver fractions were acquired thanks to the generosity of the Friends of the Fitzwilliam, the Burn Fund and the late Iain Murray who donated two silver fractions, one of which is the specimen under consideration.⁵ Murray indicated that all these fractions belonged to a private collector based in the Izmir (Smyrna) area who had acquired many of his coins in the 1980's and 1990's. Save for the coins of Ionia and a few of other northern regions, in overall condition and composition the lot, with coins from Caria and Cilicia, is similar to the group published by Troxell and Kagan. The inclusion of a very rare coin in each of these two groups may indeed suggest that, although mixed with coins from other provenances, a number of these coins may be from the same find. When I catalogued the Fitzwilliam specimen in the *Annual Report 1996* I was not aware of the first specimen published by Troxell and Kagan. I gave the following description in the *Annual Report 1996*: uncertain mint of Cilicia, AR fraction, c. 350 BC; obverse: male head to left; reverse: monogram in incuse square (apparently unpublished), 0.13g. Misled by the large number of Cilician fractions in the Spink lot, I tentatively suggested a mint in Cilicia. However, I interpreted the uncertain object of the reverse as a monogram of which I could read the Greek letters alpha, mu, and tau. The alpha, which is clearly visible on the Fitzwilliam specimen within the first half of the letter mu, can also be seen, although less distinctly, on the Troxell-Kagan specimen which, unlike the Fitzwilliam specimen, did have one further letter, although indistinct, perhaps an omicron, added to the lower right end of mu. In 1997 I finally became aware of the Troxell-Kagan specimen and considered whether these fractions might not be in fact from a Carian mint. I tried all possible letter combinations and found that only Latmos would include all the identifiable letters of the monogram, the initial lambda being the first half of the letter mu.⁶ And indeed, the Fitzwilliam monogram is made of the first four letters of *LATM*-os; the Troxell-Kagan specimen appears to include a fifth letter which, aptly enough, could be an omicron.

³ H. A. Troxell and J. H. Kagan, *Cilician and Neighbors in Miniature*, in: G. Le Rider *et al.* (eds) *Kraay-Mørholm Essays* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1989), p. 279, no. 24, pl. LXIV, 24a.

⁴ From Caria: catalogue nos. 1, 8, 10, 22, 24, and also several others that were not catalogued but simply mentioned in footnotes 2 and 3.

⁵ *The Fitzwilliam Museum, Annual Report 1996* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 22-23; 26.

⁶ This attribution to Latmos was part of a number of new Carian coin attributions that I was scheduled to present in September 1997 at the XIIth International Numismatic Congress in Berlin in a paper entitled *Attributing Some Carian Incerti*. I could not attend the Congress, but see my paper's abstract in *XII. Internationaler Numismatischer Kongress. Vortragszusammenfassungen* (Berlin, 1997), pp. 87-88.

Finally, in 1988, three new specimens appeared in a German auction catalogue Hauck & Aufhäuser, auction 14 (Munich, 6-7 October 1998), nos. 158, 159, and 160, correctly attributed to Latmos.⁷ Coin no. 159 belongs to the same issue as the Fitzwilliam specimen and no. 160 appears to be from the same obverse but different reverse dies as the Troxell-Kagan specimen. The dies of the third coin, no. 158, were engraved in a slightly different manner, and show a more developed, and perhaps, later style. Its reverse bears a monogram that is made of better formed, bolder and more angular letters, and one can easily make out mu, alpha, lambda, and tau. Alois Wenninger, responsible for ancient coins at Hauck & Aufhäuser, kindly informed me that no. 160 had been in a German private collection for the past 10-15 years, but that nos. 158 and 159 had been recently found in the Magnesia-Latmos area. This provenance is indeed conclusive evidence for associating the letters of the monograms with Latmos. The monogram on coin no. 158 is clearly made of the Greek letters lambda, alpha, tau and mu. In general, only the first two or three letters of the issuing ethnic are indicated on coins, and this is particularly the case when they are small. Two specimens, which share the same obverse die (Issue B), are characterised by two more letters that hang on the bottom right end of the monogram for *LATM*. As we have just seen, the additional letter on the Troxell-Kagan specimen is probably an omicron, although one would need to see the coin in the flesh to be certain. On the other specimen with additional letters (Hauck & Aufhäuser, no. 160), there seems to be a triangular shape with its apex downward prolonged by a circle, half of which appears off-flan. Wenninger regards these two signs as omicron and upsilon that would give a monogram including all the letters for *LATMOU*, the name of the city in the genitive form. However, mint names on coins are virtually always expressed as ethnics in the genitive plural form (e.g. *Ephesi_n*, *Magnet_n*, “[coin] of the people of Ephesos, of the people of Magnesia”).⁸ We would therefore expect to have *Latmi_n* rather than *Latmou*, but neither an omega nor a nu can be distinguished. If, nonetheless, we accept *Latmou*, this form of a city-name in the genitive singular would be, as far as I know, unique in Asia Minor.⁹ There is, however, an interesting parallel with the early IVth century BC coinage of Cilicia where a number of mints use the neuter singular – or might these be old-fashioned genitive plurals? Kraay suggested that since the Cilician mints frequently coined as agents for Persian satraps, there was perhaps some point in drawing a distinction between an issue produced on the authority of the local council, and one minted on commission for somebody else.¹⁰ Would it be possible then that with *Latmou* “[coin] of Latmos”, as opposed to *Latmi_n* “[coin] of the people of Latmos” we have an indication of the political regime in place at Latmos c. 400-380 BC (see below for the dating). Might this be the coinage of a city controlled by a ruler where the demos, if it existed at all, was not in charge of minting operations?¹¹ An interesting comparison can be made with the coinage of Magnesia on the Maeander under Themistokles and his son Archepolis who issued a number of silver coin-types and denominations in c. 465-455 BC.¹² Although, the city’s name is mentioned only by

