

Andrew Meadows

BETWEEN GREECE
AND ROME.
COINAGE IN
THE *IMPERIUM*
OF MARK ANTONY

Memoranda Numismatica
Atheniensi

BETWEEN GREECE AND ROME.
COINAGE IN THE *IMPERIUM*
OF MARK ANTONY

Andrew Meadows
Between Greece and Rome. Coinage in the Imperium of Mark Antony
Memoranda Numismatica Atheniensia 4

MNA SERIES SCIENTIFIC SUPERVISION
Yannis Stoyas

MNA 4th ISSUE EDITED
with the collaboration of Yannis Stoyas and Stelios Damigos
Editorial assistance: Dimitris Arvanitakis

GRAPHIC DESIGN & COMPOSITION
Erifili Arapoglou – enARTE

© Published by the Benaki Museum and KIKPE

Text © 2019: Andrew Meadows

Photography © 2019: figures 1, 18, 22-23, 28, 32, 34, 38, 40, 48, 53-56, 59, 63-64, 68 (BnF, Paris); 2, 8, 12 (BM, London); 3, 9, 11, 14, 19-21, 24, 26, 29-31, 33, 35-36, 44-47, 49, 51, 61-62, 65-66 (ANS, New York); 4, 6-7, 10, 13, 15-16, 25, 27, 42, 50, 60 (SMK, Berlin); 5, 17 (KHM, Vienna); 37, 39, 41, 52 (KIKPE Numismatic Collection, Athens); 43 (MFA, Boston); 57 (RPC Online); 58 (Classical Numismatic Group); 67 (Numismatica Ars Classica).

Printed on Old mill Bianco 130gr
Typeset in Garamond and Trajan (special fonts: Vasiliki Lydia and Lydia)

ISBN: 978-960-476-253-8

ISSN: 2459-4008



BENAKI MUSEUM
Koumbari 1 – 10674 Athens
GREECE
www.benaki.gr



KIKPE
Amalias 4 – 10557 Athens
GREECE
www.kikpe.gr

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the written permission of the publishers and the editor.

MEMORANDA NUMISMATICA ATHENIENSIA 4

Andrew Meadows
BETWEEN GREECE
AND ROME.
COINAGE IN
THE *IMPERIUM*
OF MARK ANTONY



BENAKI MUSEUM • KIKPE

ATHENS 2019

BETWEEN GREECE AND ROME. COINAGE IN THE *IMPERIUM* OF MARK ANTONY

“Who would not weep when he both hears and sees Antony himself, the man twice Consul, often *Imperator*, to whom was committed in common with me the management of the public business, who was entrusted with so many cities, so many legions—when he sees that this man has now abandoned all his ancestors’ habits of life, has emulated all alien and barbaric customs, that he pays no honour to us or to the laws or to his fathers’ gods, but pays homage to that woman as if she were some Isis or Selene, calling her children Helios and Selene, and finally taking for himself the title of Osiris or Dionysus, and, after all this, making presents of whole islands and parts of the continents, as though he were master of the whole earth and the whole sea?”¹

WITH THESE WORDS, Cassius Dio’s Octavian begins to write the victor’s history of Antony’s fall. About Antony and ‘that woman’ much has been written. Perhaps unsurprisingly, it is Cleopatra who enjoys most attention. A search in the British Library catalogue suggests that a new book has been published on the Queen approximately every year for the past 20 years. Antony, by contrast, attracts less attention, and if the scope is narrowed to the field of his Eastern *Imperium*, then the studies are few and far between.

The basic outline of events is clear enough. The victory over the tyrannicides Brutus and Cassius at Philippi in 42 BC left Antony, as *Triumvir Rei Publicae Constituendae*, with *Imperium* over the East of the Roman empire. He headed for Greece, and wintered, it seems, at Athens, where he was inducted into the Eleusinian Mysteries. In 41 BC he crossed to Asia, perhaps via Bithynia and then south to Ephesus. From here he set out on a lengthy tour of his eastern territories, visiting Lycia, “Phrygia, Mysia, Galatia, Cappadocia, Cilicia, Coele-

1 Cassius Dio, 50.25.1-4 (tr. Cary, modified): τίς μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἂν ὀδύρατο ὄρων στρατιώτας Ῥωμαίους δορυφοροῦντας τὴν βασιλίδα αὐτῶν; τίς δ’ οὐκ ἂν στενάξειεν ἀκούων ἰππέας καὶ βουλευτὰς Ῥωμαίων κολακεύοντας αὐτὴν ὥσπερ εὐνούχους; τίς δ’ οὐκ ἂν θρηγήσειε καὶ ἀκούων καὶ ὄρων αὐτὸν τὸν Ἀντώνιον τὸν δις ὑπατον, τὸν πολλακίς αὐτοκράτορα, τὸν τὴν προστασίαν μετ’ ἐμοῦ τῶν κοινῶν ἐπιτραπέντα, τὸν τοσαύτας μὲν πόλεις τοσαῦτα δὲ στρατόπεδα ἐγχειρισθέντα, νῦν πάντα μὲν τὰ πάτρια τοῦ βίου ἤθη ἐκλελοιπῶτα, πάντα δὲ τὰλλότρια καὶ βαρβαρικά ἐξηλωκότα, καὶ ἡμῶν μὲν ἢ τῶν νόμων ἢ τῶν θεῶν τῶν προγονικῶν μηδὲν προτιμώντα, τὴν δ’ ἄνθρωπον ἐκείνην καθάπερ τινὰ Ἴσιν ἢ Σελήνην προσκυνούντα, καὶ τοὺς τε παῖδας αὐτῆς Ἥλιον καὶ Σελήνην ὀνομάζοντα, καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον καὶ ἑαυτὸν Ὀσίριν καὶ Διόνυσον ἐπικεκληκότα, κακῶν τούτων, καθάπερ πάσης μὲν τῆς γῆς πάσης δὲ τῆς θαλάσσης κυριεύοντα, καὶ νήσους ὄλας καὶ τῶν ἡπείρων τινὰ κεχαρισμένον;



