



MERSİN ÜNİVERSİTESİ KILIKIA ARKEOLOJİSİNİ ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
YAYINLARI

MERSIN UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH CENTER OF
CILICIAN ARCHAEOLOGY



OLBA XXXI



MERSİN ÜNİVERSİTESİ KILIKIA ARKEOLOJİSİNİ ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
YAYINLARI
MERSIN UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH CENTER OF
CILICIAN ARCHAEOLOGY



OLBA XXXI

KAAM YAYINLARI

OLBA

XXXI

© 2023 Mersin Üniversitesi/Türkiye

ISSN 1301 7667

Yayıncı Sertifika No: 46660

OLBA dergisi;

ARTS & HUMANITIES CITATION INDEX, EBSCO, PROQUEST

ve

TÜBİTAK-ULAKBİM Sosyal Bilimler Veri Tabanlarında taranmaktadır.

Alman Arkeoloji Enstitüsü'nün (DAI) Kısaltmalar Dizini'nde 'OLBA' şeklinde yer almaktadır.

OLBA dergisi hakemlidir. Makalelerdeki görüş, düşünce ve bilimsel değerlendirmelerin yasal sorumluluğu yazarlara aittir.

The articles are evaluated by referees. The legal responsibility of the ideas, opinions and scientific evaluations are carried by the author.

OLBA dergisi, Mayıs ayında olmak üzere, yılda bir kez basılmaktadır.

Published each year in May.

KAAM'ın izni olmadan OLBA'nın hiçbir bölümü kopya edilemez.

Alıntı yapılması durumunda dipnot ile referans gösterilmelidir.

It is not allowed to copy any section of OLBA without the permit of the Mersin University

(Research Center for Cilician Archaeology / Journal OLBA)

OLBA dergisinde makalesi yayımlanan her yazar, makalesinin baskı olarak ve elektronik ortamda yayımlanmasını kabul etmiş ve telif haklarını OLBA dergisine devretmiş sayılır.

Each author whose article is published in OLBA shall be considered to have accepted the article to be published in print version and electronically and thus have transferred the copyrights to the Mersin University

(Research Center for Cilician Archaeology / Journal OLBA)

OLBA'ya gönderilen makaleler aşağıdaki web adresinde ve bu cildin giriş sayfalarında belirtilen formatlara uygun olduğu takdirde basılacaktır.

Articles should be written according to the formats mentioned in the following web address.

Redaktion: Doç. Dr. Deniz Kaplan

OLBA'nın yeni sayılarında yayımlanması istenen makaleler için yazışma adresi:

Correspondance addresses for sending articles to following volumes of OLBA:

Prof. Dr. Serra Durugönül

Mersin Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Arkeoloji Bölümü

Çiftlikköy Kampüsü, 33342 Mersin - TURKEY

Diğer İletişim Adresleri

Other Correspondance Addresses

Tel: +90 324 361 00 01 • 14730 / 14734

Fax: +90 324 361 00 46

web mail: www.kaam.mersin.edu.tr

www.olba.mersin.edu.tr

e-mail: sdurugonul@gmail.com

Baskı / Printed by

Sistem Ofset Bas. Yay. San. ve Tic. Ltd. Şti.

Strazburg Cad. No: 31/17 Sıhhiye / ANKARA

Tel: +90 312 229 18 81 • Sertifika No: 46660

Grafik / Graphic

Sistem Ofset Bas. Yay. San. ve Tic. Ltd. Şti.

Strazburg Cad. No: 31/17 Sıhhiye / ANKARA

Tel: +90 312 229 18 81 • www.sistemofset.com.tr



MERSİN ÜNİVERSİTESİ KILIKIA ARKEOLOJİSİNİ ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
(KAAM) YAYINLARI-XXXI

MERSIN UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH CENTER OF
CILICIAN ARCHAEOLOGY (KAAM)-XXXI



Editörler

Serra DURUGÖNÜL
Murat DURUKAN
Gunnar BRANDS
Deniz KAPLAN

OLBA Bilim Kurulu

Prof. Dr. Mehmet ÖZDOĞAN (İstanbul Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Fikri KULAKOĞLU (Ankara Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Serra DURUGÖNÜL (Mersin Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Marion MEYER (Viyana Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Susan ROTROFF (Washington Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Kutalmış GÖRKAY (Ankara Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. İ. Hakan MERT (Uludağ Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Eda AKYÜREK-ŞAHİN (Akdeniz Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Yelda OLCAY-UÇKAN (Anadolu Üniversitesi)

