The present article is an outgrowth of the acquisition by the ANS in 1981 of a tetradrachm of Audoleon, King of Paeonia (ca. 315-286 B.C.), subsequently published in the recent volume honoring Professor Paul Naster (Pl. I, B) (1). The coin represents a rare issue on the Attic standard which bears Alexander’s types but is inscribed with Audoleon’s name and title. Six specimens published so far are struck from two obverse and two reverse dies (Pl. I, A-C) (2). Henri Seyrig, in observing the unusual position of Zeus’ legs, the distinctive formation of the upsilon in the monogram, and the soft rendering of the lion’s ear on the obverse, has been able to show that at least six issues in Alexander’s name are indubitably to be associated with that issue (3). He suggested a Paeonian mint for all, which he assigned to Audoleon’s reign. E. T. Newell’s
tickets, his arrangement in the trays, and his notebook assign these issues to the mint of Pella in the time of Pyrrhus between 288 and 286 B.C. It is here, at the end of the series, that he also placed an electrotype of the Audoleon-inscribed tetradrachm in the British Museum. The obvious assumption is that he may have thought that issue, too, was minted at Pella under Pyrrhus, but for Audoleon. The purpose of the present article is two-fold: first, to augment the series which Seyrig recognized as belonging to Audoleon's time and milieu; and then to ponder further their place of minting and the authority under whom they were struck.

Audoleon, son of Patraus, has been accorded very little attention in the annals of ancient history. It is primarily his association with Pyrrhus of Epirus (297-273 B.C.), as one of the latter's fathers-in-law, that enables us to examine more closely the coinage under review against the historical background. To this end, Pyrrhus' sojourn in Macedonia between 288 and 286 B.C. assumes particular significance.

Throughout his life, Pyrrhus maintained an active and checkered military career, beginning in his youth with his support of Demetrius Poliorcetes at the Battle of Ipsus (301 B.C.), and ending with his demise during the battle against the forces of Antigonus Gonatas on the plains of Sparta in 272 B.C. (4) Pyrrhus did not begin his Italian and Sicilian campaigns until 280 or 279. Between 296 and 294 he had successfully gone to the aid of Alexander against Antipater, the two sons of Cassander contending for Macedonia, and had gained Acarnania, among other regions, as his reward (Plut. Demetr. 36.1-2; Pyrr. 6.2-3). Demetrius then lost no time in having Alexander killed and he, himself, became king of Macedon in 294 B.C. (Plut. Demetr. 36.5-37.2). In 288, Pyrrhus joined Lysimachus, Ptolemy and Seleucus in the coalition to oust Demetrius from Macedonia. Lysimachus attacked from the east and Pyrrhus from the west. Demetrius, preparing to recoup losses in Asia and unable to muster his forces in time for defense, was immediately deserted by his Macedonians. Macedonia, now lost to Demetrius, was divided between Pyrrhus and Lysimachus (Plut. Demetr. 44 and Pyrr. 11-12.2). Presumably Pyrrhus received Pella, with access to the

(4) The historical outline is drawn primarily from Plutarch's Lives, Demetrius and Pyrrhus (Loeb IX 1920, transl. by Bernadotte Perrin), and P. Lévéque, Pyrrhos (Paris, 1957), cited hereafter as Lévéque.
Pella mint. Meanwhile he had married a daughter of Audoleon (Plut. Pyrr. 9.1). (6) Although Audoleon is nowhere mentioned specifically as having joined the coalition with his son-in-law, he seems to have been partially involved. In 287/6 B.C. he was honored by an Athenian decree which thanked him for providing grain the year before, during Athens' struggle for independence against Demetrius' garrison stationed there (6). Audoleon died in 286 B.C. At about the same time, in 285, Lysimachus expelled Pyrrhus, who retired to Epirus with his Epirotes and allied forces (Plut. Pyrr. 12.6-7). Lysimachus was killed in the Battle of Corupedium in 281 B.C., and Antigonus Gonatas was eventually proclaimed king of Macedonia. In 279 B.C. Pyrrhus launched his campaigns in Italy and Sicily which lasted until 274. His final attempt to regain Macedonia from Antigonus in 273 met with failure (Plut. Pyrr. 26.2-7). He then turned to conquer the Peloponnese and was killed in Sparta in 272 B.C.