MAP 1 Antony's East

Syria, Palestine, Ituraea, and the other provinces of Syria.” (Appian, *Bellum Civile*, 5.7). While in Cilicia his celebrated meeting with Cleopatra took place. In Judaea, he established Herod, before moving on to winter in Alexandria, where he conceived twin children (to be named Alexander Helios and Cleopatra Selene) with Cleopatra. Spring brought the news of a major Parthian offensive westwards, partly under the command of the renegade Labienus. However, Antony was forced to return to Italy by the war that had broken out there between his brother and Octavian. Fulvia’s death at this time offered the opportunity for Antony and Octavian to patch up their relationship through the marriage of the former to Octavia. Future territorial division was established in September 40 BC by the Treaty of Brundisium. To deal with the Parthian menace, Antony now despatched his trusted commander P. Ventidius Bassus, who drove the Parthians out of Asia and Syria. In late 39 Antony crossed back to Greece, and, leaving Octavia in Athens, headed East in early 38 to resume his settlement there with a series of what would turn out to be short term appointments for various dynasts. Further negotiations in Italy kept Antony away for much of 37, but he returned to Antioch at the end of the year to make a more sweeping reform of the East in preparation for the start of his own campaigns against the Parthians. There would henceforth be two systems of administration in the East. On the one hand the existing system of provinces would be retained in the key areas of Macedonia, Achaea, Asia, Bithynia and Syria. On the other, a system was set up of client kings or tyrants who were to be responsible for administering territories not directly under Roman rule. A series of these were strengthened or put in

place: Polemon in Pontus, Amyntas in Galatia, Archelaos in Cappadocia and Herod in Judaea. The biggest winner, however, was Cleopatra, who was summoned to meet Antony in Antioch and received southern Syria, the tetrarchy of Chalcis, parts of Cilicia, and Cyprus. The couple also conceived their third child, Ptolemy Philadelphos.

Having thus disposed the lands that would lie in his rear, Antony set off in 36 BC on his first great Parthian expedition. It was an unmitigated disaster: a combination of poor tactics and treachery led to a rout of the expeditionary force. By the time Antony had brought his army back to Syria, he had lost one third of the 60,000 legionaries he had set out with and almost half of the 10,000 cavalry. Relations were now deteriorating further with Octavian, and an insulting offer of help from him, carried by Octavia on behalf of her brother, was essentially dismissed. This was the effective end of Antony and Octavia's marriage. By 34 BC, Antony had sufficiently rebuilt his forces, and organised his diplomacy to set off East again. The result this time was the conquest of Armenia from the unreliable Artavasdes II. Antony returned in triumphant mood at the end of the year. A grand procession took place in Alexandria after which Antony,

“having filled the gymnasium with a crowd and set up two thrones on a silver platform, one for himself and one for Cleopatra, and other lower ones for their children, in the first place declared Cleopatra queen of Egypt, Cyprus, Libya and Coele Syria. Co-regent with her was Caesarion, who was regarded as the son of the former Caesar who had left Cleopatra pregnant. Secondly, he proclaimed his sons by Cleopatra as Kings of Kings: to Alexander he assigned Armenia, Media and the lands of the Parthians (when they had been conquered); to Ptolemy, Phoenicia, Syria and Cilicia. At the same time he brought forward Alexander in Median dress, including a tiara and upright Persian head-dress and Ptolemy in boots, a cloak and a *kausia* bearing a diadem: the latter was the dress of the successor kings of Alexander, the former that of the Medes and Armenians. When the two children had embraced their parents, an Armenian guard encircled one, a Macedonian the other. Cleopatra both then and at other times when she appeared in public, took the holy dress of Isis, and was treated as the New Isis.” (Plutarch, *Life of Antony*, ch. 54)

The scene, as described, has its fantastic elements, but the basic point remains that Antony himself had no place in this partition of kingdoms. He stood outside and above the new realms he had created, as Roman Triumvir. However, the territories and resources that he now controlled were a threat to Octavian, and this would lead to war between the two men, and the final campaign of Actium.

How we interpret Antony's conduct and aims through this period is problematic. Modern scholarship on the matter has been patchy. We now have an excellent prosopographical study of Antony's supporters in Ferriès 2007 and, although, numerous books treat

context of personal rivalry among the dynasts who found themselves elevated by Antony in these years.⁵⁸

Archelaos of Cappadocia

When the last of the ruling dynasty of the kingdom of Cappadocia died in 36 BC, Antony established an outsider on the throne there too. Archelaos, son of a priest-king of Comana, was chosen. The companion of several influential Romans (as was his mother Glaphyra, who apparently shared Antony's bed for a while), Archelaos went on to marry Antony's daughter Antonia after the death of her first husband, Polemon of Pontus.⁵⁹ Archelaos' coinage, like his succession, broke the thread of continuity within Cappadocia.⁶⁰ While the placement of his portrait on the obverse was traditional, in contrast to the previous two Cappadocian kings he is shown beardless. (FIG. 42) On the reverse he replaced the figure of Athena, the standard reverse type of the Cappadocian kings, with a club, probably adverting to his claimed ancestry from Heracles. The legend too is a departure: ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΡΧΕΛΑΟΥ ΦΙΛΟΠΑΤΡΙΔΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΚΤΙΣΤΟΥ (Of King Archelaos, lover of his country, the founder).

Artavasdes II of Armenia

Antony had an uneasy relationship with Artavasdes II of Armenia. During his Parthian campaign of 36 BC, the Triumvir had received military and logistical support from the Armenian, but this came to an abrupt halt after the disastrous end of the expedition. In 34 BC Antony set out to put Artavasdes in his place by launching an attack directly on the Armenian capital of Artaxata. Artavasdes was deposed and in the Donations of Alexandria in the autumn of that year, the kingdom of Armenia was included in the territory granted to Antony and Cleopatra's son, Alexander Helios. Artavasdes' coinage gives him the title 'King of Kings', akin to that assumed by the Parthian kings, and also accorded, *mutatis mutandis*, to Cleopatra. The silver tetradrachms (FIG. 43) also identify him as godlike (ΘΕΙΟΝ).⁶¹

58 For the history of Tarkondimotos see Syme 1995, pp. 161-5. On the significance of the name, Suspène 2009, p. 47.

59 For the background to Archelaos and his relationship with Antony see Syme 1995, pp. 144-152.

60 Simonetta 1977, pp. 45-6, nos 1-8. Simonetta 2007, pp. 106-8. *RPC I*, p. 551 *ad* nos 3601-8. Archelaos' coinage too seems to have been struck on the denarius standard.