⁷ Hauck & Aufhäuser, auction 14 (Munich, 6-7 October 1998), nos. 158, 159, and 160.

⁸ Although there is some debate as to whether early occurrences of e.g. *Rodion* or *K_ion* are genitive plurals with omicron for omega, or a neuter singular adjective, referring to *nomisma* or *komma*.

⁹ There are a just a handful of examples of the use of the genitive singular in other parts of the Greek world, see e.g. on the Vth century coinage of Akragas; in Panormos, the legend is in the nominative singular, though as C. M. Kraay, *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins* (London, 1976), p. 6 observes the latter was not a Greek community.

¹⁰ Kraay, *Archaic and Classical*, p. 6. Mints where neuter singular is used include Kelenderis, Nagidos, Soloi, Issos, Tarsos and Mallos.

¹¹ The *Latmioi* are of course mentioned in the Athenian Tribute Lists where they are listed as contributing one talent to the league: see ATL, XXX; but the earliest mention of the *Latmioi* is a dedication on an archaic kouros found near Didyma: see A. Rehm, *Didyma II* (Berlin, 1958), p. 134.

¹² H. A. Cahn and D. Gerin, *Themistokles at Magnesia*, in: *NC* 148 (1988), pp. 13-20; H. A. Cahn and D. Mannsperger, *Themistokles again*, in *NC* 151 (1991), pp. 199-202; J. Nollé and A. Wenninger, *Themistokles und*

the letters M-A, Themistokles' name is either advertised in full in the genitive singular form (on his staters only), or by means of the letters theta and epsilon. These two letters, theta and epsilon, often take the shape of a monogram and constitute the reverse coin-type of the fractions. The name of Themistokles' son, Archepolis, is always advertised as two two-lettered monograms. This way of rendering the name of the issuing authority by means of a monogram and using it as the reverse coin-type might well have been copied by nearby Latmos later on. The use of a monogram of several letters on a coin to identify the mint is not uncommon in the Hellenistic period, but quite exceptional in *c.* 400-380 BC. The evidence for the governance of Latmos is very thin. We have no indication as to how the city was ruled in the first half of the IVth century; was it a democracy, an oligarchy or a city ruled by a dynast? The monogram *Latmou* might also refer to the sacred mountain of Latmos which was a very important place of worship from the Neolithic period onwards.¹³ If the 'Latmou' monogram refers to Mount Latmos, this could perhaps explain the odd shape of the early monogram (Issues A and B), which looks like the rounded peaks of a mountain. If this is right, the bearded male head on the obverse of Issue A might be the personification of the mountain.¹⁴ However, an alternative and completely different way of looking at the two additional letters would be to consider them as the initial letters of the official responsible for issuing these fractions. This explanation has some relevance because of the fact that only one specific issue was concerned (Issue B, only one obverse die recorded), and not the earlier or later issues. Moreover, these two letters are a little smaller than the rest of the monogram and do not seem to form an integral part of its main body. Whoever was responsible for that issue might have put the first two letters of his name as was very commonly done. As can be seen, the problem of these additional letters cannot be resolved here and it would be wiser to wait for clearer specimens to turn up rather than speculate further.

