

1983

# The Chronology of the Fourth-Century B.C. Facing-Head Silver Coinage of Larissa

Thomas R. Martin  
tmartin@holycross.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [http://crossworks.holycross.edu/clas\\_fac\\_scholarship](http://crossworks.holycross.edu/clas_fac_scholarship)



Part of the [Ancient History, Greek and Roman through Late Antiquity Commons](#), and the [Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance and Baroque Art and Architecture Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Martin, Thomas R. "The Chronology of the Fourth-Century B.C. Facing-Head Silver Coinage of Larissa." *Museum Notes* (American Numismatic Society). 28 (1983): 1-34.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Classics Department at CrossWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Classics Department Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of CrossWorks.

## THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE FOURTH-CENTURY B.C. FACING-HEAD SILVER COINAGE OF LARISSA

(PLATE 1)

THOMAS R. MARTIN

The mint of Larissa was the most important and the most prolific civic mint in classical Thessaly. To judge from modern collections and the contents of hoards, a great deal of the mint's production came in the fourth century B.C. when the standard obverse type became a female facing head portrayed in a three-quarter view. More than fifty years ago, Fritz Herrmann published what remains the only attempt to establish a chronological arrangement for this important coinage in his article on the silver coinage of Larissa in Thessaly.<sup>1</sup> Since these numerous issues are distinguished only by often subtle variations in their obverse and reverse types and not by any overt indications of chronology, Herrmann's chronological scheme depended almost exclusively on his own criteria of style. He settled on ca. 395 B.C. as the date of the introduction of the new facing-head issues and 344/3 B.C. as the date when these coins ceased to be produced. Since these are the final issues of the city's mint, 344/3 B.C. also became the date when the minting of silver coinage at Larissa came to an end permanently.

<sup>1</sup> "Die Silbermünzen von Larissa in Thessalien," *Z/N* 35 (1924–25), pp. 1–69, hereafter cited as "Herrmann." Additional abbreviations are: *ACGC* = Colin Kraay, *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins* (Berkeley, 1976); and *CH* = *Coin Hoards* vols. 1–6 (London, 1975–81).

As we shall see, Herrmann established these chronological termini with historical rather than numismatic arguments.<sup>2</sup> His procedure was in itself reasonable, but in this case the arguments are too weak to stand. The lower terminus in particular, which carries with it important implications for numismatic and political history, is disturbing because Herrmann based it purely on the assumption that Philip II of Macedon suppressed the coinage of Larissa in 344/3 B.C. This notion was apparently too self-evident to require any documentation, and Herrmann offered none.

In fact, the question of the date of the end of civic coinage at Larissa is extremely difficult to answer with precision and assurance on current evidence. Nevertheless, the hoard evidence published since the appearance of Herrmann's article, although far less copious than one would like, indicates that the end of silver coinage at Larissa cannot be as early as 344/3 B.C. and, furthermore, that Herrmann's chronological arrangement of the fourth-century facing-head issues is suspect. The evidence calls for a re-examination of his scheme and the outlining in at least preliminary fashion of a new arrangement for these issues.<sup>3</sup>

A full-scale treatment of the chronology of these issues could only be attempted if a comprehensive die study were made of the enormous amount of material from the Larissa mint that survives in modern collections. Since that sort of study is not in immediate prospect for practical reasons, it seems desirable for the present to begin work on this coinage based on the currently available evidence. That evidence comes from Herrmann's own work and from hoards that have been well enough published to identify the coins of Larissa which they contain.<sup>4</sup> Many hoards that might contribute to this work do not fall into this category. I hope in time to be able to assemble by correspondence and autopsy the precise information on types and conditions of wear that will help to test and to refine the hypotheses that are formulated in this study.

<sup>2</sup> Herrmann, pp. 41, 50–51 (upper terminus); pp. 49, 58–59 (lower terminus).

<sup>3</sup> This study will focus almost exclusively on silver coinage. The bronze coinage of Larissa appears too infrequently in hoards to be studied in detail by the method adopted in this paper.

<sup>4</sup> The information on hoards comes in the first instance from *IGCH* and *CH*, vols. 1–6. Original publications have been consulted when they exist.

## HOARDS AND THE END OF SILVER COINAGE AT LARISSA

The broadest indication of chronology for these Larissan issues comes from the statistics on their occurrence in hoards. That is, one can hypothesize that the appearance of very small numbers of these coins in hoards of a certain period from an area where the coins are more numerous in hoards of earlier periods indicates that minting had severely declined or ceased. For this study, the obvious area to investigate is Thessaly. Coins of Larissa are very common in Thessalian hoards of the fourth century and become less common in hoards of the third century, but their almost complete absence from hoards of the second century points immediately to a terminus ante quem of ca. 200 B.C. for the end of civic coinage at Larissa. Of the 19 Thessalian hoards on record for the period ca. 200–100 B.C., only one has any coins of Larissa.<sup>5</sup> This numismatic evidence correlates with the historical evidence because the coinage of the reorganized Thessalian confederacy of the early second century served in place of civic coinages such as that of Larissa.<sup>6</sup>

Further evidence from hoards shows that the date for the end of coinage at Larissa comes much earlier than ca. 200 B.C. From published sources, I can identify 18 hoards of silver coins which were discovered in Thessaly (including the southern perioikic area) and have been assigned dates later than ca. 300 B.C. but earlier than the mid-second-century date of the first Thessalian hoards to contain coins of the Thessalian confederacy. Only seven of these hoards have coins of Larissa, and two of these include only a single specimen. Three of the five

<sup>5</sup> *CH* 6, no. 35 (5, no. 42): 3+ Larissa drachms in a total of 450+. The other eighteen hoards are *IGCH* 214, 220, 228, 234, 237, 239, 247, 289, 304, 305, 306, 313, 314, 315; *CH* 1, no. 83, 3, no. 57, 4, no. 56, 5, no. 45.

<sup>6</sup> On the establishment of this new federal organization, see J. A. O. Larsen, *Greek Federal States* (Oxford, 1968), pp. 281–94, especially p. 291 on its coinage. The silver coins of the Thessalian League are very common in Thessalian hoards of the second century: *IGCH* 239 with 1 of 52; 247 with only League coins, a total of 75+; 313 with 1192+ of 1199+; 314 with only League coins, a total of 36 (possibly part of no. 313); 315 (see *CH* 5, no. 45) with only League coins, a total of 203+; *CH* 1, no. 83, with only League coins, a total of 50+; 3, no. 57, with only League coins, a total of 38.

remaining hoards have small numbers of coins of Larissa, with only *IGCH* 168, a mid-third-century hoard, containing a large number of these coins, 156 of a total of 591.<sup>7</sup> As shall be shown, the coins of Larissa in this hoard are all the same type and generally quite worn. This evidence from the third century clearly contrasts with that based on Thessalian silver hoards from the fourth century. There are 22 such hoards, 11 of which contain coins of Larissa.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, the coins of Larissa represent 10% or more of the contents of 10 of these 22 hoards. The comparable statistic for hoards post 300 B.C. is three of 31. In sum, the pattern of the statistics on the frequency of the appearance of coins of Larissa in Thessalian hoards suggests that the mint of Larissa was no longer producing silver coins at least by the last half of the third century B.C.

It is difficult to estimate how early the terminus of this coinage can safely be put, as figures concerning the frequency of appearance in hoards are far too imprecise an indicator of chronology to provide any further help in this investigation. Rather, conclusions must be drawn from another indicator, an analysis of the comparative state of wear of the coins of Larissa and the coins of the Macedonian kings that appear together in hoards. Since the Macedonian coins can be more accurately dated on external criteria than can the coins of Larissa, this comparison can be exploited in the search for a plausible chronology of the facing-head issues.

Seventeen hoards are recorded as containing silver coins of Larissa and Macedonian regnal coinage, but regrettably, information on the state of wear of the relevant coins is available for only five of these

<sup>7</sup> In the following list, the identification number of each hoard is followed by the number of Larissan coins and the total number of coins in the hoard. *IGCH* 117, 1 of 38; 133, 0 of 11+; 141, 0 of 16; 144, 0 of 115; 146, 1 of 26; 150, 0 of 5000–7000; 159, 0 of 61; 162, 5 of 30; 168, 156 of 591+; 220, 0 of 10+; 228, 0 of 130; 234, 0 of 100–150; 237, 0 of 2500–3000. *CH* 1, no. 52, 0 of 75+; 3, no. 43 (2, no. 72), 4 of 38+; 4, no. 56, 0 of 162+; 6, no. 24, 26 of 569; 6, no. 35 (5, no. 42), 3+ of 450+.

<sup>8</sup> *IGCH* 45, 0 of 92+; 49, 0 of a small number; 52, a large number of ca. 2000; 55, 2 of 4+; 56, 7 of 16–18+; 57, 2 of 6; 58 (including *CH* 4, nos. 20–21, 5, no. 20), 541+ of 626+; 61, 13+ of 20+; 62, 0 of 1647+; 71, uncertain; 80, 0 of 12; 82, 0 of 37+; 93, 0 of 112; 96, 2 of 13; 97, 0 of 16; 111, 10 of ca. 69. *CH* 1, no. 25, 0 of 149; 1, no. 27, 0 of 6; 1, no. 33, 0 of 4+; 1, no. 40, 10 of 90+; 2, no. 51, 1 of 9+; 6, no. 20 (2, no. 52), 1 of 7.

hoards as a result of the generally brief publications of the hoards in question.<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless, it is possible to make some progress on this scanty evidence toward the construction of a cumulative case for a lower terminus for the facing-head issues of Larissa. Throughout this discussion I will refer to the facing-head issues, Herrmann's group 7, by means of Herrmann's alphabetically designated series, which will be discussed in detail later in this paper.

*IGCH* 385 from Macedonia, now dated by Georges Le Rider to ca. 337/6 B.C., has 62 drachms of Larissa from a total of at least 240 silver coins, of which 136 lifetime tetradrachms of Philip II are the most recent coins. Fifty-four tetradrachms and two drachms are illustrated in the published reports. Sixty of the drachms are the facing-head type, Herrmann's group 7, of which it seems 58 are series A or M.<sup>10</sup> The other drachms represent one specimen of series B, one of series C, E or F, and two of group 6 (not facing-head types).<sup>11</sup> The very limited size of the illustrated Larissa sample of course makes any conclusions tentative at best, but it is noteworthy for the sake of the cumulative force of the evidence that the two illustrated drachms are as little worn, if not less, than the majority of the tetradrachms, even those which Le Rider has identified as the most recent series of Philip's coins in the hoard, Pella group 2 A 2 (see, e.g., nos. 221 and 232 in Le Rider, pl. 10). For example, one can compare the condition of the hair and of the nose

<sup>9</sup> These 17 hoards are *IGCH* 70, 74, 76, 111, 117, 146, 162, 168, 385, 386; *CH* 1, no. 37, 1, no. 40, 2, no. 51, 3, no. 43 (2, no. 72), 6, no. 20 (2, no. 52), 6, no. 24, 6, no. 35 (5, no. 42).