61 Bedoukian 1978, nos 129-35; Nercessian 2006, pp. 108-11 with the review by Hoover 2008.

Herod the Great of Judea

The internal politics of the Judaean state had been confused in 40 BC by the Parthian invasion and temporary occupation of the land.⁶² The Parthians deposed the Hasmonaean king Hyrcanus II and replaced him with his nephew Antigonus. Herod, one of Hyrcanus' chief administrators fled via Egypt to Rome to claim the Judaean throne. In 37 BC Herod was established as king in Jerusalem with the military help of Antony's officer Gaius Sosius. Alone of the new client kingdoms in the east, Herod's Judaea was not made over to any of Antony and Cleopatra's children in 34 BC. Herod issued no silver in his own name, only bronze coins with the Greek legend ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ 'of king Herod' (FIG. 44).⁶³

Malichus I of Nabataea

Unlike almost every other Hellenistic dynasty that came into contact with Antony, the Nabataean kings were allowed to continue in power.⁶⁴ That Antony regarded himself as overlord of the Nabataean kingdom is clear, however, from his appropriation of Nabataean land in order to bestow it upon Cleopatra. The hostility that arose between the Nabataean king Malichus and Cleopatra as a result would culminate in his burning of her fleet when she sought to flee eastwards from the Red Sea after the defeat at Actium. The design of Malichus' silver coinage with its eagle on the reverse reminiscent of Ptolemaic silver issues, betrays how closely linked, in economic terms at least, the Nabataean kingdom remained with Cleopatra's Egypt. The obverse depicts a portrait of Malichus. This issue (FIG. 45), which carries the regnal date of year 26 (*ca.* 35 BC), belongs to the period of his war with Herod the Great of Judaea.

Cleopatra VII of Egypt

And finally there is the Ptolemaic dynasty of Egypt. At the mint of Alexandria, Cleopatra followed the example of the entire Ptolemaic house by producing a silver coinage featuring the portrait of the founder of the dynasty, Ptolemy I, and on the reverse the Ptolemaic

⁶² For an overview of sources and events see Schürer *et al.* 1973, I, pp. 281-304. On Antony's policy *cf.* Buchheim 1960, pp. 60-68.

⁶³ For a basic account see Meshorer 2001, pp. 61-78, esp. 72-8 for the possibility that the later production of silver Tyrian shekels is to be attributed to Herod. For more recent bibliography, Meshorer *et al.* 2013, I, p. 238.

⁶⁴ For an overview of Malichus' career and position under Antony, see Bowersock 1994, pp. 37-44. For his coinage see Meshorer 1975, pp. 20-8; Meshorer *et al.* 2013, pp. 223-5.

badge of an eagle on thunderbolt (FIG. 46).⁶⁵ The inscription reads ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ‘of king Ptolemy’, and thus falls in line with the coinage of most of her predecessors: no queen had ever issued silver coinage solely in her own name, and, at least for the main tetradrachm coinage, Cleopatra was no exception. Coins are known for almost all of her 22 regnal years. In addition it appears that, in two years at least, coinage was also struck with regnal years of Caesarion (Year 16 and 1 and 22 and 7; FIG. 47),⁶⁶ drawing attention to the fact that from 37/6 to 31/0 BC, it was her son by Caesar who was acknowledged as her co-regent, not Antony. An exception is provided by the very rare drachm issues produced at the Alexandrian mint, which did feature the portrait of the queen, and were struck in her name: ΚΛΕΟΠΑΤΡΑΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΣΗΣ (FIG. 48).⁶⁷

By contrast, the designs of the royal bronze coinage of Alexandria had been far more fluid throughout Ptolemaic history, and here Cleopatra felt freer to innovate. At some point in her reign (the chronology remains unclear) the mint abandoned the designs that had been current for a century or more, featuring a head of Ammon on the obverse and two eagles on a thunderbolt on the reverse, and introduced a startling new design. On the obverse is the queen’s portrait, diademed; on the reverse a single eagle on thunderbolt, the queen’s own name, in the genitive, and a denominational mark (FIG. 49).⁶⁸ On Cyprus, which had been restored to Cleopatra by Julius Caesar, a bronze coinage was issued depicting not just the queen, but also her young son by Caesar, Caesarion (Svoronos 1904-1908, no. 1874, FIG. 50). On the reverse is a double cornucopiae that recalls the coinage of a number of her predecessors.

There were thus a series of ‘client kings and queens’ ruling under Antony, who continued to produce royal coinage, the use of which was essentially confined to their own realms. These coinages serve to illustrate the *laissez-faire* attitude of the Roman administration under Antony towards local monetary policy. This was a policy that dated back to the beginning of the Roman conquest of the Greek world in the second century BC and would continue in those kingdoms that still existed under Augustus. At the same time changes in the designs of some of these coinages, as we have seen, also

65 The silver coinage was disentangled by Mørkholm 1975. For the Alexandrian bronze see Picard *et al.* 2012; for the Cypriot see still Svoronos 1904-1908, nos 1874-7.

66 Mørkholm 1975, pp. 18-19.

67 Svoronos 1904-1908, no. 1853. See *BMC Ptolemies*, Cleopatra VII, 1. They were issued on two occasions, in the 6th and 11th years of her rule (47/6 and 42/1 BC). In this exceptional production she was, in fact, following in the footsteps of her father who had also issued drachms with his own portrait: see, e.g. *BMC Ptolemies*, Ptolemy XIII, 34 (misdescribed) and, more recently Gorny and Mosch, Auction 232 (5 October 2015), lot 316.

68 Picard *et al.* 2012, pp. 104-6, series 10.

serve to reinforce the picture that emerges from the literary sources: Antony rearranged many of the kingdoms within his *imperium*, and in a number of cases brought to an end dynasties that did not meet expectations, in favour of new men who did.