The coins catalogued and analyzed below will be considered within this framework.

The Catalogue

The sixty-nine coins in the catalogue by no means represent an exhaustive search for similar specimens. The entries include, in addition to the coins in the ANS collection, chiefly casts collected from various parts of the world by E. T. Newell decades ago, and examples in sales catalogues gleaned from the ANS photofile. A major contribution to this series has now been provided by the

(5) LÉVÊQUE, p. 134, 678-679. P. GAROUFALIAS, Pyrrhus, King of Epirus, 2nd ed., London, 1979, p. 39, suggests that Pyrrhus' marriage to Audoleon's daughter was designed to secure a northern frontier against Demetrius.

(6) DITTENBERGER, Sylloge³, 371, in the archonship of Diotimos. See also, J. POUILLOUX, Dropion, roi de Péones, in BCH, 1950, p. 25, n. 5; and W. W. TARN, Antigonos Gonatas, Oxford, 1913, p. 92, n. 7, cited herafer as Tarn. As Demetrius was hurrying to meet his invaders in the spring of 288 B.C., leaving his son Antigonus as governor in Greece, the nationalist party sent envoys to various kings, including Pyrrhus and Audoleon, to announce Athens' freedom and to secure aid in money as well as men, since grain was vital to her endeavor. With the arrival of the Egyptian fleet, the party was able to overthrow the government supporting Antigonus, and Athens declared her independence. On the date of Athens' revolt, in the summer of 288, see LÉVÊQUE, p. 159-160, n. 7. That author does not mention Audoleon in this connection.
ten coins, 2b, 4b, 7, 17c, 18b, 9e, 9f (two duplicates), 11b, 26d, in the hoard only recently uncovered at Gülnar in Cilicia and buried around 235 B.C. (?). Obverse dies are shown in Arabic numerals and retain their original numbers when shared between issues. Miniscule letters denote the reverse dies, and brackets to the right of these letters show instances of reverse linkage. Weights and die positions are included when known; and asterisks indicate the specimens illustrated. Table I charts the obverse linkage connecting issues through the obverse dies numbered at the top of each set of brackets.

Abbreviations include: CH VI = Coin Hoards VI (London, 1981); IGCH = An Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards, eds. M. Thompson, O. Mørkholm, C. Kraay (New York, 1973); Pink = K. Pink Münzprägung der Ostkelten (Leipzig, 1939); De Clercq = G. Le Rider et H. Seyrig, Objets de la collection Louis De Clercq, dans RN 1968, p. 7-50. The De Clercq collection is now in the Paris Cabinet.

**Issue I**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>*ANS, 17.015 g. ↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a.</td>
<td>*Milan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>*Inv. No. 4287, 16.86 g. ‡, Gülnar, 1980 Hd., ca. 235 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a.</td>
<td>*The Hague</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>SNGBerry 202, 17.16 g. ↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a.</td>
<td>*ANS, 17.085 g. ‡</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>*Inv. No. 2759, 17.03 g. ‡, Gülnar, 1980 Hd., ca. 235 B.C.; Dresden, 16.90 g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>*ANS, 17.10 g. →, Armenak Hd. (IGCH 1423), ca. 275-270 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>*ANS, 16.94 g. ↑, Mesopotamia Hd. (IGCH 1764), ca. 230 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>*Inv. No. 4449, 17.07 g. ‡, Gülnar, 1980 Hd., ca. 235 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>*London; Paris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a.</td>
<td>*ANS, 16.88 g. ↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>*London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7) This hoard of over 5000 coins was uncovered during excavations. It will be published as *Trésor de Gülnar 1980*, by Alain Davesne, Catherine Joannès and by Georges Le Rider to whom this author is deeply grateful for information concerning the hoard, for photographs of the ten coins, and for permission to publish them.
10a.  *ANS, 17.01 g. →
11a.  *ANS, 17.10 g. ↓

11 obverse dies  17 coins

**Issue II**

9c.  *Gotha
10b.  *Paris
12a.  *Athens, ex Saroglos coll. ; London
   b.  Private coll., USA
14.  *The Vatican
15.  *Berlin
16.  *Berlin ; private coll. USA
17a.  *Berlin
   b.  *Leningrad (doublestruck)
18a.  *Private coll., said to have come from a recent find in Thessaly.