<sup>10</sup> I will argue below that Herrmann's series A and M in fact represent only one series, which I will call A-M, with a subgroup to be called A-M 168.

<sup>11</sup> The original notice of this hoard is by Irene Varoucha-Christodouloupoulou, "Athenai-Antike," *ADelt* 19 (1964), pt. 2, 1 *chronika*, p. 8, pl. 1, nos. 2-7 (Philip), 8-9 (Larissa). The coins are fully described (except for the state of wear) and the date for the hoard is given by Georges Le Rider, *Le monnayage d'argent et d'or de Philippe II frappé en Macédoine de 359 à 294* (Paris, 1977; hereafter cited as "Le Rider"), pp. 286-89, 341-42, hoard no. 4. He illustrates 48 tetradrachms.

According to Le Rider, 58 drachms "appartiennent à la série courante (tête de la nymphe Larissa presque de face/cheval paissant)," which I take as a description of the type I will refer to as A-M. His catalogue does not allow a decision on whether the one specimen belongs to series C, E or F. Varoucha illustrates an A-M 168 and an A-M drachm respectively.

on the Larissa obverses, raised areas which are very susceptible to wear on this type of coin, with the condition of the hair and beard of the tetradrachm obverses. Similarly, the details of the representation of the horse on the reverse of the drachms appear to be, if not better, at least as well preserved, as comparable features on the horse on the tetradrachm reverses. Since smaller denominations like drachms tend to show wear more quickly than do larger denominations like tetradrachms due to their smaller surface area and faster circulation, it is worth pointing out that the drachms are as well preserved as the tetradrachms of Le Rider's thunderbolt-N series and are in fact better preserved than most of the tetradrachms which he places before this series. (See, for example, 187a and 193 in his pl. 8.) The evidence of *IGCH* 385 is certainly no barrier to believing that some of the facing-head issues of Larissa in the hoard are at least contemporary with the issues of Philip, the most recent of which Le Rider dates to the period ca. 342/1–ca. 337/6 B.C. Since under Herrmann's system the two drachms illustrated from *IGCH* 385 belong to his group 7, series A or M (as do 56 other coins in the hoard) and are therefore to be dated to ca. 395–363 B.C., it is easy to see how Herrmann's chronology of the facing-head issues is at variance with the hoard evidence.

Unfortunately it is impossible at this time to make a complete analysis of the comparative state of wear of the relevant coins of *IGCH* 386 from Macedonia ca. 340 B.C. Four of its 18 silver coins are drachms of Larissa, and the most recent coins are two lifetime tetradrachms of Philip. Both the tetradrachms and two of the drachms are illustrated in the publications of the hoard.<sup>12</sup> Of these four coins the most severely worn is Larissa drachm b, an example of Herrmann's series Q whose condition is not noted in the original publication (Plate 1, 1).<sup>13</sup> The other drachm which is illustrated, a, belongs to series C and is rated "bien." The two tetradrachms from Le Rider's group Pella 2 A 1 receive "très bien"

<sup>12</sup> The original publication is by Irene Varoucha-Christodouloupoulou, "Acquisitions du Musée Numismatique d'Athènes," *BCH* 86 (1962), pp. 417–18, pl. 9, nos. 4 (Philip), 5–6 (Larissa a and b). See Le Rider, p. 285, hoard 3, pl. 7, no. 169a, for the other tetradrachm.

<sup>13</sup> The reverse type, the rare dolphins on the obverse, and the treatment of the neckline clearly place this coin in series Q, which I will discuss below. The head on the obverse is gazing left, a variation not listed by Herrmann.

ratings, as do the two remaining drachms of Larissa. Although they are not illustrated, the published references show that these drachms belong to one of Herrmann's series K to M 1.<sup>14</sup> Difficulties in Herrmann's chronology immediately arise because the less worn Larissa drachms should according to Herrmann be dated to ca. 370–363 B.C., even though they are of a smaller denomination and apparently comparable in condition to the tetradrachms of ca. 348/7–ca. 343/2 B.C. Moreover, the drachm b, apparently significantly more worn than the drachms of series K to M 1, should by the same scheme be dated ca. 361–353 B.C. as part of series Q. It is of course impossible to draw firm conclusions from the condition of so few coins, but again this evidence is worth recording as part of the cumulative case in favor of a revised chronology of the facing-head issues.

The photographs provided with *Coin Hoards* 2, no. 52 (6, no. 20), permit a judgment on the state of wear of another relevant but tiny selection of coins. Discovered in Thessaly, of its seven coins the hoard includes one facing-head drachm of series A or M and, as its most recent coins, two tetradrachms of Alexander III from Babylon and one drachm from Miletus of Alexander III which belongs to the period ca. 325–323 B.C.<sup>15</sup> A comparison of the wear on this coin with that on the comparable denomination from Larissa indicates that the latter coin is in similar, perhaps even better condition. Both coins show signs of wear on the raised surfaces of the obverse, but the Larissa drachm seems to have a less worn reverse with a clear, sharp legend even below the ground line, a spot where wear is common on this type. The one illustrated Alexander tetradrachm is better preserved than either of the drachms with almost no visible signs of wear, while the tetradrachm of Philip, a posthumous issue from ca. 336/5–ca. 329/8 B.C., is comparably worn, especially on the obverse.<sup>16</sup> Since the Larissa drachm belongs to series A or M, dated ca. 395–363 B.C., the evidence of this hoard, too, undermines faith in Herrmann's chronology.

<sup>14</sup> Varoucha (above, n. 12), p. 418.

<sup>15</sup> This coin is part of the  $\Psi$  series, on which see Margaret Thompson, *Alexander's Drachm Mints I: Sardes and Miletus*, ANSNS 16 (1983), pp. 43–50.

<sup>16</sup> The coin belongs to Le Rider's group Pella 2 B, nos. 376–82.



No further information is currently available on other fourth-century hoards with coins of Larissa and Macedonia, but there are two third-century hoards to consider, one of which fortunately contains a large sample of relevant coins. The smaller hoard, *Coin Hoards* 3, no. 43 (2, no. 72), is from Thessaly ca. 229–228 B.C. The evidence of this hoard is problematical because the pattern of wear of the various issues included in it is very inconsistent and misleading.<sup>17</sup> The four drachms of Larissa which the hoard contains are severely worn, as one would expect of fourth-century issues by the date of this hoard. Likewise, the three Alexander drachms also show signs of much wear, although perhaps less than the coins of Larissa. However, all the drachms are so worn that it is probably futile to argue that one group is significantly more worn than the other, especially in the light of the peculiar pattern of wear exhibited in the hoard as a whole. The Larissa drachms are from series A or M. The Alexander drachms unfortunately cannot be identified precisely from the published photographs, but they are probably posthumous issues from the period ca. 320–300 B.C.<sup>18</sup> One perhaps would be justified in assuming that the Larissa drachms are roughly contemporary with or slightly older than the Alexander drachms, but such a judgment cannot be made with confidence. Criteria of comparative wear necessarily become more unreliable after coins have circulated for as long as these drachms seem to have done and therefore have become so very worn.

The one large hoard which I have examined personally is *IGCH* 168 from near Larissa, dated ca. 250 B.C. or perhaps later.<sup>19</sup> The relevant coins are 156 facing-head drachms of Larissa, series A or M, and 288 drachms of the standard Alexander type with the legends of Alexander, Philip III and Lysimachus. Almost all these Alexander-type drachms belong to the period ca. 325–300 B.C., but some of them are as recent as ca. 290 B.C. As a group the Larissa drachms are quite worn, as are the Alexander-type drachms except for the most recent examples. On the whole, the Larissa drachms are comparable in condition to the

<sup>17</sup> J. Morineau Humphris, *CH* 3, pp. 10–13, points this out.

<sup>18</sup> I am indebted to Margaret Thompson for this information.

<sup>19</sup> T. R. Martin, "A Third-Century B.C. Hoard from Thessaly at the ANS (*IGCH* 168)," *ANSMN* 26 (1981), pp. 51–77.

lifetime Alexander drachms and perhaps the early posthumous issues. For example in Plate 1, compare three typically worn Larissa drachms from this hoard, 2–4, with a lifetime Alexander drachm of Salamis, 5, and two of Miletus dated ca. 325–323 B.C., 6–7.<sup>20</sup> Since the size of the sample is larger in this case than in the others previously discussed, greater confidence can be placed in an analysis of comparative wear. In fairness to the evidence, however, an additional reservation must be admitted. Since *IGCH* 168 cannot have been hidden before the middle of the third century,<sup>21</sup> the fourth-century coins in the hoard could have circulated for over fifty years before their extraction from circulation for hoarding. In that span of time, a small denomination such as the drachm could be subjected to so much use that even coins of significantly different dates of issue could be worn down to a similar state of poor preservation. Alternatively, coins of the same date could exhibit different degrees of wear if some of them had been withdrawn from circulation for a period of time, as could have happened if some of the coins had been previously hoarded and then restored to circulation before being hoarded for the final time. In short, it would be foolhardy to claim undue precision or reliability for any conclusions based on an analysis of comparative states of wear. Nevertheless, the evidence of *IGCH* 168 is certainly striking because it agrees with the evidence of the other hoards already surveyed: coins dated by Herrmann early in the fourth century, in this case ca. 395–363 B.C., exhibit a pattern of wear comparable to that of coins of demonstrably more recent date, in this case of the 320s B.C., and perhaps a little beyond. To sum up, the evidence from published hoards militates against the assumption that the silver issues of Larissa ended as early as 344/3 B.C. and reveals serious problems in the chronology established by Herrmann for his group 7, the facing-head issues. As a result, there is a need to establish a more plausible date for the closing of the civic mint at Larissa and to examine the standard chronological arrangement of these coins.