Civic and Roman Provincial Coinage

We should begin by noting the clear reduction of production of silver coinages within ‘civic’ mints.⁶⁹ We have already seen that production of the posthumous Philip coinage stopped at Antioch in 38/7 BC. The silver mint of Laodicea-ad-Mare also came to an end in 40/39. That of Aradus, already sporadic, ended in 44/3 BC, long before the city was finally taken by Antony.⁷⁰ Particularly striking is the demise of the silver coinage of Ascalon, which was produced in various years from 99/8 BC, but came to a close in 39/8 BC. In the years since 50/49 BC the mint had adopted the portrait of Cleopatra on the obverse, and we must wonder what the significance of this coinage and its end was.⁷¹ The only exceptions to this downturn



MAP 2 Mints in the Levant

69 For a summary of this see now Olivier and Aumaitre 2017, pp. 108-9.

70 Mørholm 1983, p. 102 and Duyrat 2005, pp. 283-5.

71 For an overview see Gitler and Master 2010. Down to 55 BC the mint struck in 19 years with 36 obverse dies (88 specimens). After the adoption of Cleopatra's portrait three years are recorded, with 5 dies (8 specimens).

are the Phoenician mints of Tyre and Sidon. At both cities production continued throughout the period 42-31 BC, but even here there were interruptions. At Tyre, no coinage is currently attested for the years 37/6 and 36/5 BC; at Sidon, no silver is attested in years 42/1, 39/8, 36/5 and 35/4 BC. In the absence of published die-studies it is impossible to say just how large the issues produced were.⁷²

Last, but by no means least, we must look at the bronze coinage of the cities under Mark Antony's control, because here there have been major misunderstandings about the nature of the coinage concerned, the role of Mark Antony, and especially the position of Cleopatra and her influence over Antony. To understand what has happened, it will be helpful to begin by focussing on a series of coins that feature the portrait of Cleopatra, and which are generally described as 'coins of Cleopatra', as if they were royal issues.⁷³

As we shall see, they are not. The coins in question are all bronze, and all issued in the names of cities (FIGS 51-59). In order of production they are:

- Damascus (*RPCI* 4781). 37/6 BC (FIG. 51)
- Orthosia (*RPCI* 4501). 36/5 BC (FIG. 52)
- Tripolis (*RPCI* 4510). 36/5 BC (FIG. 53)
- Berytus (*RPCI* 4529). 36/5 BC (FIG. 54)
- Orthosia (*RPCI* 4502). 35/4 BC (FIG. 55)
- Damascus (*RPCI* 4783). 33/2 BC (FIG. 56)
- Damascus (*RPCI* 4783A). 33/2 BC (FIG. 57)
- Berytus (*RPCI* 4530). 32/1 BC (FIG. 58)
- Patras (*RPCI* 1245). 32/1 BC (FIG. 59)

All of these coins have the portrait of Cleopatra on the obverse, but their inscriptions identify them very clearly as coins of cities. In this respect, we might note the clear contrast with the coins issued by Cleopatra as Tetrarch of Chalcis, on which clear agency is expressed (above, FIGS 33-35). What is Cleopatra's portrait doing on these civic coins? As I have already noted, the tendency in the past, and indeed in the most treatments of the subject has been to treat these as coins of Cleopatra, that is to say to regard her as the issuer of these coins, and thus, presumably the chooser of the obverse design. Svoronos, for example, in his great corpus of Ptolemaic coinage, includes them among the coins of Cleopatra as «τὰ κοπέντα ἐν Ἀσίᾳ». As one commentator has recently put it, "Much of Cleopatra's coinage reflects her territorial ambition, especially in the early 30s BC. Berytus, Damascus, Orthosia and Tripolis, all Phoenician cities she acquired at

⁷² *RPCI* 4624-31 (Tyre) and 4550-4 (Sidon). For what can be said on the basis of die-counts see Olivier and Aumaitre 2017, p. 108, n. 33.

⁷³ Those known to Svoronos are incorporated as his nos 1878-96 and 1905.

that time, began to issue coinage with her portrait”.⁷⁴ But this is not what the coins are telling us with their legends: they are claiming to be civic issues.

As we noted above, two of the great advantages of coinage as a form of evidence are that coins are dateable, and that they can easily be compared with what precedes and follows. We may thus take a closer look at the context of these Cleopatra coins. The first point that we note is that none of these coinages was large. The die-studies carried by Olivier and Aumaître reveal no more than 3 obverse dies per issue, in contrast to the much larger royal coinage of Cleopatra at Chalcis.⁷⁵ The dates that the cities placed on their issues at this period allow a fairly precise reconstruction of their production. As we have seen, these ‘Cleopatra’ coins were struck between 37/6 and 32/1 BC. We can add the other half of the picture by looking at the issues from the same region that feature the portrait of Antony. Here, again, there has been a tendency to see these issues as an expression of a form of royal authority: “Throughout the triumvirate, Antony is primarily a Roman magistrate, though one of the Caesarian rather than the Republican model. The Phoenician municipal coinages illustrate the change in the secondary aspects of his rule which took place in 37, when his Seleucid claims became merged in the project of world empire, built on the ruins of Hellenistic monarchies....”⁷⁶ Closer examination of the evidence suggests that something else is going on. The issues in question are:

- Tripolis (*RPCI* 4509). 42/1 BC (FIG. 60)
- Ptolemais (*RPCI* 4740). 39/8 BC (FIG. 61)
- Aradus (*RPCI* 4466). 38/7 BC (FIG. 62)
- Balanea (*RPCI* 4456). 37/6 BC? (FIG. 63)
- Marathus (*RPCI* 4494). 37/6 BC (FIG. 64)
- Aradus (*RPCI* 4467).⁷⁷ 36/5-35/4 BC (not illustrated)
- Aradus (*RPCI* 4468).⁷⁸ 36/5-35/4 BC (not illustrated)
- Ptolemais (*RPCI* 4741). 35/4 BC (FIG. 65)
- Ptolemais (*RPCI* 4742). 35/4 BC (FIG. 66)
- Dora (*RPCI* 4752). 34/3 BC (FIG. 67)

⁷⁴ Roller 2010, pp. 182. Note also the circular debate that has taken place regarding the issues struck at Damascus and Cleopatra’s relationship with the city, described by Rowan 2019, pp. 107-8.