9 obverse dies  13 coins

**Issue III**

17c.  *Inv. No. 3114, 16.96 g. ↓, Gülner, 1980 Hd., ca. 235 B.C.
18b.  *Inv. No. 4203, 16.87 g. ↓, Gülner, 1980 Hd., ca. 235 B.C.
19.  *ANS, 16.97 g. ↑, graffiti : ΚΠ
20.  *ANS, 17.12 ←
21.  *Private coll., said to have come from a recent find in Thessaly (as 18a, above).
22a.  *ANS, 17.29 g. → ; in trade 1965, 17.19 g.

6 obverse dies  7 coins

**Issue IV**

7 *ANS, 17.27 g. ↵
22b.  *Munich, 16.47 g. ← (Seyrig 5, pl. I, 12)

2 obverse dies  2 coins

**Issue V**

9d.  *Berlin ; Florence ; De Clercq 441

1 obverse die  3 coins

(same dies)
Issue VI

9e. *Inv. No. 3142, 17.06 g. →, Gülnar, 1980 Hd., ca. 235 B.C.

1 obverse die 1 coin

Issue VII

Cantharus - Φ

9f. *Inv. No. 4096, 17.02 g. →, Gülnar, 1980 Hd., ca. 235 B.C.; Inv. No. 3195, 17.04 g. Gülnar 1980 Hd., ca. 235 B.C.

1 obverse die 2 coins
(same dies)

Issue VIII

11b. *Inv. No. 3171, 17.00 g. ?, Gülnar, 1980 Hd., ca. 235 B.C.

1 obverse die 1 coin

Issue IX

Griffin forepart - Π

11c. *ANS, 15.00 g. →, Armenak Hd. (IGCH 1423), ca. 275-270 B.C.; the Hague; Athens, ex Saroglos coll., 17.10 g. = Egger Sale 40, 2 May 1912 (T. Prowe), 589; Thessaly, 1979 Hd. (CH VI, 24, fig. 4.5), ca. 270 B.C.

1 obverse die 4 coins
(same dies)

Issue X

Π

23. *Athens; SNGCop.Macedonia 860, 16.92 g. → (Seyrig 2, pl. I, 8)

1 obverse die 2 coins
(same dies)

Issue XI

Π

24. *ANS, 17.16 g. →, Armenak Hd. (IGCH 1423), ca. 275-270 B.C.

25a. *Athens; London, 17.07 g. ∗ (Seyrig 3, pl. I, 9)

26a. Pink 566, 17.07 g. (Seyrig 3, pl. I, 13)

3 obverse dies 4 coins
Issue XII

25b. *London, 16.71 g. $ (Seyrig 4, pl. I, 10)
26b. *ANS, 17.06 g. →
c. *Vienna

2 obverse dies  3 coins

Issue XIII

26d. *Berlin; *Inv. No. 3054, 17.06 g. $ Gülnar, 1980 Hd., ca. 235 B.C.

1 obverse die  2 coins
(same dies)

Issue XIV

27. *ANS, 15.53 g. (sic $) $ (doublestruck)

1 obverse die  1 coin

Issue XV


1 obverse die  2 coins
(same dies)

Issue XVI

28b. *ANS, 16.50 g. $

1 obverse die  1 coin

Issue XVII

28c. *ANS, 17.23 g. $ Armenak Hd. (IGCH 1423), ca. 275-270 B.C.; Athens, ex Saroglos coll.

