

SOME THIRD MAGISTRATES IN THE ATHENIAN NEW STYLE SILVER COINAGE

THE very term 'third magistrate' is really a misnomer, as Margaret Thompson has well argued. The men whose names appear as subsidiary signatures on New Style issues were probably contributors to the cost of this annual liturgy—often relatives, friends or political associates of the two men principally concerned.¹ I would like to examine a few of them closely here.

The chronology of the coinage is now fortunately very tight from *c.* 140 B.C., mainly thanks to Margaret Thompson's magnificent publication. It is true that she herself wanted to move back the issue of King Mithradates/Aristion from 87/6 B.C. to *c.* 120 B.C.—and with it the whole coinage—but the case against this is virtually overwhelming. The arguments surely need not be laboured here.² One modification, however, should be made in the 'low chronology'. I earlier followed Lewis in regarding the Apellikon/Gorgias issue as a fixed point in 88/7 B.C. It is certainly the last of the long series of 'three magistrates' issues, after which the mint continued with the King Mithradates gold and silver.³ But I had overlooked a grave historical difficulty.

The Peripatetic philosopher Athenion returned to Athens some time during the summer of 88 B.C., when Mithradates was already master of Asia Minor and threatening Thrace and Macedonia. He promptly had himself elected hoplite general, secured similar commands for his friends and within a few days established a tyranny. One of his friends—Apellikon of Teos—was put in charge of the fleet. With this he was despatched against Delos, in order to secure the island and its treasures for an Athens dedicated to Mithradates' cause. The surprise raid was a fiasco owing to the commander's incompetence and the resolution of the Italian community on Delos. Almost all Apellikon's force of 1000 men were killed or captured, his equipment destroyed. He was lucky to slip away to safety himself.⁴

Delos was now 'in revolt' from Athens, but not for long. Mithradates sent Archelaos to win over Greece and his first call was in the Cyclades. Delos was his richest prize. From there Archelaos despatched Aristion with 2000 men and the Delian treasures to win Athens securely for Mithradates—an Epicurean tyrant instead of the discredited Peripatetic. The Piraeus then became Archelaos' naval base. The chronology of Athenion and Aristion is uncertain, but by the spring of 87 B.C. Aristion and Archelaos were campaigning in Boeotia against Q. Brettius Sura. This was the situation which Sulla found on crossing the Adriatic as soon as the season of the year allowed.⁵

Now coinage was struck right through to the end of Apellikon's year—thus, on Lewis's dating, to *c.* July 87 B.C.⁶ In view of the events just described this would be most surprising. Even if Apellikon *did* return to Athens after the Delos fiasco—and this is uncertain—he can have had little influence once Aristion arrived, and I find it hard to believe that coinage with his name and badge continued even then to be struck for several months more. There

¹ *The New Style Silver Coinage of Athens* (henceforth *Athens*) (1961) 587–99.

² See D. M. Lewis, *CR* n.s. xii (1952) 291 f. and *NC* 7th series ii (1962) 275–300; H. B. Mattingly, *NC* 7th series ix (1969) 327–30 and *Historia* xx (1971) 34–43. Margaret Thompson tried unsuccessfully to demolish Lewis's case in *NC* 7th series ii (1962) 301–33.

³ See *NC* 7th series ii (1962) 278. For the position of Apellikon's issue see Margaret Thompson, *Athens* 367 f. and 392–9. She wanted to make the King Mithradates/Aristion issue supplementary to the

main coinage and contemporary with Kointos/Kleas (*Athens* 416 f. and 421–4). The Piraeus and Dipylon Hoards (*Athens* 503 f. and 508 f.) surely indicate that the King Mithradates issue *follows* Apellikon's.

⁴ See Atheneaus v 211e–15b (from Poseidonios). Ferguson (*Hell. Athens*, 447 n. 1) decisively disposed of attempts to conflate Athenion and Aristion.

⁵ The best source is Appian *Mithrad.* 4. 27–5. 30, from whom these details come.