⁷⁵ Olivier and Aumaître 2017, pp. 112-9. For Chalcis see above n. 48.

⁷⁶ Grant 1946, p. 370.

⁷⁷ Obverse: Head of Antony r., Reverse: Bull galloping l.; CKΔ (above), MH (below).

⁷⁸ Obverse: Head of Antony r. Reverse: Urn between two palm branches and two sphinxes; KE (in field). A coin of this type is recorded by Rouvier, but has not subsequently been seen. See *RPC ad loc.*

We may summarise the overall picture in Table 1. The first two columns show coins that bear the portrait of Mark Antony and Cleopatra. In the third column, are the two instances where Antony and Cleopatra appear together.⁷⁹

DATE	ANTONY	CLEOPATRA	ANTONY & CLEOPATRA
42/1	Tripolis (<i>RPC</i> 4509)		
41/0			
40/39			
39/8	Ptolemais (<i>RPC</i> 4740)		
38/7	Aradus (<i>RPC</i> 4466)		
37/6	Balanea (<i>RPC</i> 4456)? Marathus (<i>RPC</i> 4494)	Damascus (<i>RPC</i> 4781)	
36/5	Aradus (<i>RPC</i> 4467)	Orthosia (<i>RPC</i> 4501) Tripolis (<i>RPC</i> 4510) Berytus (<i>RPC</i> 4529)	
35/4	Aradus (<i>RPC</i> 4468)	Orthosia (<i>RPC</i> 4502)	Ptolemais (<i>RPC</i> 4741-2)
34/3			Dora (<i>RPC</i> 4752)
33/2		Damascus (<i>RPC</i> 4783)	
32/1		Berytus (<i>RPC</i> 4530)	
Undated	Antioch (<i>RPC</i> 4135)	Patras (<i>RPC</i> 1245)	

TABLE 1 Civic coins with portraits of Antony and Cleopatra, 42/1-32/1 BC

Lest the table present a false impression, it should be stressed that one could extend the columns backwards to the birth of coinage and see nothing but a blank grid. The portrait of no Roman emperor had appeared on a civic bronze coinage prior to the period of the second triumvirate.⁸⁰ There are no Caesars and no Pompeys prior to this. For that matter, for the most part, there are no Ptolemaic portraits on civic coins in this part of the world.⁸¹ The appearance of portraits in this sudden burst is an entirely new phenomenon.

79 The example attributed by Grant 1946, p. 369 to Aradus is not admitted by *RPC*, and seems doubtful, though is accepted by Sartre 2001, p. 465.

80 The curious exception, if correctly identified, is the portrait of Gabinius that appears on the coinage of Nysa from *ca.* 57/6-46/5 BC: Barkay 2003, Groups A-D, nos 1-6 (*cf.* *RPC* 1 4826, 4825, 4825A, 4827, 4828A, 4828). In a sense, however, this is the exception that proves the rule, since Nysa was apparently refounded as Gabinia-in-Nysa by Gabinius, and his portrait thus appears as founder. Marisa too seems to have been refounded as a Gabinia; the coins there seem not to bear his portrait, however. See Qedar 1992/3, types A-D; against the identification of the 'portrait' with Gabinius, see Barkay, *op. cit.* p. 41, n. 16.

81 The only exception is provided by the intriguing silver coinage of Ascalon. See the overview by Spaer 1984. Even portraits of living monarchs on royal coinage are rare and confined to the remarkable portrait coinage of Ptolemy V struck on campaign in Coele Syria in the course of the Fifth Syrian War. For overviews and discussion see Mørkholm 1979 and 1981, and Meadows 2017.

Our question is no longer just about Cleopatra, therefore, it is also about Antony. What is his portrait doing on these coins? This is not, of course, a new question. As we have noted, Michael Grant in his monumental *From Imperium to Auctoritas*, examined the question at some length, and came to the conclusion that “the Seleucid tradition was consciously maintained.”⁸² Yet this makes little sense; the Seleucid municipal coinages to which he was referring and which had combined royal portrait with civic issue had been an isolated phenomenon of the second century BC, long since defunct.⁸³ Moreover, of the cities that began to place Antony’s image on their bronze, only one (Ptolemais) had been the mint of municipal issues under the Seleucids. In any case, Grant’s use of the passive voice here (“was consciously maintained”) leaves the agency of this maintenance ambiguous. Following the settlement of 37/6 BC by which Cleopatra’s kingdom was extended into Syria, according to Grant, “overlordship of the Ptolemaic realm is the cause of his portrait, with that of Cleopatra, at Ptolemais Ace and Aradus, which were now in the Ptolemaic kingdom.”⁸⁴ But again we cannot escape the fact that there is no prior tradition at either of these mints of civic coinage being produced for a Ptolemaic ruler.

In fact, I believe that we can firmly rule out the possibility that this adoption of Antony’s portrait was in any way caused by his relationship to Cleopatra. If we turn again to Table 1 we find the first datable instance of Antony appearing on the obverse of a civic coin at Tripolis in 42/1 BC. On the reverse of this coin is his first wife, Fulvia. Influential though she may have been at Rome, Fulvia, enjoyed no form of authority over the city of Tripolis.⁸⁵ Her likeness was chosen for the coinage presumably because she was Antony’s wife. The fact that the first dateable instance of portraiture of this kind from the province of Syria is of a Roman triumvir and his wife makes it clear that we are dealing with a phenomenon that springs not out of pure Hellenistic precedent or tradition, but rather out of a fusion of Greek and Roman expectations.⁸⁶ The double portrait had no real precedent in the Greek world,⁸⁷ but had emerged very

82 Grant 1946, p. 369; for the sentiment cf. Olivier and Aumaître 2017, p. 106 (“traditions régionales, notamment séleucides”).