1 obverse die  2 coins
(same dies)
**Issue XVIII**  
Thunderbolt — T

29.  *ANS, 17.005 g. ↑; London

1 obverse die  2 coins
(same dies)

*Total*: 18 issues

29 obverse dies (45)*

69 coins

* 16 obverse dies are shared between issues.

**TABLE I**

*Obverse Die Linkage*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Λ Torch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Wreath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Wreath - Μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Δ - ΝΦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Cantharus - Φ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Ε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Griffin forepart - Α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XI</th>
<th>Α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Η</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Σ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Μ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XV</th>
<th>A - Μ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>Star - A - Μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>Λ - Cornucopiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>Thunderbolt - T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Seyrig 5*  
*Seyrig 1*  
*Seyrig 2*  
*Seyrig 3*  
*Seyrig 4*  
*Seyrig 6*
TABLE II

Frequency of Reverse Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Style A</th>
<th>Style B</th>
<th>Style C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1-7, 10a</td>
<td>8, 9a-b,</td>
<td>11a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>10b, 18a</td>
<td>9c, 12-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22a, 17c,</td>
<td>18b, 20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10c, 22b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>9d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td>9e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td>9f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>11b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
<td>11c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
<td>24, 25a,</td>
<td>26a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td>25b, 26b-c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>26d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td></td>
<td>28a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td></td>
<td>28b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td></td>
<td>28c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the Coins

It will be seen from the chart in Table I that twelve issues have been added to Seyrig’s original six. Although issues X, XIV and XVIII do not share an obverse die with any other issue, all are bound together stylistically to assure their place somewhere in the overall series, making a total of eighteen issues now known in Alexander’s name (8).

(8) Seyrig’s ticket accompanying the coin illustrated in Pl. I, D, now in the Paris cabinet, assigns it also to his Paeonian series. However, it displays none of the major details that characterize his Paeonian group. The control is within wreath. The obverse and reverse style appear to belong, rather, to Mathisen’s Monogram Group which he assigns to Pella under Antigonus, ca. 274 B.C.: R. Mathisen, Antigonus Gonatas and the Silver Coinages of Macedonia circa 280–270 B.C., in ANMSN, 25, 1981, p. 79-124. Our Pl. I, E is the issue listed second to last by Mathisen, before tetradrachms bearing the name of Antigonus on p. 95. Compare Figs. D and E, and note also in each case the footstool on which Zeus rests his feet. See note 17, below.
There are recorded here 29 obverse dies for a total of 69 coins. If a ratio of less than six surviving coins per obverse die constitutes an incomplete record of obverses, then some must still be missing from the series. This is especially true for issue I, where obverse 1-7 are represented by only one or, at best, two coins. Nor do any of these obverses link with any other issue. However, with the appearance of obverse 8 in issue I, the picture changes somewhat, as the multiple die linkage in Table I demonstrates. In spite of the low average number of coins per obverse, it is remarkable that all five coins comprising issues XV to XVIII share a common obverse, and that the only four coins recorded for issue IX are die duplicates. It is even more remarkable that of the ten coins from this mint in the Gilsnar deposit of thousands from different mints and periods, one (26d) provides a die duplicate for the only other coin hitherto known for issue XIII; three coins add three new issues (VI-VIII) that link with those already known; and only one coin (no. 7) out of the ten provides a new obverse die. As the sequence is here arranged, the pattern of die linkage from obverse 8 onward indicates that contrary to the activity of the mint during the earlier period of issue I, none of the following issues was struck over a very long period of time, that some issues were probably struck concurrently, and that the lambda-torch controls continued to be used along with the next eight issues at least.

The sequential order of issues finds preliminary justification in the development of the engraving style and in comparisons with the copious coinage ruled by the lambda-torch controls, which has been assigned to the reign of Cassander at Amphipolis between 314 and 298 B.C. (9).