⁶ There are at present gaps in months, E, I and Θ (*Athens* 367).

was after all good precedent for the replacement of two mint magistrates in the course of a calendar year.⁷

The problem could be solved by dating the Apellikon/Gorgias issue 89/8 B.C. There would be a gap in coinage in 88/7 B.C. to match the *ἀναρχία* recorded in the great archon-list.⁸ This shift would settle an even more awkward crux about the coinage. Delos Hoard *Γ* firmly secures the position of the second issue of Herakleides/Eukles in the order. Only fifteen issues lie between it and Apellikon/Gorgias. Now this Herakleides issue was struck in an intercalary year. But with Apellikon/Gorgias dated 88/7 B.C. we reach a seeming impasse. Herakleides/Eukles (II) should be dated 104/3 B.C. on the numismatic evidence. Yet the year was quite certainly *ordinary*.⁹ I was formerly driven to postulate a year's break in coinage in 99/8 B.C., when the mining areas would have been overrun by the slaves in revolt. This slightly risky expedient settled a similar difficulty about the issue of Timostratos/Poses, which seemed otherwise to clash irremediably with the epigraphic evidence for 101/0 B.C. But would such a break have coincided so neatly with an archon year and were there no stores of bullion in Athens itself from which to coin?¹⁰ If Apellikon's issue could be dated 89/8 B.C., my clumsy earlier hypothesis could be discarded. What cannot be done is to act as though the 'intercalary problem' did not exist.

There are valid objections, of course, to shifting Apellikon.¹¹ But I think that they can be met. If we put his issue in 89/8 B.C., we make it coincide with the third successive tenure of the archonship by the *pro-Roman* Medeios and we break the neat parallel of mint-magistrates (Xenokles/Harmoxenos) staying on with the archon Medeios for a second term in 90/89 B.C. I will take the second point first. Xenokles and Harmoxenos had already been moneyers together some years before Medeios (archon 101/0 B.C.) returned unconstitutionally to the archonship in 91/0 B.C. There was nothing unconstitutional about a second tenure of the 'mint-magistracy' after a gap of years.¹² We need not therefore explain this return of Xenokles and Harmoxenos by the oligarchic 'revolution' which we seem to witness in 91/0 B.C. But no one so far had been asked or allowed to undertake the liturgy twice in direct succession and *third* tenure was equally unprecedented. Such breach of custom makes excellent sense in 91/0 B.C. The two mint-magistrates significantly now proclaim their pro-Roman sympathies by adopting the goddess Roma as their symbol in place of their earlier more equivocal badges. In the following year the moneyers Kointos/Kleas depict Nike crowning Roma. The desperate war against Rome's Italian allies was swinging steadily Rome's way before the end of 90/89 B.C., but at its outset such confident support from Athens must have been indeed welcome.¹³ In Medeios' third successive archonship Mithradates' breakthrough in the East transformed the whole situation. But when it opened there is no reason to think that Apellikon's pro-Mithradatic sympathies were known or even in existence. He had had a troubled career as an adopted citizen of Athens. His thefts from the Metroon were discovered and he had to flee the city. But he bided his time and after carefully securing 'influence' in high places he was allowed to return. Is it not possible that he even successfully imposed on Medeios and his circle?¹⁴ The repeated tenure

⁷ Euboulides/Agathokle were replaced by Zoilos/Euandros in month *Γ* (*Athens* 261 f.).

⁸ *IG* ii² 1713 (= *SIG*³ 733) col. ii 5.

⁹ For the placing of Herakleides/Eukles (II) see *Athens* 315 f., 392 and 481 (Delos Hoard *Γ*), and my Appendix. For the calendar character of 104/3 B.C. see *Hesp.* xxvi (1957) 25 ff.

¹⁰ See *Historia* xx (1971) 42 f. and my Appendix. Professor W. K. Pritchett very rightly objected (by letter) to my hypothesis and I have accepted his point.

¹¹ Lewis has developed these (by letter) and his criticisms have radically altered the plan of this

article—I hope, for the better. I am very grateful to him.

¹² There are two clear cases of other *pairs* returning. See the evidence of Ammo/Dio and Herakleides/Eukles (I and II) in *Athens* 63 and 274 f. and consult my Appendix.

¹³ See Lewis's interesting argument in *NC* 7th series ii (1962) 276 ff. My dating only strengthens the case.

¹⁴ See Athenaeus v 214e *καὶ μετ' οὐ πολὺ πάλιν κατήλθε θεραπεύσας πολλούς*.

of Xenokles and Harmoxenos suggests that candidates for the mint-liturgy were hard to find and this conclusion seems strengthened by the strange vagaries of the 'third magistracy' at this period.¹⁵ Apellikon was very rich and also very anxious to establish himself again in Athens. It would have been unreasonable to reject an offer from such a man, who was astute enough to be a paragon of political discretion as long as it suited him.