<sup>20</sup> The Salamis drachm is no. 495 in Martin (above, n. 19); the Milesian drachms are nos. 107a and 118b in Margaret Thompson's study (above, n. 15).

<sup>21</sup> Martin (above, n. 19), pp. 66–70.

The 156 drachms of Larissa in *IGCH* 168 constitute the second largest group of coins of Larissa yet found in a single hoard.<sup>22</sup> In view of the large number of these drachms in the hoard, it is extremely remarkable that all these coins are one main type with a female facing head, three-quarters left on the obverse and a horse with three or four legs bent, grazing right on the reverse (Plate 1, 2–4). In no other recorded hoard with a sizable group of drachms of Larissa do we find this consistency of type. For example, *IGCH* 58 has at least ten different types.<sup>23</sup> Also noteworthy is the variety found in the types which closely resemble the one type found in *IGCH* 168. For example, in *IGCH* 58 the facing head can be left or right, as can the horse.<sup>24</sup> Significantly, *IGCH* 58 includes no Macedonian regnal coinage and therefore probably belongs to the second or third quarter of the fourth century before the coins of Philip and Alexander had made their way into Thessaly.<sup>25</sup>

As A. R. Bellinger was the first to point out, the startling uniformity of type of the drachms of Larissa in a third-century hoard should indicate that these coins are the most recent issues of the mint of Larissa;<sup>26</sup> otherwise, we would expect to find other contemporary or later types mixed in. But Bellinger's acute observation on the uniformity of types in *IGCH* 168 cannot be reconciled with Herrmann's chronological scheme. According to Herrmann all the coins of Larissa belong to series A or M and should therefore not have been issued after ca. 363 B.C.;<sup>27</sup> if this dating were correct, *IGCH* 168 with its large number of coins of Larissa should then definitely contain at least some of Herr-

<sup>22</sup> *IGCH* 58 (ca. 350 B.C. ?) has 266 drachms of Larissa, a total which can be raised to 541+ with the addition of *CH* 4, nos. 20–21; 5, no. 20.

<sup>23</sup> See n. 77. Notice of *CH* 6, no. 24 (270 B.C. with 25 Larissa drachms), reached me just as this article was going to press.

<sup>24</sup> See, e.g., coins 7 and 18 in fig. 1, *ArchAnAth* 2 (1969), p. 106.

<sup>25</sup> Since none of Philip II's coins turns up in Thessalian hoards earlier than late in the reign of Alexander (*IGCH* 80), the absence of Philip's coins from a Thessalian hoard does not mean that the hoard could not have been hidden as late as 340–330 B.C. Tony Hackens, in a general meeting (*RBN* 1967, p. 250), dated the hoard "d'avant Philippe II."

<sup>26</sup> "The Thessaly Hoard of 1938," *Congresso internazionale di numismatica Roma 1961*, vol. 2 *Atti* (Rome, 1965), pp. 57–60. Cf. *ACGC*, p. 117.

<sup>27</sup> That is, Herrmann's lower terminus for series M. The end of A he put in 370 B.C. See Herrmann, pp. 41, 44.

mann's later issues. In addition, the presence of a large number of the coins of Alexander in the hoard in contrast to the complete absence of the coins of Philip II represents a circumstantial argument in favor of placing the lower terminus of this type of Larissa drachms substantially later in the fourth century than Herrmann did.

Taken by itself, *IGCH* 168 presents a readily comprehensible picture of the fate of the silver coinage of Larissa. The earlier preference for a multiplicity of types and marked variation in similar types was abandoned in favor of an almost uniform type. This change probably took place some years or even decades before the closure of the mint, and in the ensuing period the older, more diverse types gradually disappeared from circulation as they were replaced by the new uniform issues. These final issues of Larissa continued to circulate for quite some time and became generally well worn because the mint was no longer open to receive and restrike worn silver. Since the new drachms of Alexander began to appear in Thessaly in large numbers in the last decades of the fourth century, they eliminated the necessity to renew local production of the customary drachm coinage even if conditions permitted the re-opening of the city mint in, say, the early third century. But, the retention of Herrmann's chronology for the facing-head issues of Larissa would make *IGCH* 168 evidence for dating the end of this coinage no later than 363 B.C., an impossibly early date. It is time to examine his system in detail.

### HERRMANN'S CHRONOLOGY

Herrmann arranged the facing-head issues of Larissa in chronological order from older to more recent primarily on the assumption of a gradual deterioration of the style of the female head on the obverse. The less the Larissa obverse resembled its model, the Kimonian Arethusa of Syracuse (Plate 1, 8), the more distant in time it had to be from its inspiration, or so the argument goes by implication.<sup>28</sup> Herrmann divided

<sup>28</sup> On the Arethusa type of Kimon and its imitation at Larissa, see Katherine P. Erhart, *The Development of the Facing Head Motif on Greek Coins and Its Relation to Classical Art* (New York, 1979), pp. 181–87, 241–43.

the facing-head issues of his group 7 into 19 series (*Reihen*) designated by letters of the alphabet from A (the oldest) to R (the most recent) with the letter J omitted and the letters M and N supplemented by M 1 and N 1.<sup>29</sup> The grouping in series depends on an analysis of style for the most part, and in the course of his discussion Herrmann forthrightly declared the difficulties and the limitations of his method of classification.<sup>30</sup> The assumption that die cutters at Larissa became worse rather than better at imitating the complex representation of Arethusa as they acquired more experience with the passage of time apparently bothered Herrmann, and he admitted that “auch braucht die Stilverschlechterung nicht immer spätere Zeit anzudeuten, sondern mag hier und da auch als Arbeit geringer Hände zu erklären sein, die gleichzeitig mit dem Meister arbeiteten. Meine Endziffern sind also oft vollkommen hypothetisch.”<sup>31</sup> He also expressed reservations about the relative chronology of all the facing-head issues outside the so-called “schöner Stil” series, that is, all the issues outside series A through I. In fact, Herrmann stated that his theory of a deterioration in style as a guide to chronology could not be easily applied to series K through R and that the alphabetic order of these groups did not necessarily represent a well-established relative chronology.<sup>32</sup> On the basis of work by K. Regling, Herrmann dated series A through I to ca. 395–370 B.C., series K through M 1 to ca. 370–363 B.C., series N through Q to ca. 361–353 B.C., and series R to 353–344/3 B.C.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Herrmann, pp. 41–49.

<sup>30</sup> Herrmann, pp. 49–59.

<sup>31</sup> Herrmann, p. 50.

<sup>32</sup> Herrmann, pp. 53–54. I have tried to provide a sufficient number of illustrations, but for the discussion which follows some readers may prefer to use the plates in Herrmann's article. Since his series are not indicated on the plates, I append for the readers' convenience a list of the examples of Herrmann's series as they are arranged on plates 5–8 in *Z/N* 35 (1924–25). Series A is represented by pl. 5, nos. 1–14; B by 5, nos. 15–19 and by 6, nos. 1–3; C by 6, nos. 4–6; D by 6, nos. 7–9; E by 6, no. 10; F by 6, nos. 11–13; G by 6, no. 14; H by 6, no. 15; I by 6, nos. 16–19; K by 7, nos. 1–3; L by 7, nos. 4–5; M by 7, nos. 6–8; M 1 by 7, nos. 9–10; N by 7, no. 12; N 1 by 7, no. 13; O by 7, nos. 14–17, and by 8, nos. 1–2; P by 8, no. 3; Q by 8, nos. 4–8; R by 8, nos. 9–16.

<sup>33</sup> Regling's arguments are quoted by Herrmann, pp. 59–63.

Herrmann's own words sufficiently demonstrate that his arrangement of the facing-head issues is too insecurely based to stand against the evidence from hoards that has already been surveyed. In the tradition of Barclay Head's canon developed for the coinage of Syracuse that a worse style meant a more recent date, Herrmann evidently found it natural to organize his chronological scheme on the basis of a gradually developing "Stilverschlechterung."<sup>34</sup> There is, however, no need to assume any necessarily progressive evolution of style, for the worse or for the better, in the issues of a large and productive mint like that of Larissa. One might compare the style of the female head found on Roman Republican denarii, whose dates are approximately known. The style of this head is not a reliable guide to the relative chronology of the denarii.

Nevertheless, of necessity Herrmann based his chronology on considerations of style. It was obviously difficult to establish absolute dates for his series, but the dates about which Herrmann felt the most confidence were those of his series R, the final fourth-century issues of the mint of Larissa in his opinion. Since these coins bore the name of a man whom Herrmann took to be tyrant of Larissa from 353 to 344/3 B.C. as a minion of Philip II of Macedon, he could peg series R to that period and then align all the other alphabetical series to run backwards in time toward the fifth century.<sup>35</sup> Since Herrmann's chronology depends on his dates for series R, it is important to make clear the nature of the evidence on which those dates are based.

Herrmann derived his absolute dates for series R from G. F. Hill's interpretation of the tiny inscription ΣΙΜΟ which appears on these coins.<sup>36</sup> In brief, Hill's argument is that Simos, while serving as Philip's tyrant in Larissa, placed his own name on the city's coins during the period between Philip's intervention in Thessaly on the side of Larissa against Pherae in 353 B.C. and Philip's reorganization of the Thessalian tetrarchies in 344/3 B.C.<sup>37</sup> The historical evidence used to link the coins

<sup>34</sup> On Head's canon, see C. H. V. Sutherland, *ANSMN* 4 (1950), p. 1.

<sup>35</sup> Herrmann, pp. 58–59.

<sup>36</sup> *Historical Greek Coins* (London, 1906), pp. 93–97. Kraay, *ACGC*, p. 119, refers to the Simos issues as a "fixed point" based on Hill's arguments.