The first seven obverse dies in issue I form an entity unto themselves, and do not link with any other issue in the series. They were probably cut first, for the style of execution is finer than that exhibited by any of the other coins. It is, in fact, so similar to Ehrhardt's group IVb (Pl. I, F, Ehrhardt's issue 35) from Amphipolis, that one might well consider nos. 1-7 emissions of the same

mint (10). It will be argued below, however, that these coins belong to our series.

With obverse die 8 in issue I, new diecutters appear. The head as a whole becomes more compact, the facial features heavier, and the lion's mane consists of two parallel rows of locks extending out and sometimes downward. These heads, too, resemble obverses from Ehrhardt's group IVb. Compare especially our 12-22, 24-26, which cover several issues, and Pl. I, G and H, Ehrhardt's issues 36 and 45, respectively. Closest parallels with his group IVb are to be found with obverse 10 which links issues I, II, and IV, and obverse 23 in issue X. See Pl. I, 1 (Ehrhardt's issue 35). Again, the resemblance lies primarily in the rendering of the lion's mane. In this instance, the locks divide in the middle, the upper locks bending upward and the lower ones downward. From issue XIV through that in Audoleon's name, the first row of locks behind the lion's jaws has been reduced to miniature strokes. This treatment of the mane may be compared to Ehrhardt's group IVb, 36 (Pl. I, J). Unfortunately no link has yet been established between the names of Alexander and Audoleon. Nevertheless, obverses 27-29 are so close to the Audoleon-inscribed coins that they are unmistakably from the hand of the same die engraver.

As mentioned earlier, three stylistic factors led Seyrig to associate all six of his groups with those tetradrachms struck in Audoleon's name. In addition to the soft rendering of the lion's ear on the obverse, sometimes totally inarticulated, Seyrig noted that the upsilon in the monograms sometimes has outward curving arms, similar to that in the monogram A on the Alexander coins in Audoleon's name. Thus, Pl. I, A-C and issues IX-XI. Seyrig points out that this feature is found otherwise only with Audoleon's local types, on issues of his Paeonian predecessors, and on a few coins of Damastium (11).

The most pervasive characteristic common to both series is the position of Zeus's feet. Whether the left leg is drawn back, as in

(10) It is this group which Newell specifically ticketed as from the Pella mint during the time of Pyrrhus.

(11) Seyrig, p. 13, n. 2 and p. 14, n. 1. He notes that this symbol sometimes resembles a flower more than it does a sign or letter. He considers it originally to have been a royal or an official mark which was later combined with the initial of a minting magistrate. For Audoleon's local types struck on a local standard, see H. Gaebler, AMUGS 3², p. 203-204, nos. 1-4.
Table II records the frequency of occurrence of all three styles. With one exception (no. 23), style A is confined to the first three issues, and is seen exclusively with obverses 1-7 (12). Style B first appears with obverse 8 in issue I, and from issue V on is found virtually alone (13). Style C occurs but once, since the only two coins in issue IV (10c and 22b) were struck from the same reverse die. At the same time, style C in issue IV (10c) shares with style A a common obverse die used in issues I and II (10a-b). The awkward rendering of styles B and C is not encountered elsewhere, but may reflect an issue from Pella (Pl. I, K) associated with Le Rider's group III and dated ca. 315 B.C. (14). The position of the feet, which there rest on a footstool, may well have served as prototype for style C.

The few hoards known to have contained coins of our series do little to confirm a sequential order of issues. They tell us only that the series was struck before 280 B.C. (15). Only the Gülnar Hoard may give some indication that the present arrangement of issues is the correct one. Ten coins in a large hoard buried around the middle of the third century in Cilicia can hardly provide con-

(12) Seyrig did not, of course, take this group into consideration.

(13) In the case of nos. 18a, 20 and 21 in issue III, the left foot is drawn back toward the throne leg, but not quite behind it.