I suggested earlier that a gap in coinage in 88/7 B.C. would neatly match the *ἀναρχία* registered that year in the archon-list. Now scholars admittedly disagree about the meaning of this entry. Dow thought that it was quite possible that no archon was ever appointed and acutely adduced the evidence of *IG* ii² 1714 in support of this view.¹⁶ But on the whole Ferguson's thesis has prevailed. He argued that the Romans refused to recognise the archon who served in this first year of revolt, so that his name was replaced by the word *ἀναρχία* after their victory; this would be an exact parallel to what had happened on the fall of the Thirty.¹⁷ It is true that Philanthes is registered as archon for 87/6 B.C., but the general consensus is that he was appointed only *after* Sulla's capture of Athens on March 1st 86 B.C., replacing the 'democratic' archon.¹⁸ I believe that Dow's instinct in this matter was right. Ferguson's view has a fatal flaw. He wrongly dated the New Style issue of Aristion/Philon 88/7 B.C. This compelled him to place Athenion's coup in March or April 88 B.C., about the time of the elections.¹⁹ Now once the Aristion/Philon issue is removed from this context to its proper place several years earlier, we are free to put Athenion's coup considerably later in 88 B.C.—as indeed is demanded by the probable time-table of Mithradates' advance and of the Roman reaction.²⁰ In other words Athenion did not return to Athens until the archon year 88/7 B.C. had begun. We can now see a new significance in the language of his first harangue as reported by Poseidonios. He vehemently attacked the *ἀναρχία* which was paralysing public life and which (he alleged) the Roman Senate was deliberately prolonging, in order to impose their own political solution on Athens.²¹ What had happened, I believe, was roughly this. In 92/1 B.C.—if not earlier—election replaced lot for the eponymous archonship and Medeios returned to office. For two more years he was re-elected and a firm pro-Roman oligarchy consolidated its power. Inevitably such tight control provoked reaction. When the elections for 88/7 B.C. came round there was such strife and disorder that deadlock resulted.²² The oligarchs clamped down even harder and contrived to refer the problem to the Roman Senate—which proved in no hurry to break the deadlock. The year 88/7 B.C. thus opened without an archon. Athens was to be given a 'cooling off' period, with virtual suspension of normal political life (by the pro-Roman oligarchs) until the people should come to their senses. This was the situation to which Athenion returned from Mithradates' court. He found a city ripe for revolution and ended 'anarchy' by giving Athens a tyrant, not the archon whose absence had precipitated the crisis. Ferguson came closer to this view than at first appears possible.

¹⁵ See *Athens* 346–68.

¹⁶ *Hesp.* iii (1934) 144–6. *IG* ii² 1714 lists a board of eight archons only, starting with the *basileus*. Prosopographically several fit 88/7 B.C. to perfection (see notes in *IG* ii²). If the list was inscribed during the 'revolt' of Athens, the absence of the eponymous archon can mean only one thing—none was appointed. If it was inscribed subsequently, why should the eponymous archon *alone* be passed over?

¹⁷ See *Hell. Ath.* 440 n. 1 and Kirchner's note in *IG* ii² 1713. For the archon of 404/3 B.C. see Xen. *HG* ii 3.1.

¹⁸ Dinsmoor, *Archons* 283; Ferguson, *op. cit.*, 454 n. 6.

¹⁹ See Ferguson, *op. cit.*, 444 n. 1; Kirchner in *IG* ii² 1713; Dinsmoor *loc. cit.*

²⁰ Q. Oppius and M. Aquilius, who had tried to

regroup Roman forces in Asia, were already prisoners of Mithradates *before* Athenion left for Athens (Athen. v 213 a–b). Their capture was soon followed by the fall of Stratonikeia and the attack on Rhodes. Appian's narrative, taken as a whole, suggests that these events belong to the late autumn of 88 B.C. (3. 17–4. 27).