It is likely that the minting of these Latmian fractions was quite modest and probably occurred over a fairly short period of time. The five known specimens are from four obverse and five reverse dies. This suggests that the material is imperfectly known and that more new dies, and probably issues, are bound to surface in the future. Three issues can be distinguished. The two coins of Issue A might be the oldest because the style of the obverse head looks less developed, stiffer than on the other coins. Both specimens depict the same male head, but on one die it looks to the left, on the other to the right. They are quite worn and this does not allow an easy identification of the head. The Fitzwilliam coin head appears to have a beard, whereas the Troxell-Kagan head was described as beardless, but this is probably due to the fact the coin is very worn. Coins of Issue B have the two additional letters on the reverse monogram; the obverse bears a young female head to the right with hair in sphendone, although the hairstyle cannot be distinguished clearly because of the coins' poor condition. The single representative of Issue C has also a young female head to the right with the hair rolled up above the neck. What distinguishes this particular coin is the shape of the monogram which is bolder and angular. In the absence of attributes, identifying the male and the female heads is not an easy task. Might the bearded male head be the personification of mount Latmos?¹⁵ The city was also famous for its shrine of Endymion. However he is usually

Archepolis. Eine griechische Dynastie im Perserreich und ihre Münzprägung, in: *JNG* 48/49 (1998/1999), pp. 29-70.

¹³ The name of the city probably derives from the name of the sacred mountain, see *infra*, p. ?

¹⁴ p. ?

¹⁵ Although the Fitzwilliam specimen male head appears to have an individual feel to it, it would not make sense to regard it as a "portrait" of some ruler. There are no letters on the coin identifying a hypothetical ruler. In a similar vein, the male head flanked by the letters theta-epsilon that was identified as the portrait of Themistokles on the fractional coinage of Magnesia has now more convincingly been described as Hephaistos by Nollé, see footnote 11 for the references.

depicted as a young shepherd (mainly in later Roman art).¹⁶ The female head looks like an Aphrodite or a nymph, and the latter might be associated with the cult of Endymion. An obvious identification would be Selene who plays an important role in Endymion's myth.¹⁷ However if the male head is not Endymion, Selene is unlikely to have been depicted.

In *Annual Report 1996*, I dated the Fitzwilliam coin to c. 350 BC solely on the basis of style. The fact that the Troxell-Kagan specimen was allegedly found with coins that can be dated to the first half of the IVth century BC is important evidence and consistent with my own dating.¹⁸ Having said that, one cannot exclude that the Latmian issues might well have started earlier, around 400-380 BC, at a time when several neighbouring mints such as Magnesia, Euromos, and further south, Iasos and Mylasa were striking silver fractions. An event that may be important for the dating of our Latmian fractions is the advent of a bronze coinage in several cities of the Latmian gulf such as Myus and Priene in c. 400 BC, and slightly later, perhaps, in Naulochos.¹⁹ A close neighbour, Magnesia, also initiated a bronze coinage thereabouts. It is noteworthy that some of Latmos' closest neighbours, Myus and Naulochos, only struck small bronze coins and no silver, although new finds could change that. It is also interesting to note that while Latmos is regarded as a Carian city with a native Carian name, it preferred to use Greek rather than Carian on its coinage. This is in contrast with roughly contemporary Carian mints such as Mylasa, Keramos and Kaunos which all put the first two or three letters of their ethnics in Carian on their contemporary issues.²⁰ These cities are of course further south, well within Carian territory, whereas Latmos is on the border with Ionia where Carian influence may well have been less marked.²¹ The first half of the IVth century BC in Latmos sees the involvement of the Hekatomnids in the city's affairs. Latmos was certainly in the hands of Mausolos and the *terminus ante quem* for the city's coinage might well be the beginning of Mausolos' rule over Latmian territory.²²

All five specimens represent the same denomination with weights consistently ranging from 0.13g to 0.17g. The unique specimen of Issue C (Hauck & Aufhäuser, 158) is the best-preserved example and weighs 0.16g. If we take into account coin-wear and oxidation, the

¹⁶ See the Endymion entry in *LIMC* and *infra*, p. ?