83 For the coinages in question see Mørkholm 1965.

84 Grant 1946, p. 369.

85 On Fulvia’s position see Wood 1999, pp. 41-2, Cooley 2013, p. 28.

86 Opinion is divided on whether Fulvia had appeared on other coinages. Against the idea see Wood 1999, pp. 41-4 (apparently unaware of the issue of Tripolis). In favour of her identification on the coinage of Fulvia-Eumeneia, see *RPCI*, pp. 508-9 *ad nos* 3139-40.

87 Rare exceptions in gold are provided by the double jugate portrait issues of 3rd century Egypt (*Ptolemaic Coins* 3017-19), and a unique *mnaiëion* of ca. 180-176 BC featuring portraits of Ptolemy VI and his mother Cleopatra I on reverse and obverse (British Museum, CM 1978-10-21-1).

recently in Roman coinage.⁸⁸ In 42/1 BC the obvious models were the issues struck by Antony himself in 43 BC bearing both his own portrait and that of Julius Caesar (*RRC* 488) or those of the same year bringing together the portraits of Antony and Octavian (*RRC* 492-3). But the choice of types at Tripolis was not simply about the acknowledgement of power, since Fulvia has no part in that nexus. The joint representation of husband and wife is surely to be explained instead in honorific terms.

The adoption of the portrait of Antony by these cities was, I would suggest, a spontaneous honorific act: an attempt to place a Roman magistrate and his wife within the reciprocal relationship model that had hitherto obtained between cities and their overlords. Certain aspects of these coins may perhaps be taken to support this interpretation. At Balanea, for example, we can see that while Antony's portrait was used for the largest bronze denomination, other obverse designs were used for smaller denominations.⁸⁹ That is to say, Antony's portrait did not achieve the exclusivity we might expect in a coinage in a top-down royal tradition. Civic choice played a part. Elsewhere in Syria, Antony's portrait did not emerge on the city coinage at all, suggesting that this was far from a top-down, centralised system of iconography. The municipal coinages of the Seleucids look more cohesive. Turning for a moment to the coinages with portrait of Cleopatra, it seems virtually certain that the city of Damascus was outside of the territory allotted to the queen by Antony, and yet her portrait was chosen there as an obverse design.⁹⁰ But to return to Mark Antony, we need to think not just about the presence of his portrait, but also whose place he was taking on civic coinage. We obtain a flavour of this at Balanea (*RPC* I 4457, FIG. 68) where we can see a contemporary denomination featuring an obverse type of Tyche. The pattern is similar at many other mints in the region: the obverse of the coin is reserved for the protecting deity of the city, sometimes the Tyche or fortune of the city, sometimes a more specific one. Antony has, in a sense, become Σύνναος, with these deities. One cannot help but be reminded of a similar pattern that has been observed in the appearance of imperial statues in the cities of the eastern Roman empire: "emperors did not set up portraits of themselves; provincial cities set up portraits of the emperor in gratitude for or in anticipation of Imperial benefactions".⁹¹ And sacred and secular space, as Rose goes on to show, were equally appropriate for such dedications.

If it is correct to see the spread of royal portraits as a reaction

88 See on this Williams 2003, pp. 88-9.

89 *RPC* I 4456-9: the four different denominations bear heads of Antony, Tyche, a radiate deity and Hermes.

90 *RPC* I 4781 and 4783, Figs 51 and 56. However, see n. 74 above.

91 Rose 1997, p. 109.

on the part of the cities to the new world order, then the table of issues and dates makes interesting reading. The pattern is very clearly that Antony comes first with Cleopatra's portrait coming into use second. Far from being an iconographic trick that Antony picked from the Hellenistic world, this royal imagery seems in fact to have passed from Antony to Cleopatra. For the latter it came into existence following her initial acquisition of the Syrian territories in 38 BC. In fact, this looks like a reaction on the part of the relevant cities to a change of immediate overlord: honorific attention switches from Antony to Cleopatra or, belt and braces, to them both.

In this sense, the analogy with honorific statues breaks down. For the honorific statues of powerful Romans, there is a long Hellenistic tradition that precedes them. For the coinage there is not. This raises the question of why the reaction to Antony (and Cleopatra) took this form now, when there is no clear precedent for the adoption of coin portraiture by Greek cities in this way.

The answer to this question, as with other aspects of monetary change in the east at this time, lies at Rome. In 44 BC, shortly before his assassination, Julius Caesar's portrait had appeared on the Roman coinage.⁹² This was a seismic shift in coin design at the imperial centre, where no living individual had previously appeared on the coinage. In the following year, 43 BC, Mark Antony and Octavian followed Caesar's example, when, as we have already noted, moneyers operating most probably as part of their military establishments began to strike coins with the two generals' images (*RRC* 488 and 490). They were followed, it seems, by Brutus (*RRC* 506-7). Just a year later, at Tripolis, in 42/1 BC, a Greek city took the major step of placing one of these generals, Antony, on its coinage, along with his wife (*RPC* I 4509, FIG. 60). The fact of the coin portrait was Roman, its function Greek.

Coinage now provided a medium for the expression of a relationship between city and powerful individual. This new medium allowed cities to establish, develop or advertise a relationship with the man himself. "We should not underestimate the eagerness of individuals to demonstrate loyalty, nor their ability to adopt and exploit Roman models to placate, persuade, or dupe their Roman overlords."⁹³ In the uncertain years of the 40s and 30s BC this mattered: "abstract fidelity to Rome in such an age was not only insufficient: it was impossible".⁹⁴ In the 30s, when Antony interposed a second layer of control between the cities and himself – in the shape of a queen who was equally the mother of his children, then a natural reaction

92 Dio 44.4.4: καὶ ἐς τὰ νομίσματα ἐνεχάραξαν. For the first portraits see *RRC* 480.2.

93 Ando 2000, pp. 230-1.

94 Bowersock 1965, p. 43.

was perhaps to widen the honorific remit to include her too. This certainly seems to be a valid reading of Table 1.

Of course, coinage was a very public medium, arguably more so than statuary, since coins travel beyond their city of origin. Coins with portraits become an explicit statement of allegiance. In a period of uncertainty, rapid administrative shift and the increasing likelihood of imperial civil war, such symbols took on heightened importance. So, as Antony and Cleopatra moved westwards on their way to Actium we can observe the movement of portraiture with them: at Patras Cleopatra's portrait appears (*RPCI* 1245, FIG. 59). In this case we note a secondary development: the labelling of the image. Cleopatra's name is given around her portrait, not in the genitive, as we expect on a royal coinage 'of the monarch; but rather in the nominative, naming the person whose image is presented. This is now a label and, as such, a part of the honorific purpose, not a statement of issuer or owner.