²¹ Athen. v 213c: *μη ἀνέχεσθαι τῆς ἀναρχίας ἦν ὁ Ρωμαίων σύγκλητος ἐπισχεθῆναι πεποιήκεν ἕως ἄν αὐτῆ δοκιμάσῃ περὶ τοῦ πῶς ἡμᾶς πολιτεύεσθαι δεῖ*. Dinsmoor, keeping the mistaken dating of Athenion and Aristion, seems to have divined the identity of the two 'anarchies' (*loc. cit.*)

²² Note Arist. *Ath.* 13.1—of the early sixth century B.C.—*οὐ κατέστησαν ἄρχοντα διὰ τὴν στάσιν, καὶ πάλιν ἔτει πέμπτῳ διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν ἀναρχίαν ἐποίησαν*.

He saw that Athenion could not have characterised the *whole* of Medeios' predominance as 'anarchy'. The abuses of which he complained had obviously not lasted long. Ferguson therefore assumed that the violence of popular reaction against Medeios had led to tough oligarchic counter-measures early in 89/8 B.C. and the appeal to Rome.²³ I think that my dating is in fact preferable. Now in a year that opened in such confusion and without an archon we should not be surprised if the monetary liturgy—doubtless among others—was not filled.

With Apellikon/Gorgias then dated 89/8 B.C. and the chronology firmly established, I would proceed to look at three 'third magistrates' from issues that can be dated 120/19, 117/6 and 109/8 B.C. with fair certainty. There is no serious doubt about Aphrodisi/Dioge and none at all about Damon/Sosikrates. These are respectively the thirty-first and twentieth issues before Apellikon.²⁴ On the evidence of its style and control-marks the issue of Themisto/Theopompos must be reckoned the twenty-eighth issue before Apellikon, where Margaret Thompson placed it. It cannot really be shifted.²⁵ Now one of the 'third magistrates' under Themisto/Theopompos signs himself *MENOI*. This must surely be expanded as *MENOI(THΣ)*—a rare name that happens to be borne by the archon of 117/6 B.C. As I have argued elsewhere, there is no reason why state officials should not occasionally have contributed towards the cost of coinage; they did this at Kos and we certainly find them participating in public subscription funds at Athens.²⁶ The archon Menoites was not the only one to help out the mint. The 'third magistrates' *EYMA* and *ΙΑΣΩΝ* of 120/19 and 109/8 B.C., I submit, were the eponymous archons Eumachos and Iason ('after Polykleitos').²⁷ Sundwall and Margaret Thompson have already argued that the second magistrate of the Ktesi/Euma issue could reasonably be taken to be Eumachos. The abbreviation would be strictly parallel to *ΗΓΕΜΑ(XOΣ)* in the 120s, *ΑΜΥΝΟΜΑ(XOΣ)* in 104/3 and *ΚΛΕΟΜΑ(XOΣ)* in 101/0 B.C. We find the name Eumachos written out in full on coins of Antiochos/Karaichos c. 130 B.C., so that the archon—the name is fairly rare—would certainly seem to have contributed *before* his archonship like Iason.²⁸ Margaret Thompson, it is true, prefers to expand the *EYMA* of 120/19 B.C. as *EYMA(PEIΔHΣ)*. This man was a knight at the Pythais of 128/7 and first moneyer in 113/2 B.C. As 'third magistrate' for Aphrodisi/Apolexi in 122/1 B.C. he signed himself *EYMAPEI*.²⁹ On balance *EYMA(XOΣ)* would seem the better supplement and it may be significant that Eumareides is abbreviated *EYMAP* on the drachm of his own issue.³⁰ Margaret Thompson, however, suggests that the same man (Eumarei: Euma) is likely to have been associated with Aphrodisios in his

²³ See *op. cit.* 440 with notes.

²⁴ For the evidence see Margaret Thompson, *Athens* 310–16 and 392. She is surely right to place the issue of Karaich/Ergokle *before* Aphrodisi/Dioge (p. 312)—both on the grounds of style and the pattern of control-marks (on which see p. 615). On its precise position see my arguments in *Historia* xx (1971) 40 f. The 'intercalary' issue of Euryklei/Ariara cannot go in 122/1 B.C., which is known as ordinary, so that Karaichos' issue cannot be inserted between it and Aphrodisi/Dioge. It should be put between Polemon/Alketes and Mikion/Euryklei instead. One small formal point clinches this. On the issues of Polemon and Karaichos the third magistrate's name often takes only one line (see plates 47 and 53 f.) in contrast to the general practice.

²⁵ The only alternative placing would be *before* Aphrodisi/Dioge, but Margaret Thompson rightly rejects this on the basis of close stylistic study (p. 313). The pattern of control marks again supports her (p. 615).