MERSİN

2023

İçindekiler / Contents

Özlem Çakar-Kılıç Orta Porsuk Havzası'nda İlk Tunç Çağı: Sulak Peyzajların Demircihöyük Yerleşimine Olası Etkileri Üzerine Çok Yönlü Bir Değerlendirme <i>(The Early Bronze Age in the Middle Porsuk Basin: A Multiple Evaluation on the Potential Effects of Wetland Landscape on Demircihöyük)</i>	1
Sinan Paksoy – Abdulkadir Baran The Historical, Topographic and Architectural Definitions of “Geländemauer” City Walls in Karia <i>(Karia’da ‘Geländemauer’ Planlı Kent Surlarının Tarihi, Topoğrafik ve Mimari Tanımları)</i>	37
Ümit Aydınöglu – Burak Belge Diocæsarea’nın Antik Dönem Kent Planına İlişkin Değerlendirme <i>(Evaluation of the City Plan of Diocæsarea in the Ancient Periods)</i>	61
Deniz Kaplan – Ali Ulvi – A. Yasin Yiğit Tarsus’un Taş Yığma Tepeleri: Kilikia’nın Tümülüsleri <i>(The Stone ‘Hills’ of Tarsus: The Tumuli of Cilicia)</i>	79
Okan Özdemir Rural Houses With Architectural Decoration and New Examples of Local Workshops (Bauhütte) in Tapureli (Rough Cilicia) <i>(Tapureli’de (Dağlık Kilikia) Kırsal Konutlarda Mimari Süsleme ve Yerel Süsleme Atölyelerine (Bauhütte) Yeni Örnekler)</i>	97
Hava Keskin – Nurşah Çokbankir-Şengül – Benay Özcan-Özlü Antalya Müzesi Aphrodite Heykelciği Işığında Aphrodite Ourania ve Tanrıçanın Kehanet İkonografisi <i>(Aphrodite Ourania and the Divination Iconography of the Goddess in the Light of the Aphrodite Statuette from the Antalya Museum)</i>	121
Şükrü Özudoğru – Düzgün Tarkan Kibyra Olympeion Odeionu Pulpitum Cephesi Opus Sectile Kaplaması ve Orkestra Opus Sectile Aigis / Medusa Döşemesi <i>(The Opus Sectile Wall Covering on the Facade of the Pulpitum and the Opus Sectile Aigis / Medusa on the Orchestra Floor of the Olympeion Odeion of Kibyra)</i>	143

Çilem Uygun – Bilsen Özdemir – Taner Korkut The Lamp Molds and Lamp Production of Tlos in the Roman Period (<i>Roma Dönemi'nde Tlos Kandil Kalıpları ve Kandil Üretimi</i>)	199
Gonca Cankardeş-Şenol – Ece Benli-Bağcı – Seda Deniz-Kesici Halikarnassos'tan Amphora Mühürleri-I: Türk Kuyusu Mahallesi Kazıları (<i>Amphora Stamps from Halikarnassos-I: Excavations at Türk Kuyusu Quarter</i>)....	233
Ülkü Kara British Museum'da Bulunan Bir Zeest 80 Amphorası Mühürü (<i>A Stamp on the Type of the Zeest 80 Amphora from the British Museum</i>)	271
Can Erpek Late Antique Period in Cappadocia: Şahinefendi (Sobesos) in the Light of Historical Sources and Archaeological Remains (<i>Kappadokia'da Geç Antik Dönem: Tarihi Kaynaklar ve Arkeolojik Kalıntılar Işığında Şahinefendi- Sobesos-</i>)	287
Guntram Koch – Nergis Ataç Spätantike Sarkophage in Georgien (<i>Gürcistan'da Geç Antik Lahitler</i>).....	323
Sevgi Sarıkaya The Roles of Artabazus II and his Family Members in the Persian - Macedonian Wars (<i>II. Artabazos ve Aile Fertlerinin Pers - Makedon Savaşlarındaki Rollerini</i>)	341
Murat Tozan The Kozak Plateau in Antiquity: Toponyms, Routes and Natural Resources (<i>Antikçağ'da Kozak Yaylası: Toponimler, Güzergahlar ve Doğal Kaynaklar</i>).....	381
Ömer Tatar New Remarks on Ptolemaic Bronze Coins With Trident Punchmark in the Light of New Data from Asia Minor (<i>Küçük Asya'dan Yeni Veriler Işığında Trident Punchmarklı Bronz Ptolemaios Sikkeleri Üzerine Yeni Yorumlar</i>)	401
Ebru Akdoğu-Arca – Nuray Gökalp-Özdil Bir Batı Dağlık Kilikia Kenti Iotape ve Yeni Bir Onurlandırma Yazıtı (<i>Iotape, A Western Rough Cilician City and A New Honorary Inscription</i>)	421
Eda Akyürek-Şahin Ein Verstockter Sünder in einem interessanten Fragment einer Beichtinschrift im Museum von Bursa (<i>An Obstinate Sinner – A New Fragment of a Confession-Inscription in the Bursa Museum</i>)	449

MERSİN ÜNİVERSİTESİ
KILIKIA ARKEOLOJİSİNİ ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
BİLİMSEL SÜRELİ YAYINI ‘OLBA’

YAYIN İLKELERİ

Amaç

Olba süreli yayını; Anadolu, Akdeniz dünyası ve ilişkili bölgelere dair orijinal sonuçlar içeren Arkeolojik çalışmalara yer verir; ‘Eski Çağ Bilimleri’ni birbirinden ayırmadan ve bir bütün olarak benimseyerek bilim dünyasına değerli çalışmalar sunmayı amaçlar.

Kapsam

Olba süreli yayını Mayıs ayında olmak üzere yılda bir kez basılır.

Yayınlanması istenilen makalelerin her yıl 31 Ağustos - 31 Ekim tarihleri arasında gönderilmiş olması gerekmektedir.