<sup>37</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.35, 38 (intervention); Dem. 9.26 (tetrarchies). For detailed discussion of the intervention, see N. G. L. Hammond and G. T. Griffith, *A History*

of series R with this period, however, is tenuous. Above all, it is clear that Philip exploited the situation in Thessaly to his own advantage by maintaining a façade of constitutional normalcy as far as possible. For example, he led the Thessalians not in his capacity as the Macedonian king but as the chosen leader of the Thessalian confederacy, a post he secured in the late 350s B.C.<sup>38</sup> Since this leader customarily issued no coins under his own name nor did he interfere in civic coinage, it is very unlikely that Philip himself made any changes in the traditional coinages of Thessaly or that he encouraged others to do so.<sup>39</sup> Furthermore, Philip seems to have avoided overt interference in the traditional forms of civic government in Thessaly for the most part in order to make propagandistic use of an official policy of preserving or restoring the “ancestral constitution” of Thessaly.<sup>40</sup> Tyrants in the cities were not part of that policy, and Philip consistently intervened in Thessaly to expel tyrants, not to install them.<sup>41</sup> The position adopted by Herrmann which dates the coins of series R on the assumption that the inscription “Simo” refers to Philip’s tyrant in Larissa is untenable.

of Macedonia. Vol. II. 550–336 B.C. (Oxford, 1979), pp. 267–81 (Griffith); T. R. Martin, “Diodorus on Philip II and Thessaly in the 350s B.C.,” *ClassPhil* 76 (1981), pp. 188–201. On the tetrarchies, see Griffith, pp. 528–34.

<sup>38</sup> For Philip’s leadership of this confederacy, see Griffith (above, n. 37), pp. 220–23; Marta Sordi, *La lega tessala fino ad Alessandro Magno* (Rome, 1958), pp. 249–60.

<sup>39</sup> The only leader of the confederacy to issue coins with his name inscribed on them was the tyrannical Alexander of Pherae, whose leadership was contested by the members of the confederacy because of its revolutionary character. See Sordi (above, n. 38), pp. 193–234 on Alexander and pp. 334–39 on the normal functions and privileges of the leader of the confederacy (the *lagos* or *archon*).

<sup>40</sup> Philip’s reorganization of Thessalian federal government meant that he could forge effective control of the cities without subverting their traditional civic governments. On Philip’s ostensible respect for Thessalian tradition, cf. Griffith (above, n. 37), p. 534; J. R. Ellis, *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism* (London, 1976), p. 140. If, as Ellis, pp. 141–42, 238, and M. Sordi, “La dracma di Aleuas e l’origine di un tipo monetario di Alessandro Magno,” *AJIN* 3 (1956), p. 20, suggest, the Thessalian confederacy under Philip issued a federal bronze coinage, there was a federal silver coinage of the fifth century as a precedent. For this latter coinage, see Peter Franke, “ΦΕΘΑΛΟΙ—ΦΕΤΑΛΟΙ—ΠΕΤΘΑΛΟΙ—ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΙ. Zur Geschichte Thessaliens im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.,” *AA* 85 (1970), pp. 85–93.

<sup>41</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.14.1–2, 35, 38, 69.8.

The matter does not end here, however, because subsequent attempts to maintain the chronological connection between series R and a career for Simos in the 350s and 340s B.C. have taken another direction. The consensus is that at some point after the entry of Philip into Thessalian affairs in the 350s, Simos became tyrant of Larissa without the help of Philip and indeed contrary to his wishes. Philip therefore intervened in 344 B.C. to expel Simos and his fellow Aleuads from Larissa, thus putting an end to series R.<sup>42</sup> The evidence used to support this reconstruction is, as in the previous case, insufficient. The clearest piece of evidence is Demosthenes' brief reference to a Eudikos and Simos of Larissa who were called friends of Philip until they had put Thessaly into Philip's hands.<sup>43</sup> The implication seems to be that Simos along with the other collaborators mentioned in the same passage suffered exile as the penalty for Philip's lost favor, but the chronology is not specified.<sup>44</sup> The rest of the evidence is either too vague to be of help or completely worthless.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>42</sup> See Griffith (above, n. 37), pp. 525–26; Ellis (above, n. 40), pp. 137–38; Helmut Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen* (Darmstadt, 1967), pp. 295, 672; Sordi (above, n. 38), pp. 286, 364–68; H. D. Westlake, *Thessaly in the Fourth Century B.C.* (London, 1935), pp. 190–91.

<sup>43</sup> *De Cor.* 48.

<sup>44</sup> In any case, Demosthenes cannot be trusted implicitly in such assertions about the fate of collaborators. For example, Aristartos of Sicyon and Perilaos of Megara, who are named as exiles after the list in which Simos appears, reappear later in the same oration in a list which names traitors who gave away the freedom of their cities first to Philip and now to Alexander (*De Cor.* 295–96). One might also notice Euthykrate of Olynthos, another friend of Philip, who Demosthenes says “came to the worst ruin of all” after betraying his city to the king (*Dem.* 8.40). Hypereides reports that the same man was alive and apparently influential even after 338 B.C. (frag. 76 OCT = frag. B 19.1, LCL *Minor Attic Orators*, vol. 2).

<sup>45</sup> Harpokration, s. v. “Σίμος,” says only that Simos was an Aleuad who seemed to have cooperated with Philip. Aristotle at *Pol.* 1306a25–30 refers to a Simos in describing an incident at Larissa in which an oligarchic government was made into a tyranny, but his description is so compressed that it is very uncertain what role this Simos played. The date of the incident is in any case unknown. Diod. Sic. 16.69.8 succinctly reports that in 344/3 B.C. Philip “expelled the tyrants from the cities” in Thessaly, but the cities are not named. Pherae was certainly one, but Pagasae is more likely than Larissa to have been another. Polyae. 4.2.11 does not indicate that Philip expelled the Aleuads from Larissa because, according to this story, the Aleuads forestalled any action to undermine their position. This passage



It is possible to summarize as follows the historical evidence which bears on Simos and the coins of series R. A certain Simos, a noble of Larissa, was involved in the summoning of Philip to Thessaly in the 350s B.C. for help against the tyrants of Pherae. At some point after he and a confederate, in the words of Demosthenes, "had put Thessaly into Philip's hands," Simos lost the special favor of the Macedonian king. We do not know when the loss occurred or with what specific consequences for Simos. For example, if in this context Demosthenes meant by "putting Thessaly into Philip's hands" the reorganization of the Thessalian tetrarchies in (it seems) 344 B.C.,<sup>46</sup> a plan which Simos could have helped Philip to devise, the loss of favor could have meant only that Philip betrayed Simos' hopes by failing to make him one of the tetrarchs and not that Simos was driven from Larissa.<sup>47</sup> In sum, it is certain that Simos cannot have been Philip's tyrant at Larissa from 353 to 344/3 B.C., as Herrmann believed, and if he ever exercised tyrannical power in this period, it would have been in 345–344 B.C. for only as long a time as it took Philip to return to Thessaly and unseat him.<sup>48</sup>

By now it should be clear that the historical evidence used to date the coins of series R to the period 353–344/3 B.C. is largely a mirage, changing its appearance or even completely fading away in substance depending on the point of view of the interpreter. The consequences of the unsatisfactory nature of the historical evidence are obvious. There is no choice but to look above all at the evidence of the coins themselves in any attempt to give a date to series R and to the other series of the facing-head coinage of Larissa.

is evidence only for tension between the king and his collaborators, nothing more. Finally, the scholia to Dem. 1.22 and 2.14 are worthless because they confuse the Aleuads of Larissa with the tyrants of Pherae.

<sup>46</sup> Griffith (above, n. 37), pp. 528–35.

<sup>47</sup> The names of only two tetrarchs are attested, but neither is Simos: Theopomp. *FGrH* 115 frag. 209; *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 274, no. 8; Ellis (above, n. 40), pp. 141, 276, n. 64.

<sup>48</sup> This is essentially the view of Westlake (above, n. 42) and Ellis (above, n. 40), and the date is established as follows. The stasis described by Aristotle occurred in peacetime (*Pol.* 1306a26), therefore after the peace of 346 B.C. The best time for Simos to have become tyrant against Philip's wishes was while the king was away fighting the Illyrians in 345 B.C. (*Isoc. epist.* 2.3; G. L. Cawkwell, *Classical Quarterly* 13 [Oxford, 1963], pp. 126–27). Philip intervened in 344 B.C. (*Diod. Sic.* 16.69.8).

## NUMISMATIC EVIDENCE FOR A NEW CHRONOLOGY

## RELATIVE CHRONOLOGY

According to Herrmann, series R and its neighbor, series Q, are the most recent issues of the mint at Larissa, dated ca. 361–344/3 B.C. A glance at their obverses and reverses shows why Herrmann put these coins together (Plate 1, 9 = R, 10 = Q). On the obverse, one sees a rather elongated version of the female facing head ultimately derived from Kimon's head of Arethusa on the coins of Syracuse. On the reverse, the horse in series Q and most of R grazes with all four legs extended instead of crouching in the position which G. F. Hill described as "about to lie down" which is so common on the other series at Larissa.<sup>49</sup> This grazing horse is replaced by a prancing horse on some specimens of R.<sup>50</sup> As for the legend on the reverse, R regularly has  $\Lambda\text{API}$ , which also occurs in Q along with  $\Lambda\text{API}\Sigma\text{AI}$ . Particularly noteworthy in these series are several details in the treatment of the obverse type. First, all the examples assigned by Herrmann to Q exhibit a scalloped or indented neckline on the female head.<sup>51</sup> This particular refinement otherwise appears on a facing-head coinage, oddly enough, only on the Arethusa-type imitations from Carthaginian Motya around the very early years of the fourth century B.C.<sup>52</sup> Second, in Q certainly, and perhaps in R as well, the nymph is wearing a chlamys fastened by a

<sup>49</sup> NC 1923, p. 220.

<sup>50</sup> Herrmann, p. 48, lists two examples. He says he cannot decide whether specimen alpha is genuine, not having seen it in person, because its reverse resembles a forgery by Christodoulos. The reverse of specimen beta is described as "wohl derselbe Stempel," but he expresses no doubt about its authenticity. This coin he had seen personally in the Berlin collection on which he worked for this article on the coinage of Larissa (p. 2). See below, n. 87.

<sup>51</sup> Herrmann, p. 47.