²⁶ The date of Menoites is certain: see my detailed

arguments on the later second century archons in *Historia* xx (1971) 43–45. For Kos see J. Kroll, *ANS Museum Notes* xi (1964) 91–9 ff. For the Athenian funds see *IG* ii² 2336 as republished by Dow (*HSCP* 1 (1940) 116 ff.); *Hesp.* xxxvi (1967) 88 ff., no. 19, B. 38–44 with C. 51–63.

²⁷ These archons' dates too are certain: see my article in *Historia* xx (1971) 43–45 ff.

²⁸ For the parallels see *PA* 738, 6281 and 8574 ff. For the magistrates see Margaret Thompson's excellent summarising section (*Athens* 547–84). Kirchner listed only 10 men called Eumachos (*PA* 5814–5821 with 5813 a–b). Iason was 'third magistrate' also for Charinautes/Aristeas in 112/1 B.C. (144/3 T).

²⁹ He signs in full as first magistrate. Margaret Thompson's account of him and his brother Alkidamos (pp. 566 and 549) was corrected by Lewis in *NC* 7th series ii (1962) 290 f. Eumareides was an ephebe in 138/7 B.C. (*Fouilles de Delphes* iii 2.23 col. ii 21).

³⁰ See *Athens* 245. Eumachos is abbreviated *EYM* and *EY* on the small denomination of Antiochos/Karaichos (*ibid.* 157).

two tenures of the mint magistracy. She adduces as parallels Dionysos (Dionysos) and Diok, who served in both terms of Herakleides/Eukles, and the Sokra (Sokrates) who is found with Mikion/Euryklei and Euryklei/Ariara.³¹ The argument is not clinching. *EYMA* for Eumareides in a year when the archon was Eumachos would have been confusing and one might expect *EYMAP* at the least. 'Third magistrates' were not averse to giving helpful clues, where confusion was likely.³² Moreover Aphrodisios is not a very uncommon name. Two men so called from Piraeus were Councillors in 135/4 B.C. and there is also Aphrodisios of Azene, an orator known from 122/1 B.C. If the Aphrodisios of 120/19 B.C. was *not* Apolexis' former colleague, the case for equating *EYMAPEI* with *EYMA* falls.³³ However this may be, I think that we may fairly suggest that in 120/19, 117/6 and 109/8 B.C. the eponymous archon was one of the men who contributed money for the coinage.

Distinguished foreigners were also welcome to contribute—as they did to the public subscription funds.³⁴ None was more distinguished than the Seleucid prince—the future Antiochos VIII—who was sent to Athens for education and safety in the 130s. His arrival can be precisely dated. He was 'third magistrate' in the tenth month of the issue of Timarchou/Nikago. The Seleucid anchor symbol can be seen as a delicate compliment to the boy on whose behalf money was being advanced.³⁵ On the evidence of style and control marks the issue of Timarchou/Nikago must be ranked the forty-fifth before Apellikon and so dated 134/3 B.C. This can be neatly confirmed. Its immediate predecessor in Margaret Thompson's arrangement—the issue of Mened/Epigeno—was struck in an intercalary year and the epigraphic evidence proves conclusively the intercalary character of 135/4 B.C.³⁶ Antiochos' own issue, with the Seleucid elephant, belongs in 131/0 B.C. One of his 'third magistrates'—*MENAN(ΔΠΟΣ?)*—had served earlier with him in 135/4 B.C. and it is worth enquiring whether he could not be a Syrian Greek from the young prince's entourage. A Menandros (?) son of Menandros of Antioch was an ephebe at Athens in 119/8 B.C. and his father could well be the 'third magistrate' of a dozen years earlier.³⁷ *ΑΓΑΘΑ(ΡΧΟΣ?)* might be a fellow-countryman. In 183/2 B.C. Agathon of Antioch contributed to a subscription fund at Athens on behalf of himself, his wife and his son Agatharchos. Born in the 180s this son could have shared the expenses of the coinage with the young prince Antiochos in 131/0 B.C. The name Agatharchos is not common for an Athenian.³⁸

By patient perseverance we may begin to learn the secrets of the New Style coinage and exploit its prosopographical evidence better. Though the main hope lies in identifying more first and second magistrates, I trust that in this brief paper I have been able to show that something can be gained by attending carefully to the evidence of the misnamed 'third magistrates'.