Yayın için değerlendirmeye alınacak makalelerde aşağıdaki kriterler gözetilir:

- Prehistorya, Protohistorya, Klasik Arkeoloji, Klasik Filoloji (ile Eskiçağ Dilleri ve Kültürleri), Eskiçağ Tarihi, Nüvizmatik ve Erken Hıristiyanlık Arkeolojisi (İS 7. yüzyıla kadar) alanlarında yazılmış makaleler, yayın için değerlendirmeye alınır.
- Makaleler tanıtım veya katalog niteliklerinin ötesinde, araştırma sorusuna/ problemine dayanmalı, somut kanıtlar ve tartışmalarla desteklenen, verilerin tartışıldığı ve bağlantıların kurulduğu içeriklere sahip olmalıdır. Tartışma içermeyen ve kontekstlerinden kopuk şekilde ele alınan arkeolojik malzemeler, kataloglar, buluntu raporları, derleme yazılar değerlendirmeye alınmaz.
- Olba Dergisi, Arkeoloji bilim dalını temsil eden bilimsel bir süreli yayındır. Bu sebeple, verileri farklı bilim dallarının (Harita Mühendisliği, Mimarlık, Arkeometri, Jeofizik ve Antropoloji vb.) işbirliği ile oluşturulan çalışmaların makalelerinde, arkeolojik değerlendirmenin ön planda tutulması beklenir.

Yazım Kuralları

1. a- Makaleler, Word ortamında yazılmış olmalıdır.
b- Metin 10 punto; özet, dipnot, katalog ve bibliografya 9 punto olmak üzere, Times New Roman (PC ve Macintosh) harf karakteri kullanılmalıdır.
c- Dipnotlar her sayfanın altına verilmeli ve makalenin başından sonuna kadar sayısal süreklilik izlemelidir.

d- Metin içinde bulunan ara başlıklarda, küçük harf kullanılmalı ve koyu (bold) yazılmalıdır. Bunun dışındaki seçenekler (tümünün büyük harf yazılması, alt çizgi ya da italik) kullanılmamalıdır.

2. Noktalama (tireler) işaretlerinde dikkat edilecek hususlar:

a) Metin içinde her cümlelin ortasındaki virgülden ve sonundaki noktadan sonra bir tab boşluk bırakılmalıdır.

b) Cümle içinde veya cümle sonunda yer alan dipnot numaralarının herbirisi noktalama (nokta veya virgül) işaretlerinden önce yer almalıdır.

c) Metin içinde yer alan “fig.” ibareleri, parantez içinde verilmeli; fig. ibaresinin noktasından sonra bir tab boşluk bırakılmalı (fig. 3); ikiden fazla ardışık figür belirtiliyorsa iki rakam arasına boşluksuz kısa tire konulmalı (fig. 2-4). Ardışık değilse, sayılar arasına nokta ve bir tab boşluk bırakılmalıdır (fig. 2. 5).

d) Ayrıca bibliyografya ve kısaltmalar kısmında bir yazar, iki soyadı taşıyorsa soyadları arasında boşluk bırakmaksızın kısa tire kullanılmalıdır (Dentzer-Feydy); bir makale birden fazla yazarlı ise her yazardan sonra bir boşluk, ardından uzun tire ve yine boşluktan sonra diğer yazarın soyadı gelmelidir (Hagel – Tomaschitz).

3. “Bibliyografya ve Kısaltmalar” bölümü makalenin sonunda yer almalı, dipnotlarda kullanılan kısaltmalar, burada açıklanmalıdır. Dipnotlarda kullanılan kaynaklar kısaltma olarak verilmeli, kısaltmalarda yazar soyadı, yayın tarihi, sayfa (ve varsa levha ya da resim) sıralamasına sadık kalınmalıdır. Sadece bir kez kullanılan yayınlar için bile aynı kurala uyulmalıdır.

Bibliyografya (kitaplar için):

Richter 1977 Richter, G., Greek Art, New York.

Bibliyografya (makaleler için):

Corsten 1995 Corsten, Th., “Inschriften aus dem Museum von Denizli”, Ege Üniversitesi Arkeoloji Dergisi III, 215-224, lev. LIV-LVII.

Dipnot (kitaplar ve makaleler için)

Richter 1977, 162, res. 217.

Diğer Kısaltmalar:

age.	adı geçen eser
ay.	aynı yazar
vd.	ve devamı
yak.	yaklaşık
v.d.	ve diğerleri
y.dn.	yukarı dipnot
dn.	dipnot
a.dn.	aşağı dipnot
bk.	Bakınız

4. Tüm resim, çizim, tablo ve haritalar için sadece “fig.” kısaltması kullanılmalı ve figürlerin numaralandırılmasında süreklilik olmalıdır. (Levha, Resim, Çizim, Tablo, Şekil, Harita ya da bir başka ifade veya kısaltma kullanılmamalıdır).
5. Bir başka kaynaktan alıntı yapılan figürlerin sorumluluğu yazara aittir, bu sebeple kaynak belirtilmelidir.
6. Makale metninin sonunda figürler listesi yer almalıdır.
7. Metin yukarıda belirtilen formatlara uygun olmak kaydıyla 20 sayfayı geçmemelidir. Figürlerin toplamı 10 adet civarında olmalıdır.
8. Makaleler Türkçe, İngilizce veya Almanca yazılabilir. Türkçe yazılan makalelerde yaklaşık 300 kelimelik Türkçe ve İngilizce yada Almanca özet kesinlikle bulunmalıdır. İngilizce veya Almanca yazılan makalelerde ise en az 300 kelimelik Türkçe ve İngilizce veya Almanca özet bulunmalıdır. Makalenin her iki dilde de başlığı gönderilmelidir.
9. Özetin altında, Türkçe ve İngilizce veya Almanca olmak üzere altı anahtar kelime verilmelidir.
10. Metin, figürler ve figürlerin dizilimi (layout); ayrıca makale içinde kullanılan özel fontlar ‘zip’lenerek, We Transfer türünde bir program ile bilgisayar ortamında gönderilmelidir; çıktı olarak gönderilmesine gerek yoktur.
11. Figürlerde çözünürlük en az 300 dpi; format ise tif veya jpeg olmalıdır; bunlar Microsoft Word türünde başka bir programa gömülü olmamalıdır.
12. Dizilim (layout): Figürler ayrıca mail ekinde bir defada gelecek şekilde yani düşük çözünürlükte pdf olarak kaydedilerek dizilimi (layout) yapılmış şekilde yollanmalıdır.