Conclusion

Overall, the coinage that was struck in Mark Antony's East supports a reconstruction of the administrative system in his *imperium* which saw a centrally derived authority established over a patchwork of local systems. These local systems retained their complexity of hierarchies and continued to behave as appropriately as they could in the face of the requirements of those hierarchies. Cities did their best to cope with the reality of the double-layered, Royal-Roman political and administrative layer above them. Antony arranged the world according to his military and administrative needs, within the framework of the larger Roman Republic. The kings clung to power, on the one hand through allegiance to the Roman State, and its immanent representative, Antony, and on the other through the traditional, reciprocal relationship they had long enjoyed with the civic and other political entities beneath them. Roman, Royal and Civic coinages, as we have seen, fully describe this complex set of political, administrative and economic relationships. The Roman coinage remains steadfastly Roman in design and, for the most part, metrology. The needs of Antony's military machine led to its production in the east for the first time in a systematic way. The arrival of Roman coinage had a noticeable impact on several of the Royal coinages that remained, pushing them towards compatibility with the denarius. Civic coinage, meanwhile, now largely confined to bronze, reacted to the new world order by becoming, in some places at least, a vehicle for the maintenance of vertical relationships.

In this coinage in Antony's *imperium* we find, then, the beginnings of the rhetorical structure that will develop in the reign of Augustus to create a coinage that functioned symbolically as every

city's link with the imperial person. Under Augustus two basic developments would occur; first, the use of the imperial portrait would spread throughout the Greek world; and second, the name of Augustus would appear, in the nominative, on many of the resulting coinages. Roman provincial coinage would grow and grow, but it had been born with Mark Antony.

FIGURES

Note: all the coin images are under scale 2:1



[1]



[2]



[3]



[4]



[5]



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amandry, M. 1986. 'Le monnayage en bronze de Bibulus, Atratinus et Capito. Une tentative de romanisation en Orient, 1', *Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau*, 65:73–85.
- . 1987. 'Le monnayage en bronze de Bibulus, Atratinus et Capito. Une tentative de romanisation en Orient, 2', *Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau*, 66:101–12.
- . 1990. 'Le monnayage en bronze de Bibulus, Atratinus et Capito. Une tentative de romanisation en Orient, 3', *Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau*, 69:65–96.
- . 2008. 'Le monnayage de L. Sempronius Atratinus revisité'. *American Journal of Numismatics* 20: 421–34.
- . 2013. 'L Atratinus Augur/Antonius Imp'. In *Essays in Honour of Roberto Russo*, P. G. van Alfen and R. Witschonke (eds), 389–95. Zurich / London: Numismatica Ars Classica AG.
- Ando, C. 2000. *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*. Classics and Contemporary Thought 6. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Atlan, S. 1975. 'Side' de Basilan Amyntas Sikkeleri. Die Münzprägung Des Amyntas in Side'. *Belleter* 39: 575–611.
- Baldus, H. R. 1973. 'Ein Neues Spätporträt der Kleopatra aus Orthosia', *Jahrbuch Für Numismatik Und Geldgeschichte*, 23: 19–43.
- Barkay, R. 2003. *The Coinage of Nysa-Scythopolis (Beth-Shean)*. Corpus Nummorum Palaestinensium 5. Jerusalem: The Israel Numismatic Society.
- Bedoukian, P.Z. 1978. *Coinage of the Artaxiads of Armenia*. Special Publication - Royal Numismatic Society 10. London: Royal Numismatic Society.
- Biedermann, D., and F. Haymann. 2015. 'Die Denare des P. Ventidius Bassus (RRC 531)', *Revue Belge de Numismatique et de Sigillographie*, 161: 293–310.
- Bowersock, G. W. 1965. *Augustus and the Greek World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 1983. *Roman Arabia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Buchheim, H. 1960. *Die Orientpolitik des Triumvirn M. Antonius: ihre Voraussetzungen, Entwicklung und Zusammenhang mit den politischen Ereignissen in Italien*. Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Jahrgang 1930, Abh. 3. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

ΜΕΤΑΞΥ ΕΛΛΑΔΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΡΩΜΗΣ.
ΝΟΜΙΣΜΑΤΟΚΟΠΙΕΣ ΣΤΟΝ ΧΩΡΟ
ΔΙΚΑΙΟΔΟΣΙΑΣ (*IMPERIUM*)
ΤΟΥ ΜΑΡΚΟΥ ΑΝΤΩΝΙΟΥ

ΤΑ ΝΟΜΙΣΜΑΤΑ ΠΟΥ ΕΚΔΟΘΗΚΑΝ από τον Μάρκο Αντώνιο στην Ανατολή αποτελούν μια ισχυρή, σύγχρονη μαρτυρία για την εκεί πολιτική του εν λόγω μέλους της δεύτερης Τριανδρίας, καθώς και για την αυτοπροβολή και την πρόσληψη της εικόνας του. Αυτή η μαρτυρία δίνει τη δυνατότητα να χρησιμοποιηθεί ως ένα ικανό διορθωτικό εργαλείο στις αναπόφευκτα μεροληπτικές κειμενικές αναφορές για τις δραστηριότητές του και για την περιώνυμη σχέση του με την Κλεοπάτρα. Εξετάζοντας τις συγκεκριμένες κοπές ανά κατηγορία —ρωμαϊκές, βασιλικές, εκδόσεις των πόλεων και ρωμαϊκές επαρχιακές— μπορούμε να έχουμε μια θεώρηση του Αντωνίου από διαφορετικές οπτικές και να αντλήσουμε πληροφορίες για τη διαχείριση της Ανατολής εκ μέρους του κατά έναν τρόπο που άλλες μαρτυρίες δεν το επιτρέπουν.