(15) It is true, as Seyrig emphasizes (p. 13) that one of the two specimens under 28a in issue XV (his no. 6) emerged together with an Alexander tetradrachm in Audoleon's name in the Prilepec Hoard: i.e. in ancient Paeonian territory. However, three have been reported from Thessaly (II, 18a; III, 21; IX, 11c) and one from Mesopotamia (I, 6). In addition to the ten coins in the Gülnar Hoard, four coins were among the contents of the Armenak Hoard from Turkey (I, 5; IX, 11c; XI, 24; XVII.28c). The burial date of 275-270 B.C. for the latter follows Margaret Thompson, whose publication of the hoard is forthcoming. If these coins were struck in Paeonia and meant for export, as seems most likely (note 16, below), one would normally expect to find them in deposits outside of their home territory, as indeed we do.
clusive evidence of relative wear. It is, nevertheless, noteworthy that nos. 2b, 4b and 7 in issue I are considerably more worn than the other seven (III, 17c, 18b; VI, 9e; VII, 9f; VIII, 11b; XIII, 26d). On no. 4b in particular, details have been worn smooth and the name of Alexander is barely legible.

Before giving final consideration to the location of the mint, the subject of control marks should be addressed. The meaning of such marks is sometimes difficult to grasp. One assumes that each of the letters, ligatures and symbols served a specific purpose at the local mint. It would not be too surprising to find rather common and banal controls occurring independently both at the Paeonian mint and under Cassander at Amphipolis. Thus, Η in our issue XII and in Ehrhardt's issue 32. Likewise, cantharus in our issue VII and Ehrhardt's issue 36. However, the monogram Ε is less common. It would hardly be coincidental that it too appeared at both places and not too far apart in time, in Ehrhardt's issue 45 (see Pl. I, H) and in our issue VIII. Certainly the major lambda-torch combination has to bear some direct relation to Cassander's Amphipolis mint. In the face of these stylistic and operational connections with Amphipolis, is the mint for both of our series, then, to be located at Pella during the time of Pyrrhus, as Newell apparently believed, or in Paeonia under Audoleon, as Seyrig suggests?

It seems certain that the latter alternative is our only choice. One may safely consider as Paeonian the provincial workmanship displayed by reverse styles B and C. One remarkable detail is what occasionally appears to be a native type of «bashlik», a cloth cap that covers the head and ears of Zeus. This is most readily apparent on 8-9a, and may possibly be present on 9c and 24. Seyrig's comparison of the upsilon in issues IX-XI with Audoleon's local coinage is a valid one, and die links carry almost all of the other issues along with these, in spite of the fact that in some, such as IV and VIII, the arms of the upsilon are upright. It is also obvious that at the very least, engravers were copying the style of coins struck under Cassander. This in itself suggests that the series started well before 288 B.C. under Audoleon in Paeonia, thereby discouraging an attribution to Pella under Pyrrhus. The style of the first seven obverse dies and their accompanying reverses which at first glance seems anomalous may be seen as the work of diecutters sent directly over from the Amphipolis mint by Cassander to inaugurate Audoleon's
Alexander series. Native engravers come in with obverse 8 in issue I and probably worked alone thereafter, although there is a possibility that obverses 15, 19, 20, 22 and 23 were also cut by engravers from Amphipolis. On the whole, however, coarse workmanship betrays the hands of local employees. The series began, appropriately enough, with Cassander’s lambda-torch combination, but without the third control that is always present on his own coinage. The monograms must refer to people (15a), and one can hazard the guess that one or two magistrates came from Amphipolis as well, to oversee the operation of Audoleon’s Alexander mint, and to help with the output of an unfamiliar coinage. It is possible that the lambda-torch issue, the longest in the series, was also under the supervision of an outside official.

It is difficult to say precisely when these standard issues would have started. However, it is certain that they preceded the Audoleon-inscribed coins. An absolute chronology for the two series and a reason for Cassander’s initial cooperation are suggested by the historical circumstances.