MERSIN UNIVERSITY
'RESEARCH CENTER OF CILICIAN ARCHAEOLOGY'
JOURNAL 'OLBA'

PUBLISHING PRINCIPLES

Scope

The Journal 'Olba', being published since 1998 by the 'Research Center of Cilician Archeology' of the Mersin University (Turkey), includes original studies on Prehistory, Protohistory, Classical Archaeology, Classical Philology (and ancient languages and cultures), Ancient History, Numismatics and Early Christian Archeology (up till the 7th century AD) of Asia Minor, the Mediterranean and related regions.

Articles should present new ideas and not only have catalogues or excavation reports as their contents. The articles of archaeological studies undertaken together with other disciplines such as geophysics, archaeometry, anthropology etc should give more emphasis to the archaeological part of the work as the Journal Olba is an archaeological journal.

Olba is printed once a year in May. Articles can be sent from 31 August - 31 October each year.

Submission Criteria

1. a. Articles should be written in Word programs.
b. The text should be written in 'Times New Roman' in 10 puntos; the abstract, footnotes, catalogue and bibliography in 9 puntos (for PC and for Macintosh).
c. Footnotes should take place at the bottom of the page in continuous numbering.
d. Titles within the article should be written in small letters and be marked as bold. Other choises (big letters, underline or italic) should not be used.
2. Punctuation (hyphen) Marks:
 - a) One space should be given after the comma in the sentence and after the dot at the end of the sentence.
 - b) The footnote numbering within the sentence in the text, should take place before the comma in the sentence or before the dot at the end of the sentence.
 - c) The indication fig.:

* It should be set in brackets and one space should be given after the dot (fig. 3);

* If many figures in sequence are to be indicated, a short hyphen without space between the beginning and last numbers should be placed (fig. 2-4); if these are not in sequence, a dot and space should be given between the numbers (fig. 2. 5).

d) In the bibliography and abbreviations, if the author has two family names, a short hyphen without leaving space should be used (Dentzer-Feydy); if the article is written by two or more authors, after each author a space, a long hyphen and again a space should be left before the family name of the next author (Hagel – Tomaschitz).

3. The ‘Bibliography’ and ‘Abbreviations’ should take part at the end of the article. The ‘Abbreviations’ used in the footnotes should be explained in the ‘Bibliography’. The bibliography used in the footnotes should take place as abbreviations: Name of writer, year of publishment, page (and if used, number of the illustration). This rule should be applied even if a publishment is used only once.

Bibliography (for books):

Richter 1977 Richter, G., Greek Art, New York.

Bibliography (for articles):

Corsten 1995 Corsten, Th., “Inschriften aus dem Museum von Denizli”, Ege Üniversitesi Arkeoloji Dergisi III, 215-224, pl. LIV-LVII.

Footnotes (for books and articles)

Richter 1977, 162, fig. 217.

Miscellaneous Abbreviations:

op. cit. : in the work already cited

idem : an author that has just been mentioned

ff : following pages

et al. : and others

n. : footnote

see : see

infra : see below

supra : see above

4. For all photographs, drawings and maps only the abbreviation ‘fig.’ should be used in continous numbering (remarks such as Plate, Picture, Drawing, Map or any other word or abbreviation should not be used).
5. Photographs, drawings or maps taken from other publications are in the responsibility of the writers; so the sources have to be mentioned.
6. A list of figures should take part at the end of the article.

7. The text should be within the remarked formats not more than 20 pages, the drawing and photographs 10 in number.
8. Papers may be written in Turkish, English or German. Papers written in Turkish must include an abstract of 300 words in Turkish and English or German. It will be appreciated if papers written in English or German would include a summary of 300 words in Turkish and in English or German. The title of the article should be given in two languages.
9. Six keywords should be remarked, following the abstract in Turkish and English or German.
10. Figures should be at least 300 dpi; tif or jpeg format are required; these should not be embedded in another program such as Microsoft Word.
11. The article, figures and their layout as well as special fonts should be sent by e-mail (We Transfer).
12. Layout: The figures of the layout, having lesser dpi, should be sent in pdf format.

NEW REMARKS ON PTOLEMAIC BRONZE COINS WITH TRIDENT PUNCHMARK IN THE LIGHT OF NEW DATA FROM ASIA MINOR

Ömer TATAR*

ÖZ

Küçük Asya'dan Yeni Veriler Işığında Trident Punchmarklı Bronz Ptolemaios Sikkeleri Üzerine Yeni Yorumlar