Οι «ρωμαϊκές» κοπές του Αντωνίου, τα αργυρά δηνάρια και τα χρυσά νομίσματα (*aurei*) που παραδοσιακά εκδίδονταν στη Ρώμη, αρχίζουν να παράγονται στην Ανατολή σε σημαντικές ποσότητες. Ως αποτέλεσμα η χρήση του δηναρίου στην Ανατολή, που είχε κάνει την εμφάνισή της την προηγούμενη δεκαετία, τώρα πλέον σταδιακά εδραιώνεται. Ωστόσο τα δηνάρια και οι *aurei* και οι άλλες κοπές που παρήχθησαν στο όνομα του Αντωνίου από τους διοικητές του αποκαλύπτουν μια αυστηρή προσκόλληση στη χρήση των ρωμαϊκών τίτλων και τονίζουν τη θέση του Αντωνίου εντός της ιεραρχίας της Ρωμαϊκής Πολιτείας. Σπάνιες εξαιρέσεις όπως τα περίφημα δηνάρια με την επιγραφή *Armenia devicta* («Αρμενία κατανηκθείσα») μάλλον χρειάζεται να αποτιμηθούν εκ νέου στο πλαίσιο αυτό.

Η κατάσταση των πραγμάτων παρέμεινε ως είχε στις ρωμαϊκές επαρχίες, όπου ο Αντώνιος διατήρησε, τουλάχιστον αρχικά, ορισμένες από τις αργυρές νομισματοκοπίες που είχαν εκδοθεί στο παρελθόν, όπως κιστοφορικά τετράδραχμα στην επαρχία της Ασίας και μεταθανάτια τετράδραχμα στο όνομα του Σελευκίδου βασιλέως Φιλίππου Α΄ στη Συρία. Πέρα από τα όρια των επαρχιών, ο Αντώνιος ανέδειξε σε θέσεις εξουσίας νέα πρόσωπα σε διάφορα «πελατικά» βασίλεια. Οι κοπές βασιλικού τύπου συνεχίστηκαν, ωστόσο η μορφή τους άρχισε να προσαρμόζεται, λαμβάνοντας υπ' όψιν τον νέο επικυρίαρχο. Οι εκδόσεις των νέων βασιλέων συνέχισαν να ακολουθούν ελληνιστικά πρότυπα, συγκλίνοντας όμως μετρολογικά προς το ρωμαϊκό δηνάριο, προσαρμοζόμενες αυθόρμητα ίσως σε έναν καινούριο κόσμο νομισματικής ενοποίησης που ο ίδιος ο Αντώνιος ενθάρρυνε, ιδίως με τα δηνάρια των λεγεώνων του.

Οι πόλεις στην Ανατολή βρέθηκαν σε μια κατάσταση όπου έπρεπε να προσαρμοστούν σε μια νέα ιεραρχία, με δύο επίπεδα εξουσίας από πάνω τους: τους βασιλείς και τις βασιλισσες, και σε ανώτερη βαθμίδα τον επικυρίαρχο. Μέσω των διευθετήσεων που πραγματοποίησε, ο Αντώνιος τοποθέτησε διάφορους ηγεμόνες ανάμεσα στον εαυτό του και στο εκάστοτε σώμα πολιτών. Η απάντηση των πόλεων, ορατή μόνο στα νομίσματά τους, ήταν να αντιμετωπίσουν τον Αντώνιο ως τον υπέρτατο άρχοντά τους. Ακολούθησαν τις εξελίξεις στη ρωμαϊκή νομοματοκοπία και έθεσαν το πορτραίτο του Αντωνίου (και αυτά των συζύγων του) στις εκδόσεις τους. Κατ' αυτόν τον τρόπο γεννήθηκε το φαινόμενο που είναι γνωστό σήμερα ως ρωμαϊκές επαρχιακές κοπές.

Μετά την παραχώρηση ιδιαίτερα εκτεταμένων εδαφών στην Κλεοπάτρα κατόπιν εντολών του Αντωνίου κατά τη δεκαετία του 30 π.Χ., η βασίλισσα της Αιγύπτου άρχισε επίσης να εμφανίζεται σε τοπικές νομοματοκοπίες με έναν τρόπο σχεδόν χωρίς προηγούμενο στον ελληνιστικό κόσμο. Είναι ακόμη πιθανόν η Κλεοπάτρα να ανέλαβε μέρος της ευθύνης για τη νομισματική παραγωγή που απαιτούσαν οι πολεμικές προετοιμασίες του Αντωνίου. Η αυξημένη έκδοση χάλκινων νομισμάτων στη Χαλκίδα του Λιβάνου, τα αινιγματικά τετράδραχμα της «Αντιοχείας» με τα διπλά πορτραίτα και τα «δηνάρια» με την επιγραφή *Armenia devicta* μπορεί να συνιστούν όλα ενδείξεις αυτής της ανειλημμένης ευθύνης.

Ο Αντώνιος που ξεπροβάλλει από τα δεδομένα αυτά είναι ένας ηγήτορας που εξασκεί με πυγμή τον έλεγχο ως προς τη θέση του στην ιεραρχία της Τριανδρίας, κατευθύνοντας τους Ρωμαίους υφισταμένους του και διαμορφώνοντας ένα σύνθετο διοικητικό πλαίσιο που θα του επέτρεπε να ολοκληρώσει την ειρήνευση της Ανατολής. Ταυτόχρονα, σε φαινόμενα όπως οι νομισματοκοπίες του στόλου και των λεγεώνων, υπάρχουν εμφανή σημάδια μιας προσέγγισης που κοιτάζει προς το μέλλον της αναδυόμενης αυτοκρατορίας, σε μια προσπάθεια να συγκεράσει και να απλοποιήσει τις διαφορές μεταξύ του ελληνικού και του ρωμαϊκού κόσμου. Αυτό ήταν ένα αφήγημα που ο αντίπαλός του και τελικός νικητής, ο Οκταβιανός, δεν επιθυμούσε να καταγραφεί. Αλλά, παρά ταύτα, συνιστούσε μια προσέγγιση την οποία κληρονόμησε.

Περίληψη στα ελληνικά: Γιάννης Στόγιας
(*Summary in Greek: Yannis Stoyas*)