³¹ See *Athens* 595 f. with n. 1 on p. 596.

³² Note (*Athens* 558, 561 f., 576 f.) *ΔΗΜΙ ΟΥΑΙ*, *ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΚΕ*, *ΝΙΚΟΓ ΝΕ(ώτερος)*, and *ΝΙΚΩΝ* [Δ] (*Κηφισεύς?*). *ΜΗΤΡΟ ΔΙ* in 126/5 B.C. seems to use the demotic to distinguish himself from the homonymous 'third magistrate' of the same year (*ibid.* 574). This might also explain the variants *MENAN/MENANΔΠΟΣ* in 134/3 B.C., but it is possible—as Margaret Thompson admits—that this is the same man, serving in two months (see her p. 573 with p. 147).

³³ See *Hesperia* xxi (1952) 359 ff., no. 7, lines 73 and 75 and Meritt's notes on p. 365: *IG* ii² 1004, 4 f. and 1006, 5 f. and 52. The change of symbol (unrelated?) in the second issue does not *disprove* identity. See my Appendix (Table).

³⁴ See *IG* ii² 2332, lines 72–4, 87, 114 f., 131 f., 136, 139 etc. : 2333, line 60.

³⁵ See *Athens* 147 and 158–60 for discussion of the Antiochos problem. Margaret Thompson rightly

identified the third and first magistrate, but claimed him as an Athenian citizen—using the Seleucid elephant either as a mere play on his name or as a compliment to a royal patron of Athens. For the stay of the future Antiochos VIII in Athens see Appian *Syr.* 68 and my arguments in *NC* 7th series ix (1969) 329 f. and *Historia* xx (1971) 36 ff.

³⁶ For the position of Timarchou/Nikago see *Athens* 307, 310 f., 392 f. The evidence of control combinations confirms the placing of Mened/Epigeno (see p. 614). For 135/4 B.C. see *Hesperia* ix (1940) 128 and 133 (on no. 26, line 3 f.).

³⁷ See *Athens* 147, 157 and 573: *Hesperia* xxxiii (1964) 215 (new fragment of *IG* ii² 1008 col. iv end: [---]νδρος Μενάνδρου Ἀρτιοχεύς | Κορ[νήλιος] Πισπλίον Ῥωμαίος).

³⁸ See *IG* ii² 2332, 131 f. Kirchner listed only 11 men called Agatharchos (*PA* 27–35 and 26a–b). Agathanax (*PA* 25), Agathandros (*PA* 26) and Agathaios (*PA* 23 f.) are even rarer at Athens.

APPENDIX

ATHENIAN NEW STYLE SILVER COINAGE FROM 140/39 TO 82/1 B.C.

Moneyers	Year	Type	Third magistrates	Symbol	Archon
KTESI/EUMA	140/39	I*	None		Hagnotheos
Aplustre (monograms)	139/8		None		Diokles
GLAU/ECHE	138/7	I	None		Timarchos
MIKI/THEOPHRA]	137/6	[O*]	None	Nike in chariot	Herakleitos
HERA/ARISTOPH]	136/5				Timarchides
MENED/EPIGENO	135/4	I*			Dionysios
TIMARCHOU/NIKAGO]	134/3		Menan- Menandros Antiochos	Anchor+star	Nikomachos
POLYCHARM/NIKOG]	133/2				Xenon
Salonica Hoard					
DOROTHE/DIOPH	132/1				Ergokles
ANTIOCHOS/NIKOG KARAICHOS]	131/0	[O*]	Eumachos Menan- Agatha-	Elephant	Epikles
Kessab Hoard					
THEOPHRA/SOTAS	130/29	I			Demostratos?
DIOG/POSEI	129/8		Hegema-		Lykiskos
ACHAIOS/HELI	128/7	[O*]			Dionysios
LYSAN/GLAUKOS	127/6				Theodorides
Naxos Hoard					
EPIGENE/SOSANDROS	126/5				Diotimos
POLEMON/ALKETES	125/4				Iason
KARAICH/ERGOKLE	124/3				Nikias and Isigenes
MIKION/EURYKLEI	123/2		Sokrates	Dioskouroi	Demetriós
APHRODISI/APOLEXI]	122/1	[O*]	Eumarei- Hegema-	Nike	Nikodemos
EURYKLEI/ARIARA]	121/0	I	Sokra-	Three Graces	Phokion?