Büyük çoğunluğu II. Ptolemaios Philadelphos dönemine ait olan, bir kısmı ise I. Ptolemaios Soter döneminde darp edilmiş krali bronz sikkelerin arka yüzünde karşımıza oldukça büyük, oyuk formu, trident biçiminde bir punchmark çıkmaktadır. Hemen hemen tüm örneklerde, arka yüzün sağ boşluğuna vurulduğu görülür. Bu damga, sikkeler üzerinde alışlagelmiş kontrmarktan biçimsel olarak farklılaşmakla beraber sahip olduğu işlev ise aynıdır. Krali Ptolemaios bronz sikkeleri üzerinde yer alan trident biçimli damgaların nerede, ne amaçla ve ne zaman vurulduklarına dair literatürde çeşitli yayınlar mevcuttur. Araştırmacılar eldeki veriler ışığında çeşitli görüşler ileri sürmelerine karşın, Küçük Asya verilerinin çok az ölçüde yayınlanmış olması daha kapsamlı bir yorumlama yapılmasına mâni olmuştur. Önceleri Fenike kentlerinden Berytos'ta vuruldukları düşünülse de arkeolojik çalışmalar neticesinde ele geçen örnekler ışığında Kıbrıs adasında damgalanmış oldukları fikri ön plana çıkmıştır. Küçük Asya'nın güney ve güney-batı kıyıları boyunca gösterdikleri dolaşım ise yayını yapılmış limitli veriden ötürü tam manasıyla ele alınamamıştır. Güncel veriler ışığında hazırlanan bu çalışmada Karia, Lykia, Pamphylia ve Kilikia bölgelerinde yürütülen bilimsel arkeolojik çalışmalarda ele geçen örnekler ve müze koleksiyonunda yer alan, büyük kısmı daha evvel yayınlanmamış yeni örnekler sayesinde bu sikkelerin nerede, ne amaçla ve ne zaman punchmarklandıklarına ilişkin yeni yorumlamalar yapmak mümkün olmuş, gösterdikleri yoğun sirkülasyonu ele alma şansı olmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ptolemaios Krallığı, Bronz Sikke, Punchmark, Küçük Asya

* Research Assistant Dr. Ömer Tatar, Akdeniz University, Faculty of Letters, Department of History, 07058 Antalya-TR. E-posta: omertatar@akdeniz.edu.tr. Orcid No: 0000-0002-5644- 2188.

This article is an extended version of a discussion from PhD titled Ptolemaic Hegemony over Lycia in the Light of Numismatic Data completed by the present author in 2022.

I would like to thank Prof. Z. Çizmeli-Öğün for sharing with me the data from Kaunos excavations, Ç. Ulutaş from Antalya Archaeology Museum for noting me about the coin from Gagai rescue excavations and Dr. H. Köker for the data of Burdur Museum.

ABSTRACT

There is a very large and hollow-shaped trident punchmark on the reverse side of Ptolemaic bronze coins, most of which belong to the Ptolemy II Philadelphos period. Some of them were also minted during the period of Ptolemy I Soter. It is observed that almost all of them were punched on the right field of the reverse. This stamp differs formally from the usual countermark on coins. However, the function it has is the same. There are various publications in numismatic literature on where, for what purpose and when the trident-shaped stamps on the Ptolemaic bronze coins were struck. Researchers have put forward different opinions in the light of the available data. However, limited publication of Asia Minor data prevented a more comprehensive interpretation in these publications. Although, in the light of the examples obtained, it was first thought that they were stamped in Berytos, one of the Phoenician cities, the idea that the punchmarks were applied on Cyprus became popular. On the other hand, their circulation along the south and south-west coasts of Asia Minor could not be fully considered due to limited data. In this study, the specimens found during the archaeological research carried out in the regions of Caria, Lycia, Pamphylia and Cilicia and the samples in the museum collections, most of which have not been published before, have been brought together. In this way, it has been possible to make new interpretations about where, for what purpose and when these coins were punchmarked, and to comment on the intense circulation they showed.

Keywords: Ptolemaic Kingdom, Bronze Coins, Punchmark, Asia Minor

Introduction

Small stamps struck on coins are called countermarks. They are applied on the coins which have been withdrawn from circulation for any reason by the issuing authority and therefore no longer circulate or have reached a different geography for reasons such as to put them into circulation again or to attribute a new value or to become valid in a foreign land¹. The use of countermarks on regal Ptolemaic coins had also these general purposes². With few exceptions, countermarks are used on bronze coins of the kingdom. The stamp, which is the subject of this study, is on regal bronzes as well. It is a big trident shaped mark stamped on the reverse side of a group of bronze coins, during the reign Ptolemy II Philadelphos³ (fig. 1). On these coins, there is a

1 On the use of countermarks on Greek coins, see. Le Rider 1975; Forestier 2006.

2 While Davesne (Davesne – Le Rider 1989) classifies the marks on the Meydancikkale hoard coins, he uses the titles: “official countermarks”, “special signs/stamps”, “deformation” and “graffiti”. Davesne (Davesne – Le Rider 1989, 300) divides the stamps that he calls countermarks in general into official countermarks and private countermarks and names the special ones as “stamp/mark”. See also Davesne 1987, 145-146.

3 We know an example on a silver coin from Meydancikkale hoard. For this coin, which is attributed to Cyprus, see. Davesne – Le Rider 1989, n. 4855. As mentioned below in the text, Davesne proposes a connection between this trident countermark on Meydancikkale tetradrachm and the punchmark on bronze issues and accordingly uses it to strengthen his case where he suggests that these bronzes were punchmarked by a mint on Cyprus. However, its use on that specimen is different from those on bronze coins considering its form. On this issue, also see. Ashton – Arslan – Dervişağaoğlu 1996, 270, fn. 2; Lichocka 1997, 11. Králi for other sporadic examples of similar stamping on Ptolemaic coins, see. Lichocka 1997, 11-12. These are, just like the Meydancikkale specimen, small in size and in relief with a background.

post-production mark, which we can describe as a punchmark, which is different from the usual countermark form⁴. This stamp is a countermark in terms of its function. However, it is a punchmark in terms of its shape due to its hollow and inward structure. Therefore, it does not have a background and the trident is instamped. Showing a certain order, on most of the specimens it is on the right field of the reverse side and mostly on the wings of the eagle, which forms the main reverse type. While the earliest examples are on the bronze coins of Ptolemy I Soter, which are dated to c. 294 BC., these punchmarks are mostly on the bronzes of Ptolemy II Philadelphos, which were struck between c. 275-265/260 BC.