**Historical Probability**

Audoleon is first mentioned when around 315 B.C., or perhaps a little later, he was befriended by Cassander, who came to his aid against the Autariates, an Illyrian mountain tribe (Diod. 20.19.1; Justin 15.2.1.). This fact established the bond which would explain Cassander’s interest, if not self-interest, in seeing an Alexander coinage created in Paeonia. Cassander’s own supply of such coins was more than ample; but neither did Audoleon want for silver bullion and, as Seyrig suggests (16), his tetradrachms struck on the Attic standard were undoubtedly meant to circulate in regions of the Greek world accustomed to Alexander’s types. Hoard evidence and intergroup linkage dictate the chronological arrangement of Ehrhardt’s group IVb. The issues with which Audoleon’s coinage has been compared would fall sometime between 306 and 298 B.C.

(15a) The monogram $\lambda$ is present on Amphipolis issues from the reign of Cassander through those of Demetrius and Lysimachus into that of Antigonus (see Mathisen, note 8 above, p. 99, Table 12). If that monogram signifies the same magistrate in each case, then he would have been partially responsible for the operation of the mint for thirty years or more.

As stated, the beginning of Audoleon’s first issue (nos. 1-7) appears to have entailed a larger production which extended over a longer period of time than the remainder of his Alexander coinage. But it need not have started before *ca.* 300. Indeed, if the assumption that Audoleon’s Alexander mint was using Cassander’s men and later copying Cassander’s issues is valid, then Audoleon’s issues would have to postdate those of Cassander with which they can be compared. There need not have been a break in the series. However, from no. 8 the pattern of die linkage indicates a relatively small output of short duration. It could easily fit into a two-year period between 289/8 and 287/6 B.C. Audoleon would not have applied his name and title to his Alexander coinage before Alexander’s immediate successors assumed the royal title in 305. The apt moment for the striking of the small Alexander issue in his own name would have been on the occasion of his participation in the coalition and his assistance, however nominal, to Athens in 287, shortly before his death. That issue, then, ended his series of Alexanders.

If all of this coinage is removed from Pella, as is surely required, there is very little left by way of Alexanders to assign to that mint during the time of Pyrrhus, between 288 and 286/5 B.C. The most recent attribution of certain Alexanders to Pyrrhus at Pella is extremely dubious (17). But did the mint necessarily operate for

(17) R. MATHISEN (note 8, above, p. 94-96, 104-107, 110) assigns two groups of Alexander tetradrachms to Pella during the period in question — his Bipennis Group to Pyrrhus between 288 and 283 B.C., and his Monogram Group (mentioned in n. 8, above) to Antigonus in 274, interrupted by Pyrrhus’ final invasion in 274 and ending with a dielinked emission in his, Antigonus’, name. For Pyrrhus’ Bipennis coinage, which Mathisen extends over a five-year period, there is one issue and for twelve specimens, two obverse and eight reverse dies. Would such a small coinage cover that period in Macedonia? Antigonus’ Monogram Group for year 274 consists of fifteen issues, fifty-eight specimens, twelve obverse and forty-three reverse dies. First, Mathisen seems to disregard the fact that M. THOMPSON (*The Mints of Lysimachus*, in *Essays Robinson*, eds. C. M. KRAAY and G. K. JENKINS, Oxford, 1968, p. 181) opens the Pella mint of Lysimachus in 286/5 B.C., two years after he had opened his mint at Amphipolis. It seems clear that Pyrrhus was expelled from Macedonia no later than 285 and was no longer in a position to control the mint at Pella after that date. See LÉVÊQUE, p. 167-171. For a discussion of the length of his control over territories ceded to him by Cassander’s son in 295 B.C., especially the city of Ambracia and the province of Acarnania, see LÉVÊQUE, p. 187-193.
Pyrrhus during this period, other than to issue a few bronzes? When one looks elsewhere for coinages attributed to Pyrrhus, one finds no gold or silver before his campaigns in southern Italy and Sicily between 279 and 274 B.C., and then issues only from the mints of Tarentum, Locri Epizephyrii and Syracuse, struck in his name. Pyrrhus held Acarnania from around 295, when Cassander’s son awarded it to him, and a few Corinthian-type «Pegasi» of the later style from Ambracia have been tentatively assigned to the time of Pyrrhus; but that these issues would have provided for his Macedonian needs is untenable.