¹⁷ There exists a marble relief head identified with Selene and dated to 460-450 which is very similar to the Latmian coin depiction, see *LIMC*.

¹⁸ Troxell and Kagan, *Cilician and Neighbors*, p. 281.

¹⁹ These coins were discussed at a conference organised in Bordeaux in May 2001 on the first bronze issues of Greece and Asia Minor. Since most of the coins we mention are either unpublished or have only appeared in auction catalogues without being properly assessed, it is best to wait for the publication of the Bordeaux papers rather than give incomplete references. The neighbouring city of Pidasia might have minted a small series of bronze coins (five specimens recorded with an average weight of 0.63g) in the early fourth century, see R. Ashton in R. Ashton *et al.*, *Some Greek Coins in the British Museum*, in: *NC* 158 (1998), p. 47, n. 40, pl. 16, B. Their reverse type is two letters: pi – iota within a dotted circle, and the unusual custom of using the letters of the issuing authority as the main coin-type at Magnesia and Latmos might have found a pendant at Pidasia. This certainly reinforces the attribution of these bronzes to Pidasia by Latmos.

²⁰ For Keramos, see K. Konuk, *Coin Evidence for the Carian Name of Keramos*, in: *Kadmos* 39 (2000, forthcoming); Kaunos, see K. Konuk, *The Early Coinage of Kaunos*, in: R. Ashton and S. Hurter (ed.), *Studies in Greek Numismatics in Memory of Martin Jessop Price* (London, 1998), p. 219. For Mylasa, see K. Konuk, *The Coinage of the Hekatomnids*, (unpublished DPhil, 1998, Oxford), p. 26 which discusses a unique silver fraction (SNG von Aulock, 7807) which has on the obverse two Carian letters: NE that are transcribed as MU and are the first two letters of the Carian ethnic of Mylasa. A detailed study of the early coinage of Mylasa is in preparation and will appear shortly.

²¹ It must be said that very little is known about the use of Carian in Latmos. Carian inscriptions from Caria (the bulk of known Carian texts are from Egypt) are from the second half of the Vth and IVth centuries, a relatively late period by which time Latmos, at the border of Ionia and Caria, must have witnessed the dominance of Greek over Carian, at least as far as official documents were concerned such as coins and inscriptions. However, before drawing any conclusion, one should await proper excavations, the city of Latmos having so far been only explored by means of surveys. Finding inscriptions in Carian cannot be excluded.

²² For the references see *infra*, p. ?

weight that was aimed at was probably just under 0.20g. The most widely used standard in that area *c.* 400-380 was the Milesian standard. Miletos was still striking its prolific lion-forepart obols until the end of the fifth century and the first satrap of Caria, Hekatomnos, adopted a reduced version of the Milesian standard that was already in use for the issues of Mylasa, the ancestral capital of the Hekatomnids. Tetartemoria (1/48th of a stater) on this standard were struck at Mylasa before and during Hekatomnos' rule and had a theoretical weight of *c.* 0.26g; even severely worn specimens hardly ever weigh less than 0.20g.²³ Hence it is unlikely that the Milesian standard was the one in use at Latmos. Nor is Persic standard a suitable candidate, for its tetartemoria are too heavy at *c.* 0.22g. The Rhodian standard, on the other hand, was already the most popular coin-weight in Ionian and Carian mints, and Hekatomnos was among the first in mainland Caria use it for his Zeus Labraundos-type tetradrachms. The Rhodian standard tetradrachm had a theoretical weight of *c.* 15,35g with a tertartemorion at *c.* 0.16g which is quite consistent with the Latmian weights. Alternatively, and perhaps more plausibly, the Attic standard, whose tertartemorion had a theoretical weight of *c.* 0.18g, would fit the Latmian weights perfectly, and had been already in use at Magnesia under Themistokles and Archepolis; there are in fact two tetartemoria of Themistokles weighing respectively 0.17g and 0.18g.²⁴

²³ For Mylasa, the coinage of Hekatomnos and the Milesian standard see K. Konuk, *Coinage of the Hekatomnids*, pp. 31-40.

²⁴ Nollé and Wenninger, *Themistokles und Archepolis*, p. 68, Th6a.

1 (x3)



2



(x3)



3



(x3)



4



(x3)



5



(x3)



Ω

ΑΩ

ΩΩ

ΑΑ