Studies on the subject

Several studies on the issue have been published commenting on where, when and by whom these coins were punchmarked. The earliest remark on the punchmark is by Svoronos (1904, n. 381β). In a note to an example in his catalog, the author named the trident symbol as the trident of Berytos and thus claimed that the stamp in question might have been struck in this city⁵. However, he does not clearly suggest a date and reason. Cox (1959, 97-98), who published the coins found in the Curium excavations, made a connection between the trident punchmarked coins and the cease of the activities of Ptolemaic mints on Cyprus since the mid-260s BC. The author suggested that the reason why the minting on the island ceased might be the loss of Cyprus following Antigonos Gonatas' victory against Ptolemy II in Kos, and that Antigonos Gonatas, who had a great naval victory, stamped these coins, and maintained their circulation⁶. However, Le Rider (1969, 32-33) dismisses this possibility, stating that as a result of this method, the Ptolemaic coins would remain in circulation reminding of the dominance of the kingdom in question. He states that this must be a marking applied by the Ptolemaic kingdom itself and possibly for economic reasons. Davesne (1987, 147-149), who made the first comprehensive study on the subject, proposes that, unlike Cox, this stamp should not have been directly political, but for economic reasons following Ptolemy II Philadelphos' bronze coinage reform⁷. He argues that as the trident symbol used is Poseidon's attribute, hence a naval symbol, and more importantly, due to the large number of coins circulating in Cyprus, the coins must have been punchmarked and used on the island of Cyprus⁸. On the other hand, Davesne (1989, 303) takes the silver coin with a similar stamp in the Meydancikkale hoard as a further evidence of the Cypriot origin of bronzes, as that silver issue is attributed to Cyprus⁹. Also, Noeske (1995) proposes that, based on the large number of bronze coins found on Cyprus, this must be a stamp applied by the royal

4 Unlike usual countermark, which is a symbol with a raised form in a geometric shape such as rectangular, round or square, these signs are both in a hollow form and occupy a large space on the coin.

5 Jenkins (1967, 67) agrees with this.

6 Similarly, Seyrig suggested that this countermark may have been struck on royal coins by Antigonos Gonatas, who won a naval victory against the Ptolemies in approximately 263-262 BC., see: Seyrig 1966. However, Antigonos Gonatas' domination on the island is not historically attested. On this, see: Le Rider 1969, 32-33; Bagnall 1976, 190. Cfr. Lichocka 1997, 13-14.

7 Also see: Schulze 2001.

8 Also see: Konuk 2004, 173; Bodzek 2020, 380.

9 For the tetradrachm see Davesne – Le Rider 1989, n. 4855.

Ptolemaic authority on Cyprus. Lichočka (1997), on the other hand, agrees with the idea that the punchmarks must have been applied on Cyprus, but associates the reason for stamping with a political event. Moreover, unlike other researchers, she proposes the next king's reign for this application. According to the author, BC. Ptolemy III Euergetes, who started the Third Syrian War, which took place between 246-241 BC, needed money to pay the soldiers and thus create a strong navy. Therefore, perhaps the lack of coins in Cyprus during this period caused the non circulating coins from the previous ruler's period to be stamped and put into circulation. Lorber (CPE I, 115) has brought a new explanation to the subject in the light of current data. Considering the wide circulation of the coins bearing this stamp from the south of Asia Minor to Cyprus and the Syrian-Phoenician geography, the author states that it is the Ptolemaic navy rather than a mint that applied the trident punchmark on the reverse of the coins. So, it is clearly understood that recent studies on the subject mostly agree that these coins were punchmarked on Cyprus with a financial reason and by the Ptolemaic Kingdom.

New Extensive Data

It is the discovery of many new bronze coins bearing trident punchmarks in the research I conducted within the scope of my doctoral thesis, which makes possible new interpretations of where, for what purpose and when these stamps were applied and also their wide circulation. First of all, as a result of the study of the new specimens from Asia Minor, 2 new issues were detected in addition to the 7 known issues from the examples in the literature carrying this stamp, and the number of issues bearing trident punchmark increased to ⁹.

The total number of coins with trident punchmarks from Asia Minor, most of which are unpublished, and newly studied excavation and museum material is 62. 32 coins were found in archaeological excavations and 1 in a surface survey. 29 coins, on the other hand, were observed in the museum collections. Euromos (1 coin), Milas Coal Basins (Çakıralan/Belentepe) (1 coin), Kaunos (2 coins), Patara (11 coins), Limyra (8 coins)¹⁰, Gagai (1 coin) and Nagidos (8 coins) are the excavations where regal bronze coins with trident punchmark were found (fig. 2). The surface survey where 1 coin was found is the one carried out in southern Caria. When it comes to coins in museum collections, specimens are in the Aydın Archaeology Museum (6 coins), Bodrum Museum of Underwater Archaeology (3 coins), Marmaris Museum (4 coins), Fethiye Museum (10 coins), Burdur Archaeology Museum (1 coin), Antalya Archaeology Museum (1 coin) and Alanya Archaeology Museum (4 coins) (fig. 3).