APPENDIX—*contd.*

Moneyers	Year	Type	Third magistrates	Symbol	Archon
APHRODIS/DIOGE	120/19		EUMA—	Double cornucopiae	EUMACHOS
DIONYSI/DIONYS	119/8	[I*]			Hipparchos
AMMONIOS/KALLIAS	118/7				Lenaios
THEMISTO/THEOPOMPOS	117/6		MENOI—		MENOITES
SOKRATES/DIONYSODO	116/5			Apollo Delios	Sarapion
METRODOROS/MILTIADES DEMOSTHEN	115/4				Nausias
DIOTIMOS/MAGAS	114/3				—ratou (gen.)
EUMAREIDES/ALKIDAM KLEOMEN	113/2				Paramonos
CHARINAUTES/ARISTEAS	112/1		Iason		Dionysios
PHANOKLES/APOLLONIOS	111/0				Sosikrates
EUBOULIDES/AGATHOKLE } ZOILOS/EUANDROS }	110/9				Polykleitos
DAMON/SOSIKRATES	109/8		IASON		IASON
Delos Hoard 1959					
EUMELOS/KALLIPHON	108/7				Demochares
HERAKLEIDES/EUKLES (I)	107/6	[O*]	Dionyso— Diok—	Winged Tyche + amphora	Aristarchos
THEODOTOS/KLEOPHANES	106/5	[O*]			Agathokles
HERAKLEIDES/EUKLES (II)	105/4	I	Dionysog— Diok—	Winged Tyche + amphora	?
Delos Hoard Γ					
ANDREAS/CHARINAUTES	104/3	[O*]	Amynomas—		Herakleides
HIKESIOS/ASKLEPIADES	103/2	[O*]			Theokles
TIMOSTRATOS/POSES	102/1	I		Dionysos + mask	Echekrates
AMPHIKRATES/EPISTRATOS	101/0	[O*]	Kleomas—	Ears of grain	Medeios (I)
DOSITHEOS/CHARIAS	100/99				Prokles
DEMETRIOS/AGATHIPPOS	99/8				Theodosios
Delos Hoard KS					

APPENDIX—*contd.*

Moneyers		Year	Type	Third magistrates	Symbol	Archon
Zaroya Hoard	NIKETES/DIONYSIOS]	98/7			Gorgon head	Argeios
	ARISTION/PHILON]	97/6			Drinking Pegasos	Herakleitos
	AROPOS/MNASAGO]	96/5			Winged Agon	-kratou (gen.)
	XENOKLES/HARMOXENOS (I)]	95/4	[O*]	None	Coiled serpent	Theodotos?
	NIKOGENES/KALLIMACHOS	94/3		None in months A-B	Hermes or none	Kallias
	DEMEAS/HERMOKLES]	93/2	I		Head-dress of Isis	Kriton?
Halmyros Hoard	XENOKLES/HARMOXENOS (II)]	92/1		None	Dolphin + trident	Menedemos?
	XENOKLES/HARMOXENOS (III)]	91/0		None	Roma	Medeios (II)
	KOINTOS/KLEAS	90/89			Roma + Nike	Medeios (III)
Piraeus Hoard	APELLIKON/GORGIAS]	89/8			Griffin	Medeios (IV)
	No coinage	88/7				No Archon
	KING MITHRADATES/ARISTION	87/6		None	Star between crescents	Philanthes
Dipylon Hoard	Sullan issue (monograms)	86/5		None		Hierophantes
	Abruzzi Hoard	Sullan issue (trophies)	85/4		None	
Anatolian Hoard		MNASEAS/NESTOR	84/3		None	Kerknos
	KLEOPHANES/EPITHETES	83/2	I	None	Baitulos + fillet	Pammenes
	MENTOR/MOSCHION]	82/1		None	Harmodios and Aristogeiton	Demetrios
	ARCHITIMOS/DEMETRI]	Early 70s?		None	Isis	?
Cretan Hoard II						

My two departures from Margaret Thompson's *order*—KTESI/EUMA and KARAICH/ERGOKLE—are defended in my main text and in *Historia* xx (1971) 40 ff. For the archons and the intercalary evidence see Meritt, *Athenian Year* 237 f. and my Appendix in *Historia* xx (1971) 43 ff. Meritt curiously omitted to mark 140/39 B.C. as intercalary, though this is proved by *Hesperia* xvii (1948) 18 ff., no. 10 (line 37 f.). I append 'I*' to issues with the intercalary month (N), where the epigraphic evidence confirms the coins: otherwise I merely put 'I'. Something can be learned, however, from the calendar character of neighbouring years and so I show those that are certain.