<sup>52</sup> On the facing-head issues of Motya, see G. K. Jenkins, "Coins of Punic Sicily," SNR 1971, p. 31, and Erhart (above, n. 28), pp. 233–34. Erhart suggests in n. 481 that this indented neckline may be Punic in origin. It also appears on the profile heads of some fifth-century Syracusan issues, e.g. Kurt Regling, *Die griechischen Münzen der Sammlung Warren* (Berlin, 1906), nos. 331–33.

button or similar clasp at the base of her neck.<sup>53</sup> Like the scalloped neckline, the chlamys is not characteristic of Kimon's Arethusa but rather appears on fourth-century facing-head issues from western Asia Minor which carry a representation of Apollo.<sup>54</sup> Third, all the issues of Q and all but one of R lack the necklace characteristic of other facing-head series at Larissa (except P), and the earrings common in other series are generally absent as well.<sup>55</sup> Finally, series Q exhibits one additional oddity. Some specimens from this series have dolphins alongside the facing head on the obverse, which otherwise appear nowhere else in the facing-head coinage of Larissa.<sup>56</sup> The dolphins presumably reflect the influence of the dolphins to be seen sporting in the hair of Arethusa as depicted by Kimon, but on these coins of Larissa, as on the facing-head issues of Motya, the dolphins are placed around the nymph's hair rather than in it.<sup>57</sup>

In sum, the issues of R share a number of the characteristics which serve to distinguish series Q from the other series in Herrmann's classification. Therefore, his decision to place these series together seems reasonable based on their overall similarities, although, as I see it, the two series are probably not exactly contiguous.<sup>58</sup> But we can no longer accept Herrmann's chronology which makes these series the last silver coins of Larissa because that position belongs to the type found in *IGCH* 168. Furthermore, the grounds on which Herrmann based his

<sup>53</sup> The chlamys is clearly visible in Herrmann's illustrations of Q. On nos. 11 and 12 of Herrmann's pl. 8 from series R, there is a bulge along the neckline that might be the fold of a chlamys, but the spot where the button or clasp should appear is off the flan on both these coins. Herrmann recognized this bulge but wrongly called it a necklace. See n. 55. If it should be proven from other examples of R that a chlamys does occur in this series, one should then consider moving R close to the start of the facing-head issues.

<sup>54</sup> See the issues of Klazomenai, Miletus and the satraps of Karia described by Erhart (above, n. 28), pp. 213–19.

<sup>55</sup> Herrmann, pp. 47–48, who failed to recognize the chlamys, erroneously described the fold of this garment fastened at the neck as a necklace on the coins of these series. Herrmann's series R, coin beta, is his only example with earrings in the series.

<sup>56</sup> Herrmann, pl. 8, 8, and Varoucha (above, n. 12), pl. 9, 6. See Plate 1, 1, for a reproduction of the latter specimen.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Erhart (above, n. 28), p. 233.

<sup>58</sup> See the discussion which follows on the order of the series.

absolute dates for Series R are unreliable. The same observation applies to the chronology of series Q. Herrmann dated these coins to the period ca. 361–353 B.C. on the grounds that they were the series just before R, whose start he put in 353 B.C., but were later than the issue inscribed ΑΛΕΥ (Herrmann's group 8), which he dated to the period ca. 363–361 B.C.<sup>59</sup> But just as 353 B.C. has no claim to authoritative status as a chronological fixed point, neither does 361 B.C. because no compelling stylistic or hoard evidence can be marshalled to date these coins. First, the obverse and reverse types of this "Aleuas issue" are so markedly different from those of the other facing-head issues that it makes little sense to attempt to date the issue closely on the basis of style (Plate 1, 11).<sup>60</sup> Second, the hoards are of no help because no examples of this issue are on record from any hoard. In the absence of any relatively objective criteria for dating, scholars are forced to rely on interpretations of the types and legend of the issue as the basis for their chronological suggestions. In this way Herrmann arrived at his date of ca. 363–361 B.C.<sup>61</sup> In the same manner, Marta Sordi has subsequently argued that the Aleuas issue belongs considerably later in the century at the start of the reign of Alexander the Great, probably in 336 B.C.<sup>62</sup> Sordi's arguments are intricate and exhaustive, but when two such different chronological conclusions can be drawn from the same evidence, it is necessary to admit that we cannot in truth date these coins with any confidence. Since the Aleuas issue is not precisely dated, it cannot safely be used as a chronological peg from which to hang other facing-head issues. In other words, Herrmann's date of ca. 361 B.C.

<sup>59</sup> Herrmann, pp. 60, 63–66.

<sup>60</sup> Obv. ΑΛΕΥ, male helmeted head facing l., double ax; rev. ΛΑΡΙΣΑΙΑ ΕΛΛΑ eagle on lightning bolt l.

<sup>61</sup> Herrmann, pp. 64–66. His most substantive argument rests on his interpretation of the legend ΛΑΡΙΣΑΙΑ as contemporary with the similar adjectival legends on the coins of Alexander of Pherae, but this legend appears on several other issues of Larissa, some of which Herrmann dates as early as the fifth century, e.g. groups 3 D, E, F and G (Herrmann, pp. 21–22). It is obvious that this criterion is ambiguous at best in this case. For the view that the coin was issued by Jason of Pherae, see H. T. Wade-Gery, "Jason of Pherae and Aleuas the Red," *JHS* 44 (1924), pp. 63–64, with references to earlier attributions by various scholars.

<sup>62</sup> "La dracma di Aleuas e l'origine di un tipo monetario di Alessandro Magno," *AIIN* 3 (1956), pp. 9–22.

as the upper terminus of series Q is just as unsubstantiated as is his lower terminus of 353 B.C. We are free to place Herrmann's final series, Q and R, wherever they appear to belong based on the numismatic evidence.

The record of the various types of the facing-head issues as they occur in hoards helps to provide a rough guide to the relative chronology of these coins. In the latest hoards to contain coins of Larissa, instead of specimens from Herrmann's final series Q or R, there are only examples which he would put earlier than these series.<sup>63</sup> In fact, with the exception of four well-worn didrachms in *IGCH* 162, all the coins of Larissa in the hoards of the third and second centuries B.C. whose contents have been adequately described are the same type.<sup>64</sup> These drachms carry on the obverse the familiar female facing head turned slightly to the left and on the reverse a horse to the right in an odd crouching position with bent legs.<sup>65</sup> The reverse legend is uniformly the genitive plural ethnic, ΛΑΡΙΣΑΙΩΝ, with part of the word inscribed above the horse and part below in the exergue (Plate 1, 2-4). This is of course exactly the type found in *IGCH* 168 which Bellinger identified as the final issue of the mint of Larissa. Under Herrmann's classification, the didrachms of *IGCH* 162 belong to series A and *IGCH* 168 type drachms belong to A or M. One must say A or M because the drachms of these two series are, in my opinion, too similar to represent different series. Herrmann's explanation as to why the coins of A and M should constitute two series appears to rest above all on the assumption that the coins of M do not achieve the "beautiful style" of the coins of A, although he does claim that the facing head of A always has earrings but that of M does not and that the nymph's lips are more closely pressed together in M.<sup>66</sup> Herrmann's judgment on the style and lips of M seems to me subjective, and, to judge from Herrmann's own plates, earrings

<sup>63</sup> I should reiterate that my discussion of the hoard evidence depends on currently published information.

<sup>64</sup> *IGCH* 168 (Thessaly, ca. 250-240); *CH* 3, no. 43 (2, no. 72, Thessaly, ca. 229-228); *IGCH* 232 (Euboea, ca. 171-169).

<sup>65</sup> The one drachm of Larissa in *IGCH* 162 (Thessaly, ca. 250) is described only as "of the fourth century," but it seems very unlikely that this coin is not the same type as the other drachms in late hoards.

<sup>66</sup> Herrmann, pp. 41, 45, 55.

are not always visible on the coins of A. (See, for example, Herrmann's pl. 5, 12, from series A, and his pl. 7, 8, from series M.) I will therefore treat the coins of A and M as one series, to be called A-M. The subgroup of A-M found in *IGCH* 168 which has the nymph three-quarters left and the horse right will be called A-M 168.

If one proceeds backwards in time in terms of the dates of the hoards in which coins of Larissa appear whose types can be determined, the next relevant hoards are six which belong to the 330s and 320s B.C. The types in these hoards support the claim of A-M 168 to the status of the final issue of the mint of Larissa. In two of these hoards there is only a single drachm of Larissa, in both cases an A-M 168 type.<sup>67</sup> The only hoard in this group with a large number of Larissa drachms is *IGCH* 385 with A-M and A-M 168 types as 58 of its 62 specimens from this city. As mentioned earlier, the other drachms belong to series C, E or F (one specimen), B (one) and group 6 (two).<sup>68</sup> Herrmann placed group 6 at the beginning of the fourth century.<sup>69</sup> Two other hoards in this period have two drachms of Larissa in each, an A-M and a "K or Q" type in one hoard and one D and one E type in the other.<sup>70</sup> We are now beginning to encounter types other than A-M 168, but unfortunately it is not possible at this time to report on the condition of the great majority of these coins. The situation improves somewhat in the sixth hoard of this group, *IGCH* 386.<sup>71</sup> This is the hoard that has two drachms from one of Herrmann's series K to M 1 which are described as "très bien" in condition, an E type in "bien," and a Q type whose condition is not rated but which appears to be more worn than the E coin in the published photographs.<sup>72</sup>

<sup>67</sup> *IGCH* 76 (Messenia, ca. 327); *CH* 2, no. 52 (6, no. 20, Thessaly, ca. 323–320).

<sup>68</sup> See n. 11.

<sup>69</sup> Herrmann, p. 40.

<sup>70</sup> *CH* 1, no. 37, in Le Rider, pp. 290–92, hd. 5, Macedonia, ca. 337/6, and pp. 292–93, hd. 6, in commerce, ca. 337/6. The date of these hoards is derived from the coins of Philip of Le Rider's group Pella 2 A 2 of ca. 342/1–ca. 337/6 B.C. The identifications of the Larissa drachms are Le Rider's.

<sup>71</sup> See n. 12.

<sup>72</sup> Varoucha (above, n. 12), p. 418, pl. 9, 5 (E) and 6 (Q). Since the two drachms of K to M 1 are not illustrated, it is impossible to determine their precise series. I suspect it is M, i.e. A-M.

The next hoards in this survey provide limited but useful information. One worn didrachm, the denomination Herrmann places with series A, appears in at least one hoard of ca. 348 B.C., and several more are perhaps included in a contemporary hoard.<sup>73</sup> Another small hoard of approximately the same date contains at least one drachm of Herrmann's fifth-century group 3 D.<sup>74</sup> The final hoards to be treated are those regarded as the earliest ones on record as containing coins of Larissa. Both are large hoards whose contents can only be partially described at present, but their evidence is valuable.<sup>75</sup> Both hoards come from Thessaly, and neither contains any Macedonian regnal coinage. This absence of the coinage of the Macedonian kings is not a very precise chronological indication because no Macedonian coins appear in Thessalian hoards until the reign of Alexander.<sup>76</sup> Since the other Greek coinages in these hoards are not easily dated themselves, the mid-fourth-century date given these two hoards in *IGCH* must be regarded as tentative. Their date could be later in the century. In any case, both hoards exhibit a mixture of Larissa types in which A-M 168 appears to be the most numerous and, as a group, the least worn.<sup>77</sup>

<sup>73</sup> *IGCH* 371 (Macedonia, ca. 348) with one; *IGCH* 56 (Thessaly, ca. 350) with one or two (?). The contents and the date of the latter hoard are uncertain. The date for *IGCH* 371 rests on the presence of coins of the Chalkidian League and the absence of any coins of Philip II. See n. 100.