When we look at the regional density based on archaeological excavations and survey, it is seen that 5 were found in Caria (15%), 20 in Lycia (60%), and 8 in Cilicia (25%) in particular during archaeological excavations and surveys. When we classify the museums considering the borders of the ancient period, 13 coins from Caria (45%), 10 coins from Lycia (35%), 1 coin from Pamphylia (3%), 1 coin from Pisidia (3%)

¹⁰ Unfortunately, the data is up to 2004. It has not been possible for me to study rest of the coins. The number of coins with trident punchmark must be higher now. I would like to thank J. Gorecki once again for sharing with me the finds from the excavations by giving the Svoronos reference number.

and 5 coins from Cilicia (14%). As a result, it is seen that the main density is in Lycia, Caria, and Cilicia, respectively.

As mentioned above, trident punchmarks are observed on the reverse side of coins from the reign of Ptolemy I and Ptolemy II. There are two different series and six different issues of Ptolemy I on which there are trident punchmarks¹¹. This number is much higher when it comes to the bronzes from Ptolemy II period. There are five different series and 21 different issues with trident punchmark¹². The density is approximately 55% in Zeus with laurel wreath/eagle with open wings series. This corresponds to 15 of the 27 total issues. These are the issues of Alexandria, dated to around 275-265/60 BC¹³.

Where were these coins punchmarked?

So, where were these coins punchmarked? Considering the opinions about where the stamp might have been struck, the claim of Berytos, which Svoronos put forward in his rather early work, was clearly out of place with the archaeological finds unearthed in the following years¹⁴. The following studies, on the other hand, point to the island of Cyprus in common with archaeological reasons. Most recent data shared here confirms this attribution.

First, it should be stated that in the light of the available data, it is seen that approximately 7-8% of the regal bronze Ptolemaic coins found in Asia Minor (including the excavation finds and museum collections) are composed of coins from Cyprus mints¹⁵. In this context, considering the military mobility and geographical proximity, it is normal and expected for the Cyprus mint coins to circulate in the south of Asia Minor.

On the other hand, when we take a look at the circulation of these punchmarked coins on Cyprus in the light of published and accessible data, the number of punchmarked

11 These are the series with head of Alexander III with elephant headdress right on the obverse and eagle standing on thunderbolt left with spread wings (see. Svoronos, n. 235; CPE, n. B43 (Alexandria); Svoronos, n. 363; CPE, n. B110 (Uncertain Mint 9 (Cyprus)); Svoronos, n. 356; CPE, n. B115 (Uncertain Mint 9 (Cyprus)); Svoronos, n. 379; CPE, n. B117 (Uncertain Mint 10 (Cyprus))) and those with laureate head of Zeus right on the obverse and the same reverse type with the previous one (see. Svoronos, n. 271; CPE, n. B63 (Alexandria); Svoronos, n. 296; CPE, n. B100 (Alexandria)).

12 Series: laureate head of Zeus right / eagle standing on thunderbolt left with spread wings (see. Svoronos, n. 600; 560; 568; 576; 580; 602; 561; 572; 577; 581; 589; 557; CPE, n. B166; B168; B172; B174-B175; B180; B183-B185; B187-B190; B196-B197 (Alexandria)); head of Alexander III with elephant headdress right / eagle standing on thunderbolt left with spread wings (see. Svoronos, n. 582; CPE, n. B191) (Alexandria); laureate head of Zeus right / eagle standing on thunderbolt left with closed wings (see. Svoronos, n. 381; CPE, n. B317 (Uncertain Mint 22, Probably on Cyprus)); head of Alexander III with elephant headdress right / eagle standing on thunderbolt left with closed wings (see. Svoronos, n. 382; CPE, n. B318 (Uncertain Mint 22, Probably on Cyprus)); head of Alexander III right, wearing mitra with long hair / laureate head of Zeus right / eagle standing on thunderbolt left with closed wings (see. Svoronos, n. 635; 641; CPE, n. B322; B328 (Tyre)).

13 Svoronos, n. 600; 560; 568; 576; 580; 602; 561; 572; 577; 581; 589; 557; CPE, n. B166; B168; B172; B174-B175; B180; B183-B185; B187-B190; B196-B197.

14 Cox's publication of specimens from Cyprus made their origin clear.

15 See. Tatar 2022, 364-366.

coins found in archaeological studies on the island is¹⁶. 14 were found in Curium¹⁶, 2 in Nea Paphos¹⁷. On the other hand, it is known that there are 2 specimens in the National Museum of Nicosia¹⁸. In this regard, after southern cities of Asia Minor, Cyprus is the territory where these punchmarked coins are mostly found¹⁹.

On the other hand, the island of Cyprus, where royal bronze coins were minted during the Ptolemy I period, does not seem to have had a bronze minting activity during the reign of Ptolemy II. Therefore, there is no mint on the island which produced reformed bronzes as well. The possible lack of coinage that may have been experienced on the island during this period and the coins found on the island indicate that, just as Davesne, Noeske and Lichočka stated, the need for coins on the island caused the old issues to be punchmarked and continued to be in circulation²⁰.

On the other hand, Cyprus was a very significant base for Ptolemaic Kingdom both in commercial and military sense. It was a naval base as the island controlled the basin as far as Rhodes²¹. Moreover, during the Second Syrian War, it was most probably Cyprus from where military campaigns in Syria and Cilicia was controlled and the ships moved to these regions²².