The archon-dates themselves can now be regarded as sound. Dinsmoor's discussion of the span from c. 110 to 88/7 B.C. (*The Athenian Archons* 240 ff. and 288 ff.) remains basic, though partly outdated: see his own after-thoughts in *Athenian Archon-List* 200–204 ff. Kallias is tied to 94/3 B.C. by synchronism with the Roman consuls of 94 B.C. and by the tribal cycle of the Delian Sarapis priests; the priests of 106/5 B.C. and of Kallias' year both came from tribe II. See Dinsmoor, *Archons* 288 f. with my remarks in *Historia* xx (1971) 44 f. The archons from Medeios (II) to Niketes—and their dating—are established by combining the evidence of *IG* ii² 1713 (= *SIG*³ 733) with 1716 and Agora inv. no. 2388 (see *Hesperia* Suppl. viii [1949] 117 ff. and Dow, *AJA* xxxvii [1933] 578–588). Diodoros (i 8) dates the archon Herodes 60/59 B.C. (Ol. 180.1), but Kastor seems to put his immediate predecessor in 62/1 B.C. (Ol. 179.3). He also, however, synchronises Theophemos with the Roman consuls of 61 B.C., and scholars generally (and rightly) agree to prefer Diodoros and date Theophemos 61/0 B.C. This effectively fixes the Athenian archons at least from 129/8 to 82/1 B.C., though one or two gaps and uncertainties remain. See the notes on *SIG*³ 733 and Dinsmoor, *Archons* 280–285. Indeed *only* on this assumption can Argeios be made to synchronise with the Roman consuls of 97 B.C. (see *SIG*³ 726 and *IG* ii² 2336, 183 f. as republished by Dow in *HSCP* li [1940] 111 ff.).

Details of hoards shown summarily in my table (the name following the *last* issue included) can be found in *Athens* 475–513: for Delos 1959 see *BCH* lxxxix (1965) 545 n.1. Square brackets linking issues show where the succession is guaranteed by die-links; there is admittedly a *slight* possibility that Charinautes/Aristeas preceded Eumareides/Alkidam, but I find Margaret Thompson's arguments against this convincing (*Athens* 313 ff.). Her juxtaposition of Xenokles/Harmoxenos II and III seems equally cogent (*ibid.* 395 f.). For the Sullan coinage see *ibid.* 425–439, where the trophies issue is regarded as the last silver put out by the Athenian mint—to honour Sulla in 84/3 B.C. I would myself place Mnaseas/Nestor here. Athens' own silver would recommence when Sulla revisited the city on his way back to Italy. Might not his initiation into the mysteries (Plutarch, *Sulla* 26) partly explain the choice of moneyers closely involved—as their symbol shows—with the Eleusinian cult? It is tempting to see similar topical relevance—so soon after Aristion's fall—in the 'tyrant-slayers' symbol of Mentor/Moschion. Stylistically this issue and its two predecessors are tied in with the distinctive sequence culminating in Apellikon/Gorgias and King Mithradates/Aristion. Only with Architimos/Demetri is there a sharp stylistic break, though one obverse die used near the end of the issue of Mentor/Moschion is reused in the last months of Architimos/Demetri. See for all this *Athens* 395–401 and Section X of pl. B. Cretan Hoard II (*ibid.* 511 ff. and pl. 196) contains two 'extremely fine' coins of Nikomedes IV (92/1 and 90/89 B.C.) and—best of all—one of Mithradates VI. One of the two tetradrachms of Mentor/Moschion is 'not very fine' (G. le Rider), though fresher than all the other New Style pieces except for the single Architimos/Demetri specimen. This alone is comparable to the Mithradatic tetradrachm of 76/5 B.C. The evidence of style and this hoard combines to suggest a break in Athenian coinage after Mentor/Moschion (82/1 B.C.?)—probably not very long and not the last. The coinage seems to have come to an end in the late 40s, if we can trust the evidence of the Hierapytna Hoard (see *Athens* 516 f. with my comments in *NC* 7th series ix [1969] 328).

HAROLD B. MATTINGLY

University of Leeds