<sup>74</sup> *IGCH* 55 (Thessaly, ca. 350?).

<sup>75</sup> *IGCH* 52 (Larissa environs, before 350); 58 (Atrax, ca. 350). The latter hoard's contents are supplemented by *CH* 4, no. 21, and 5, no. 20.

<sup>76</sup> As the record stands now, the first Thessalian hoards to contain Macedonian regnal coins are *IGCH* 80, *CH* 2, no. 51 and *CH* 2, no. 52 (*CH* 6, no. 20). All of these hoards contain coins of both Philip II and Alexander III, and their dates are ca. 323–320 B.C.

<sup>77</sup> The following list identifies the types, as closely as can be determined from photographs, of all the coins that are illustrated in the publications of *IGCH* 52 and 58 according to Herrmann's classification as modified to include A-M and A-M 168 as separate categories.

*IGCH* 52 in *ADelt* 19 (1964), pt. 2, 1 *chronika*, pl. 1: 13 = group 4; 14–16 = F; 17 = A-M 168; 18 = A-M; 19 = N 1, Q or R; 20 = O or R. Hirsch 34, 21–22 Feb. 1963: 1187–89 = group 3H; 1190 = A (didrachm); 1191–95 = A-M 168; 1196 = A-M; 1197–98 = E; 1199 = O?; 1200 = D. Hirsch 35, 25–28 June 1963: 341–44 = A-M 168; 345–46 = E; 347 = F; 348 = O; 349–50 = O, Q or R; 351 = B.

*IGCH* 58 in *ArchAnAth* 2 (1969), pp. 106–7, figs. 1–2: 1 = group 6; 2–7, 9 =

The facing-head coins which consistently show signs of considerable wear are those belonging to Herrmann's series M 1, N, N 1, O, P, Q and R.<sup>78</sup> This evidence agrees with that of the other hoards surveyed and provides the basis for a realignment of the facing-head series. In this realignment, the earliest issues will be Q, one of those which Herrmann made the latest, and the latest issue will be A-M 168, a particular variety of two series, A and M, which, in my opinion, are in fact the same. Unfortunately the evidence of the hoards does not indicate precisely how to arrange the other series.

The most distinctive of the facing-head series is Q because it is the only one to have dolphins around the nymph's head on some examples (Plate 1, 1). Since these dolphins recall those of the late fifth-century Arethusa type of Syracuse on which the Larissa imitation is based, it makes sense to think that this particular detail was copied at Larissa on the mint's early copies of the prototype and was then omitted from later dies, perhaps because dolphins were an inappropriate accompaniment for the nymph who represented a landlocked city such as Larissa. These dolphins could mean that Q is at the beginning of Larissa's facing-head issues.<sup>79</sup>

Other indications help to confirm this view. First, the indented or scalloped neckline of the nymph on the coins of Q recalls the same detail on fifth-century issues of Syracuse with a profile head and facing-head issues of Motya from ca. 400 B.C.<sup>80</sup> Second, since the chlamys which the

A-M 168; 8, 10-12 = A-M; 13 = C; 14 = F; 15 = B; 16 = G; 17 = H; 18-19 = L; 20 = O or P; 21 = N; 22 = O; 23 = M 1, N, O or P; 24 = R.

<sup>78</sup> Notice, for example, in *IGCH* 52, Hirsch 35, nos. 348-50; in *IGCH* 58, *ArchAn-Ath*, fig. 2, nos. 23-24.

<sup>79</sup> An analogous situation exists in the appearance of a solitary dolphin beside the female facing head modeled after Arethusa which occurs on the coinage of the satrap Pharnabazos minted at Tarsos. The dolphin appears on what (to judge from the style) is perhaps the earliest issue of this type but then disappears on later issues of Pharnabazos and continues to be missing on the similar coins of Datames from the same mint. For these coins, see *SNGvAutlock* 5916-24 (Pharnabazos) and 5934-42 (Datames). No. 5916 definitely has a dolphin. From the photographs, it is not possible to determine whether 5917-18 also have a dolphin or just a die break in the same area. On the imitation of the Syracusan Arethusa at Tarsos, see *ACGC*, pp. 118-19, 281-82.

<sup>80</sup> See n. 52.



nymph wears in Q and P, but not in later series, was a characteristically Thessalian garment which seems to be very rare in depictions of women and was therefore likely to attract notice, it could be explained as a detail introduced on early issues to emphasize that the lady was indeed Thessalian despite her resemblance to the Syracusan nymph and occasional representation in company with very un-Thessalian dolphins.<sup>81</sup> Once the nymph was familiar in her new facing-head pose, this rather mannish attribute could be dropped.

As for the reverse, it too is comfortable at the beginning of these issues because the straight-legged grazing horse resembles the horse on the obverse of the coins which Herrmann makes the very earliest issues of Larissa at the start of the fifth century.<sup>82</sup> More importantly, the legends which appear on coins of Q are those of the undeniably earlier issues of Larissa in Herrmann's groups 1–3 rather than the genitive plural ethnic spelled with omega of the issues like A–M 168 which belong at the end of the coinage of Larissa.<sup>83</sup> Some specimens have  $\Lambda\text{API}$

<sup>81</sup> Others beside Thessalians of course wore the chlamys, but the garment's nickname ("Thessalian wings") attests its particular association with Thessaly. The chlamys is worn by the youths who appear on fifth-century coins of Larissa as participants in the Thessalian sport of bull-leaping (e.g., Herrmann, pl. 3, 16–23). On bull-leaping, see *RE*, Ser. 2, 9, s.v. "*ταυροχαθάρια*," cols. 24–27 (Ziehen). The chlamys was a male garment only rarely shown on female figures in art. See *RE* 6, s.v. "*χλαμύς*," cols. 2343–45 (Amelung); *DarSag* 1, s.v. "chlamys," pp. 1114–16; Margarete Bieber, *Griechische Kleidung* (Berlin, 1928), pp. 22–24.

<sup>82</sup> Herrmann, p. 3, group 1, pl. 1, 1–3.

<sup>83</sup> The appearance in *IGCH* 52 and 55 as well as in the excavations at Olynthos of worn specimens of group 3 confirms the early date of these coins. For *IGCH* 52, see n. 77; for *IGCH* 55, see *BCH* 84 (1960), pl. 7, 2; for Olynthos, see David M. Robinson and Paul M. Clement, *Excavations at Olynthos*, pt. 9 (Baltimore, 1938), p. 242, pl. 32, 14.

Herrmann's groups 1 and 3 have  $\Lambda\text{API}\Sigma\text{AION}$  as one of their legends, but this form of the genitive plural ethnic is distinguished from the later form by the use of omicron instead of omega. The legend in group 6, which Herrmann dates to the start of the fourth century, is reported to be  $\Lambda\text{API}\Sigma\text{AION}$ , but none of the examples I have seen has the inscription sufficiently well preserved to show whether omega is in fact used. The spacing of the letters in the legend of group 6 is so close that omicron would appear to fit better than the wider letter omega. See Herrmann, pl. 4, 17–18; *BMCThessaly*, pl. 5, 13; *ArchAnAth* 2 (1969), p. 106, fig. 1, 1. It may be relevant that the local script of Thessaly, which did not have omega, continued

as their legend, thereby recalling groups 1, 2 and 3.<sup>84</sup> Those with  $\Lambda\text{API}\Sigma\text{AI}$  recall group 3.<sup>85</sup> On the basis of these characteristics of the coins of Q in combination with the evidence of the hoards (e.g., a worn specimen in *IGCH* 386; several worn specimens in *IGCH* 52 which are Q or related series), I would make series Q the first of the facing-head issues of Larissa. The coins of Q which have dolphins on the obverse are probably the first of this series.

Like those of Q, the coins of series M 1, N, N 1, O, P and R are over-all the most worn of the facing-head issues in the hoards.<sup>86</sup> It is therefore probable that these series also belong at the early end of the facing-head issues. Unfortunately, the evidence of the hoards is not sufficient to demonstrate the order in which these series should be placed. I can only suggest that the types of P may be likely candidates for placement in a very early series because they closely repeat characteristics already familiar from Q, in particular the scalloped neckline with a chlamys on the obverse and a straight-legged horse on the reverse with the legend  $\Lambda\text{API}\Sigma\text{AI}$  (Plate 1, 12). Moreover, the elongated facing head with straggling hair beside the neck seen in P resembles the distinctive style of the nymph in Q. At the present time it is only possible to say that series M 1, N, N 1, O and P, in an unknown order, represent as a whole the early series of the facing-head issues after series Q. The evidence will not yet allow a more precise alignment. Fortunately, there is one piece of evidence which provides a basis for placing this group of series in relation to the remaining series. An obverse die link connects series R to series K.<sup>87</sup> In conjunction with the hoard evidence, this link

to be used until at least the later part of the fifth century in inscriptions. See L. H. Jeffrey, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (Oxford, 1961), p. 98.

<sup>84</sup> The coins with the legend  $\Lambda\text{API}$  which Herrmann, p. 36, calls group 4b do not in fact belong to group 4, in my opinion. See n. 90.

<sup>85</sup>  $\Lambda\text{API}$  and  $\Lambda\text{API}\Sigma\text{AI}$  may both be shortened forms of the early legend  $\Lambda\text{API}\Sigma\text{AIA}$  found spelled out in groups 3 and 4.

<sup>86</sup> Of course, an occasional specimen from these series can survive in an excellent state of preservation. The coin of O or R shown in *ADelt* 19 (1964), pt. 2, 1, *chronika*, pl. 1, 20, is said to be FDC (p. 9).