The Alexander coinage was interrupted at both Amphipolis and Pella while those mints were under the control first of Demetrius and then of Lysimachus between 294 and 281. At neither mint did

Mathisen is correct in noting stylistic similarities between his Bipennis and Monogram groups (his pl. 20, 25 and 27). It is for that very reason that the Bipennis group would seem to fit better toward the beginning of the Monogram series under Antigonus, rather than back in 288-286. The only hoard evidence for the Bipennis issue comes from the Jabukovac Hoard (IGHC 447), buried in 280/75, or possibly a little later. That deposit contained a single example, and the burial date is not certain (Mathisen, p. 82-83).

The monogram Π accompanying the double axe, which Mathisen expands to «Pyrrhus», is at the same time used to show, p. 113, the monogram continuity between the Bipennis issue and the Pan Heads of Antigonus, where it could hardly stand for Pyrrhus. On the other hand, bronzes with a similar monogram are considered to have been struck for Pyrrhus at Pella. See R. Mathisen, The Shield/Helmet Bronze Coinage of Macedonia, in SAN, 10, 1979, p. 2-6. See also BMCThessaly, p. 113, 36-39.

Tarn (p. 265-266) and Lévéque (p. 564, the first group of bronzes) follow J. N. Svoronos and A. J. Reinach (Journal International d'Archéologie Numismatique, 1911, p. 125-126 and 201-202, respectively), who considered that Pyrrhus used the bronze coins of Demetrius and Antigonus, by surcharging some pieces with the monogram ΠΠ, surmised to be Epirote. Peter Franke has now shown (Die antiken Münzen von Epirus, Wiesbaden, 1961, p. 251-253) that the bronzes of which those scholars speak are not Epirote but Macedonian in origin and of a much later date than the time of Pyrrhus; namely, emissions shortly after the reign of Philip V (220-179 B.C.), some having been overstruck on bronze coins of the earlier Macedonian kings, Demetrius II and Philip V.


(19) BMCCorinth, p. lvi and p. 110, 58.
these rulers issue any but their own types (20). The main mint of Amphipolis fell immediately into the hands of Lysimachus in 288, when his coinage began there. Is it likely that Pyrrhus would have been issuing a silver Alexander coinage at Pella while the mint at Amphipolis was putting out a more important coinage bearing Lysimachus’ types and name?

Pyrrhus’ exploits did not permit him to remain in one place for any length of time. He spent much of his effort on raids and forays, rather than on seeking permanent control; and the ancient sources imply that his way was often paid by plunder (21). Pyrrhus was not secure for very long in any of his foreign ventures. Certainly neither Lysimachus nor Antigonus ever permitted him a firm hold on Macedonia. It is more than doubtful that he counted on the Pella mint at any time to support his military objectives; and it is almost certain that all of the issues included in the catalogue above should be attributed to a Paeonian mint under Audoleon.


(21) Before the coalition was formed, Pyrrhus took advantage of Demetrius while ill and invaded Macedonia, “intending merely to overrun and plunder some parts of it”. He then withdrew, having come “more for plunder than anything else δέ ληστικότερον ἀργυρόν οὖν ἐμείνεν (Plut. Pyrr. 10.1-2). See Lévêque, p. 147-148. Then, late in 274 B.C., after returning to Epirus from his six-year stay in Italy and Sicily, Pyrrhus sought a war by which he could maintain his army, since he had no money χρήματα δὲ οὖν ἔχων. He therefore planned a second invasion of Macedonia, intending to “strip and plunder the country ὡς ἄρπαγή καὶ λεπλασία χρησόμενος (Plut. Pyrr. 26.2). This second and final Macedonian invasion is discussed by Lévêque, p. 557-563.

ADDENDUM

After this article had gone to press, one more Alexander tetradrachm was found among the contents of the Gulnar Hoard. It does not represent a new issue, as it is our Issue III (wreath). However, it does provide a new obverse die, similar to others in the same issue. Unfortunately, it is not illustrated for lack of space.
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