<sup>87</sup> Herrmann, p. 45, coin K gamma, p. 48, coin R beta. It must be pointed out that the reverse of coin R beta bears a resemblance to the reverse of a coin whose authenticity worried Herrmann (see n. 50). However, since there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of coin K gamma and Herrmann personally examined coin R beta in

furnishes important confirmation of the relative chronology of the earlier series already described and the later series such as K which are distinguished in part by the horse with bent legs on the reverse. K in turn is associated with I by the general appearance of the obverse and reverse types as well as the inscription  $\text{I}\Delta$  or  $\Delta\text{I}$  found in both these series.<sup>88</sup>

The remaining series except for A and M again cannot be put into a secure chronological order as a result of the paucity of evidence. For the moment it will suffice to say that the individual series K and I, followed by B, C, D, E, F, G, H and L in an unknown order, represent the "middle" of the over-all series between the earlier series and the series A-M, a single group which can be placed with confidence at the end of the facing-head issues of Larissa. The hoard evidence for the placement of A-M is consistent, and the obverse and reverse types are appropriate as well for this chronology. The style of the head of the nymph has become standardized, with wavy hair that generally fills the space around the head more uniformly and completely than did the more straggly strands of some of the earlier heads. The horse has bent legs which give it a distinctive posture that is usually a deeper crouch than the similar posture seen on earlier series. The legend is the full genitive ethnic plural,  $\Lambda\text{P}\text{I}\Sigma\text{A}\text{I}\Omega\text{N}$ , divided so as to fit above and below the horse (Plate 1, 2-4). Some of the A-M series coins have small symbols (plant, trident) below the belly of the horse, and it is possible that these coins may belong earlier rather than later in this group.<sup>89</sup> The final coins of A-M are those which I have called A-M 168, on which the head on the obverse is always three-quarters left and the horse on the reverse is always right.<sup>90</sup>

Berlin, it is reasonable to believe that both coins are genuine and that the die link is a reliable and important piece of evidence.

<sup>88</sup> Herrmann, pp. 44-45, 54. I cannot agree with Herrmann's opinion, pp. 52-53, that a conspicuous break in the style of the obverse from "beautiful" to "not beautiful" occurs between I and K.

<sup>89</sup> Martin (above, n. 19), pp. 75-76.

<sup>90</sup> It should be pointed out that the unusual legend  $\Lambda\text{A}\text{P}\text{I}$  (above)  $\Pi\Lambda\text{E}\text{I}$  (below) which appears in Herrmann's series A and in his profile-head group 4b (Herrmann, p. 36) does not constitute an argument for placing series A at the start of the facing-head issues and therefore closer in time to the earlier profile-head issues. This legend is reported for only one drachm in 4b; otherwise the coins in this group are triobols. But this drachm is in fact not a profile-head piece as reported by Herrmann but rather

So far, this discussion has concerned only the drachms of the facing-head coinage of Larissa, the denomination which served as the mint's largest denomination in almost all periods, in typical Thessalian fashion.<sup>91</sup> Hoard evidence is largely lacking for smaller denominations, which must therefore be left out of consideration. It is possible, however, to say something about the one issue of didrachms known from Larissa. On these coins, the obverse type is the stylistically fully developed facing head three-quarters left, while the reverse features either a prancing horse wearing a bridle or collar, or the familiar crouching horse, both to the right (Plate 1, 13). The legend is the full genitive plural ethnic. Herrmann placed these didrachms with the "most beautiful" drachms of series A.<sup>92</sup> I agree that these coins belong with the later rather than the earlier series of drachms, but it is difficult to determine exactly where this larger denomination belongs because the hoard evidence is of little help. Didrachms in worn condition are found in hoards both of the middle of the fourth and the middle of the third century B.C.<sup>93</sup> The fully developed head and the slightly crouching horse would be appropriate in series A-M, while the prancing horse type with legend distributed around the flan should be somewhat earlier. All one can say is that the didrachms, or at least some of them, should be earlier than the middle of the fourth century.

#### ABSOLUTE CHRONOLOGY

The didrachms provide an appropriate transition to the meager evidence available for the dates which should be assigned to the various

a standard facing-head type of series A. For the coin, see Mionnet, *Supplément*, vol. 3 (Paris, 1829), p. 293, 192. (A second example can be found in *NC* 1923, pp. 219–20, no. 14, pl. 9.) That the triobols assigned to 4b have a profile head does not mean that these coins must necessarily be early because these smaller denomination pieces could have been minted with an older obverse type even while contemporary drachms were showing a more modern type, the facing head. I suspect that 4b does not belong with 4a and 4c at all, a suspicion heightened by the differences in the style between the profile head of 4b and those of 4a and 4c.

<sup>91</sup> For the coinage of Thessaly, see *ACGC*, pp. 115–20.

<sup>92</sup> Herrmann, p. 51.

<sup>93</sup> *IGCH* 52 (before 350); 71 (ca. 350–325); 371 (ca. 348); 162 (ca. 250).

facing-head issues of Larissa. Pherae was apparently the only other Thessalian mint to issue didrachms.<sup>94</sup> Two types are known, one with a profile head and the other with a female facing head whose flowing locks of hair are vaguely reminiscent of Kimon's Arethusa.<sup>95</sup> A resemblance to the female facing head of the coins of Larissa is also discernible (Plate 1, 14). In the light of the appearance of the unusual denomination of didrachm with a facing head at both Larissa and Pherae and of the traditional rivalry between the two cities, it would be surprising if their facing-head didrachms were not roughly contemporary. Fortunately, at least an approximate date can be given to the facing-head didrachms of Pherae because they are inscribed with the name of Alexander, the nephew and successor of Jason of Pherae. Alexander ruled, it seems, from 369 to 358 B.C.<sup>96</sup> This was a period of increased military activity in Thessaly as Alexander tried to achieve dominance and the Aleuads at Larissa tried to block him.<sup>97</sup> Since cavalry was a national specialty in Thessaly and a cavalryman's pay at this time was most likely exactly one didrachm of the Aeginetan standard per day, the mints of Larissa and Pherae could have begun to issue didrachms as a convenient and attractive denomination to use in the competitive recruiting and payment of mounted troops.<sup>98</sup> This new mint practice may have begun with Alexander's predecessor at Pherae, and it has been suggested that the profile-head didrachms of Pherae belong to Jason's rule, which extended from ca. 385 to 370 B.C.<sup>99</sup> The change

<sup>94</sup> To judge from the varieties listed by Herrmann and in *BMCThessaly*.

<sup>95</sup> For these coins, see *ACGC*, p. 118, pl. 21, 387–88. The nymph is identified as Hypereia rather than Hekate by Erhart (above, n. 28), pp. 248–49.

<sup>96</sup> Westlake (above, n. 42), pp. 128–29, 156; Sordi (above, n. 38), pp. 193, 230. It is an interesting coincidence that one sees on coins of Perdikkas III from this same period a horse in the striking pose with right front and left rear legs raised (prancing or trotting) which also appears on some of the didrachms of Larissa. For Perdikkas' coins, see *ACGC*, p. 144, pl. 28, 508, to which compare pl. 21, 396, of Larissa. For the dates of Perdikkas' coins as 368–359 B.C., see Hammond (above, n. 37), p. 192.

<sup>97</sup> For the events of this period, see Westlake (above, n. 42), pp. 126–59; Sordi (above, n. 38), pp. 191–234.

<sup>98</sup> For the Thessalian emphasis on cavalry, see, for example, Westlake (above, n. 42), pp. 108–9. For the rate of pay, see Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.21.

<sup>99</sup> Kraay, *ACGC*, p. 118, suggests the coins are Jason's. For the dates, see Sordi (above, n. 38), pp. 156–61, 187. Jason built his power with substantial forces of cavalry, a number of whom were mercenaries. See Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.18–19, 4.28.

from profile to facing head on the didrachms of Pherae perhaps took place under the influence of the facing head on the coinage of Larissa because the latter city's mint, which had produced facing-head issues before the didrachms, clearly had this type before Pherae did. In fact, Pherae retained the profile head on its drachms throughout this period. Based on these observations, a date of ca. 370 B.C. would seem reasonable for the didrachms of Larissa, with a considerable margin of approximation clearly understood. This dating receives some support from the appearance previously noted of a worn didrachm in *IGCH* 371, a hoard which is plausibly dated ca. 348 B.C., and the report of some didrachms in *IGCH* 52, a hoard perhaps no later than 350 B.C.<sup>100</sup>

The hoards are otherwise not very helpful at present with absolute chronology because we cannot yet establish precise dates for hoards with coins of Larissa which do not also include Macedonian regnal issues.<sup>101</sup> It is not necessarily safe to date hoards such as *IGCH* 52, 55 and 58 to ca. 350 B.C. on the grounds that they do not include any coins of Philip II because his coins do not otherwise turn up in hoards in Thessaly until late in the 320s B.C.<sup>102</sup> And the only Macedonian hoard to contain a coin of Larissa beside the hoards which also have coins of Philip is *IGCH* 371.

There is, however, some small help to be found in the reports of the excavations at Olynthos. Two silver coins of Larissa were found there, a worn trihemion of group 3a DE (i.e., earlier than the facing-head

<sup>100</sup> *IGCH* 371 consisted of at least four tetradrachms of the Chalkidian League and one didrachm of Larissa. It is usually assumed that the coinage of the Chalkidian League ceased in 348 B.C. when Philip captured and plundered the League's capital city and mint, Olynthos. See Robinson and Clement (above, n. 83), pp. 112, 133–34, 162–63. This view is supported by the hoard evidence. Chalkidian coinage appears in fifteen fourth-century hoards, but in only one of these are there any coins of Philip (*IGCH* 385 of ca. 337/6 B.C. with 136 tetradrachms of Philip and one Chalkidian tetradrachm). The other fourteen hoards are plausibly dated 348 B.C. or earlier. For these hoards, see the index of mints in *IGCH*, s.v. "Chalcidian League." For the date of *IGCH* 52, see n. 25.

<sup>101</sup> Study of the Theban issues with magistrates' names may help to determine absolute dates for the hoards in which they occur. These issues appear to belong to the period ca. 371–338 B.C. See *ACGC*, pp. 113–14.

<sup>102</sup> See n. 76.

issues) and a worn drachm that could be O, P, Q or R.<sup>103</sup> Twelve bronze coins of Larissa are also recorded from these excavations, and their types are of interest. Ten of these coins have the type of the triobols of group 4b, the profile head on the obverse and a crouching horse on the reverse. The legend appears to be the full genitive plural ethnic distributed above and below the horse rather than the peculiar legend of 4b.<sup>104</sup> Only two of these bronzes have facing heads on the obverse and in both cases the reverse is a horseman like that on the drachms of G and H and the obols Herrmann tentatively assigned to A and B together (while admitting they could belong with later series).<sup>105</sup>

As a result of the scanty number of bronze coins of Larissa recorded in hoards, it is impossible to draw a certain correlation between the types of the facing-head silver and bronze issues, but it would be odd if there were not some connection. Therefore, the types of the bronze coins found at Olynthos at least confirm that the facing-head type was already in use by mid-century. However, they may also suggest that the production of the A-M types was not yet so common that it had been put on all small denominations. In general, the limited information from Olynthos confirms the other indications of chronology already surveyed, with perhaps the added hint that facing-head types were not yet so numerous in, say, the late 360s B.C. that they had migrated to Macedonia in large numbers.<sup>106</sup>

<sup>103</sup> Robinson and Clement (above, n. 83), p. 242, pl. 32, 14; David M. Robinson, *Excavations at Olynthus*, pt. 3 (Baltimore, 1931), pp. 24–25, pl. 4, 62. Robinson, p. 25, refers to Herrmann's pl. 8, 4–8, which is series Q, but he says the coin belongs to "Group I," which is presumably an error for "Group VII," because the page reference to Herrmann is given as p. 49.

<sup>104</sup> Robinson, pt. 3 (above, n. 103), p. 96, pl. 19, 794; Robinson, *Excavations at Olynthus*, pt. 6 (Baltimore, 1934), pp. 83–84, pl. 18, 739–43; Robinson and Clement (above, n. 83), p. 243, no. 3 (four specimens), pl. 32, 16.

<sup>105</sup> Herrmann, p. 42.

<sup>106</sup> Robinson's statistics (above, nn. 103–4), pt. 3, pp. 4–5, and pt. 6, p. 1, show that the great majority of the coins found in the Olynthos excavations belong to the period before 348 B.C. It is of course impossible to tell how long before that date the coins of Larissa made their way to Olynthos. The only coins of Larissa found in a hoard at Olynthos are Robinson, pt. 6, 739–40, the 4b type in bronze. See Robinson and Clement (above, n. 83), pp. 191–93, hoard no. 1 Æ.

There are virtually no other criteria for the determination of absolute chronology. We have already seen that the name Simos in series R is not a reliable indicator of chronology for those coins. The same can be said of the other abbreviated names and solitary letters that occasionally appear on other facing-head issues from Larissa. The name NAYK occurs in Q, ΙΔ and ΔΙ in K, Ι, Μ and Ξ on the obols assigned to A and B, and ΠΛΕΙ in A.<sup>107</sup> Only the last is inscribed in large letters and in the exergue. Under the arrangement I have proposed for these issues, "Nauk" comes at the head of the series (although it is not on the very earliest specimens of Q, those with dolphins), the following names and letters (including "Simos") occur on issues which follow one another somewhat later in the series, and "Plei" comes last of all. With the exception of "Plei," these inscriptions come at points in the series where the coins exhibit perceptible changes in style or type, and it is not out of the question that the inscriptions refer to the mint officials or die makers involved in implementing these changes.

But how is one to explain the great disparity between the appearance of these diminutive letters in the field and that of the inscription "Plei" which is so large and displaces part of the normal ethnic legend in its position in the exergue? It is hard to believe that an artist could have aspired to such prominence on the civic coinage in the light of the local tradition in this matter. This distinctive and unique inscription perhaps reflects political circumstances of a special character. It is only a suggestion for thought, but the sort of episode described by Aristotle in which a special magistrate at the head of a military force whose job was to avert civil war actually became a tyrant would offer such special circumstances. When he seized power at Pherae, Alexander broke tradition by putting his name on Pherae's coins in large letters in place of the civic legend.<sup>108</sup> It is not out of the question that a tyrant in Larissa did the same for a brief period. This explanation cannot be proven,

<sup>107</sup> Herrmann, pp. 41–42, 44–45, 47.

<sup>108</sup> For Aristotle, see n. 45. ΠΛΕΙ could be the abbreviation for a name known in Thessaly such as Pleistarchos (*IG IX*, 2, no. 6, line 1; no. 24, line 5, from Hypata) or Pleistainos (*IG IX*, 2, no. 568, line 16, from Larissa). The archon appointed to settle factional strife would surely have had control of the mint as part of the necessary administration of the city's finances. Compare the comparable fourth-century situation at Pharsalos, Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.2, for which such power is specifically attested.



but it does have the virtue of suggesting why no names or letters occur on the very numerous examples of series A-M 168, which have only symbols as some sort of control mark. If the occurrence of "Plei" in the A-M series was associated with an episode of tyranny, the inscription of a name or even of letters from a name on coinage at Larissa would thereafter have been abandoned in order to avoid any association with the anti-traditional practices of a tyrant.<sup>109</sup>

I have argued elsewhere that the silver coinages of Larissa came to an end not long after 321 B.C. as a result of economic devastation after a period of famine, war and destruction in Thessaly.<sup>110</sup> It is unfortunately not possible to suggest a date for the beginning of the facing-head issues with equal confidence. Herrmann suggested ca. 395 B.C. because he put the didrachms first in the series and associated them with the victory of Larissa over Pharsalos in 395 B.C.<sup>111</sup> This hypothesis has no evidence to support it, and I think it more likely that the didrachms are not the earliest facing-head issue and that they are contemporary with the similar coins of Pherae. Too little is known about the events of Thessalian history in the fifth and early fourth centuries to settle upon a particular event as the catalyst for the change from the older types at Larissa to the facing head in imitation of Syracuse. And in

<sup>109</sup> Even if this explanation of Π/ΔΕΙ is correct, it still does not help with chronology. The only possible hint is the report that Simos of Larissa was traveling around with the hetaira Neaira and came to Athens with her sometime before 374/3 B.C. See Dem. 59.24, 33, 108. If this is the Simos of Aristotle's story, he could have left Larissa as a result of the strife that led to the establishment of the tyrannical neutral archon. The date of the Π/ΔΕΙ issues would then be ca. 375 B.C. This is only speculation, however.

<sup>110</sup> "The End of Thessalian Civic Coinage in Silver: Macedonian Policy or Economic Reality?" *Proceedings of the 9th International Numismatic Congress, Bern, September 1979*. (Luxembourg, 1982), pp. 157-64. In brief, the evidence for economic devastation is, first, the extraordinary gifts of grain to Thessalian cities including Larissa attested by M. N. Tod, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1948), no. 196. These gifts show that the problems of the 320s B.C. imposed grave agricultural and therefore financial losses on Larissa. Second, the Lamian or Hellenic War was contested in Thessaly during 323-322 B.C., with a final struggle in 321 B.C. The Thessalians resisted the Macedonians to the bitter end with obvious consequences. See Diod. Sic. 18.12-13, 15-18, 38.

<sup>111</sup> Herrmann, p. 50.

fact, the change may have had nothing to do with political or military history. The impetus for the change to a facing head from a profile head like those of Herrmann's group 4 may have been entirely aesthetic. The facing-head motif in a three-quarter view was extremely popular as a coin type by the end of the fifth century, and the mint officials at Larissa may simply have decided to adopt the most up-to-date style for their production.<sup>112</sup> The Thessalians were proverbially wealthy, and at least some entertained pretensions to the latest canons of taste and fashion.<sup>113</sup> The profile head, which had replaced the very local type showing the national sport of bull-leaping, was itself probably a response to current trends in numismatic art, and the facing head could well be explained in similar fashion.<sup>114</sup> But we simply cannot tell on present evidence when the facing-head types began at Larissa.<sup>115</sup>

If the date suggested above for the didrachms is valid, I would say that the early and middle series should be placed roughly in the first quarter of the fourth century, while series A-M extends over the period ca. 375–320 B.C. It is of course quite possible that the early and middle series did extend further down into the century. That the number of series is large in a relatively shorter period of time in the earlier part of the century is not a decisive objection against this chronology because these series seem to have been greatly outnumbered by the coins of A-M in terms of the amount of coinage produced. There are more than enough coins of this latter series to cover the period assigned to them. In any case, this new chronology must remain tentative as a result of the nature of the evidence on which it rests. I hope, however, that it will be helpful to have outlined the objections to Herrmann's chronology

<sup>112</sup> See Erhart (above, n. 28), pp. 141–209, on the proliferation of this type in the last quarter of the fifth century.

<sup>113</sup> For their wealth in the earlier part of the fourth century, see Isoc. 8.117. Simonides was only one of the poets who had worked for Thessalians (Pl. *Prt.* 339a), and the sophist Gorgias spent time in Thessaly, some of it in Larissa, it seems (Isoc. 15.155; Arist. *Pol.* 1275b26–31).

<sup>114</sup> For the bull-leaping types, see Herrmann's groups 1–3. On the change to a profile head, see Herrmann, p. 37.

<sup>115</sup> Kraay, *ACGC*, pp. 118–19, recalling the almost twenty-five year interval before the mint of Tarsos copied Kimon's Arethusa, points out that the change at Larissa need not have been made immediately after the appearance of the prototype.

and to have made a preliminary attempt at revising it. With further evidence, more secure progress may be possible in the future.<sup>116</sup>

#### KEY TO PLATE

1. Larissa, *BCH* 86 (1962), pl. 9, 6.
2. Larissa, ANS (*IGCH* 168).
3. Larissa, ANS (*IGCH* 168).
4. Larissa, ANS (*IGCH* 168).
5. Salamis, ANS (*IGCH* 168), Martin (above, n. 19), 495.
6. Miletos, ANS (*IGCH* 168), Thompson (above, n. 15), 107a.
7. Miletos, ANS (*IGCH* 168), Thompson (above, n. 15), 118b.
8. Syracuse, ANS.
9. Larissa, ANS.
10. Larissa, ANS.
11. Larissa, ANS.
12. Larissa, ANS.
13. Larissa, *ZfN* 35 (1924-25), pl. 5, 3.
14. Pherae, *ACGC*, pl. 21, 388.

<sup>116</sup> Thanks are due to Otto Mørkholm, Margaret Thompson, Hyla Troxell and Nancy Waggoner for helpful and valuable suggestions and for their care in reading drafts of this paper at various stages. They are not to be held responsible for any errors nor to be thought as necessarily in agreement with all the hypotheses presented here.

# Plate 1



Facing Head Coinage of Larissa