As can be seen, although there are many specimens from the south of Asia Minor, they show a very wide geographical and numerical distribution and are not concentrated in a specific place. Therefore, in the light of the available data, it is possible to propose that these coins were stamped on the island of Cyprus and spread to Asia Minor. There is currently no data to support Lorber's idea that the stamping authority may have been the navy itself.

Why were these coins punchmarked?

While Svoronos does not suggest a reason for this practice, Cox and Seyrig connect it to Antigonos Gonatas' hegemony on the island and his political propaganda. Davesne and Noeske, on the other hand proposes a purely financial cause which emerged following the bronze coinage reform of Ptolemy II. Most recently, Lichočka suggests that they may have been applied in the context of the Third Syrian War during the reign of Ptolemy III. Finally, Lorber combines financial and military reasons and proposes their use by the Ptolemaic fleet after the reform of Ptolemy II.

When all the existing data is examined, indeed the main reason must be the new weight regulation with the reform that took place in the second half of 260s BC. and the absence of the minting of reformed coins on the island, and an urgent need for bronze coinage. Thus, continuation of the circulation of old coins was maintained by stamping as a result of such need.

16 Cox 1959, 57-63; 65; 69; 71.

17 Nicolaou 1990, 34; 37.

18 Lichočka 1997, 9-10.

19 There are hardly any examples from other regions. 1 coin from Beth Zur (Israel) (Sellers 1993, 34), 1 coin from Kom Truga (Egypt) (Shahin 2005, n. 512), 1 coin from Petra'da (Jordan) (Sidebotham 2005, 433; 434, n. 37) and 1 coin from Khirbet Qeiyafa (Israel) (Farhi 2016, 104).

20 Davesne 1987, 147-148; Noeske 1995; Lichočka 1997.

21 Strootman 2020, 130-131.

22 Grainger 2010, 124-125; Grabowski 2020, 143-144.

Indeed, all bronze coins bearing this punchmark are the issues of the pre-reform series, namely before the reform of mid-260s BC. Although the minting of existing series from the reign of Ptolemy I continued in the first half of Ptolemy II's reign, there was a grand arrangement in regal bronzes in a date around between 265-260 BC.²³ As a result, there was a weight increase of approximately 50% in the weight of bronze coins²⁴. On the other hand, older bronzes were driven out of circulation²⁵. In this context, it is clear that the underlying purpose of punchmarking the regal bronzes discussed here is to adapt them to the new weight system, to revalidate them and to maintain their circulation²⁶. 5 out of 6 issues from the reign of Ptolemy I are obols with c. 8 gr. mean weight and c. 22 mm. diameter. Other issue is diobol with c. 16 gr. mean weight and 28 mm. diameter. When it comes to the bronzes of Ptolemy II, which are higher in number, 16 issues are diobols, 3 are obols and 2 are hemiobols which were struck in the same weight system. Thus, about 66% of punchmarked coins are diobols, about 30% obols, and 3% hemiobols. Although the units in the pre-reform weight system do not have a direct equivalent in the new system, it is observed that they remain under the same unit of the new system with small diameter and weight differences (fig. 4.). Therefore, as a result of this stamping, the obols and diobols of the previous weight system became equivalent to the obols, diobols and hemiobols of the new system with larger diameters and greater weight and they remained in circulation.

Thus, comments, which suggest an initial financial reason related to the reform of Ptolemy II, by Davesne, Noeske and Lorber are confirmed. There is no information or evidence to support Cox and Seyrig's Antigonos Gonatas suggestion. However, it is just a simple financial solution to make "transition" to new system just like Davesne

- 23 This increase resulted in a 3:2 exchange ratio between old and new bronze units. Wolf 2013, 83. See also Lorber 2005, 138; Picard – Faucher 2012, 35. It is thought that the main purpose here is to bring the material value of the bronze payment instrument closer to its nominal value, to create an acceptable alternative to silver, especially in Egypt, and to make the role of the bronze coin in the economy more important in this way, on this issue, see Van Driessche 1988; Davesne 1998, 57-58; Picard 1998, 416-417; Morkholm 2000, 117; Lorber 2005, 137-138; Le Rider – Callataÿ 2006, 158-159; Cavagna 2010, 125; 132; CPE I, 110; Wolf 2013, 84; 2015, 542-543. Morkholm (2000, 117) and Picard (1998, 414; 416) state that due to the weight differences seen in regal bronze coins, the nominal value of bronze was always more prominent. On the other hand, Picard and Faucher (2012, 37) suggests that the increase may be related to the coin exchange commission for payments made with bronze. Regarding the interpretation of the use of bronze coins, which became stronger with this reform within the kingdom, as an effort to increase monetisation, see. Von Reden 2001. On the relevance of this effort to tax payments in general, see. Manning 2016; Von Reden 2007, 161-170; Faucher 2013, 221. The aim of shifting the payments made to soldiers with silver coins to bronze is among other purposes, see. Meadows 2020, 100-101.
- 24 While the top unit was the triobol with an average weight of 21 gr. during the predecessor king's reign, the biggest unit of these new bronzes, which were divided into 8 different units, was the octobol with an average weight of 90 gr., and dichalkon became the lowest unit with an average weight of 3 gr. See. Lorber 2005, 150, tab. 2; CPE I, 111, tab. 2.1. For detailed metrological analysis, see Wolf 2013, 64-80.
- 25 These bronze issues, struck in two different weight systems, do not occur in Egyptian hoards together. See. Picard – Faucher 2012, 33; CPE I, 110.
- 26 Davesne 1987, 149; CPE I, 115. Also see. Schulze 2001.

suggested?²⁷ While the financial reason and lack of coinage on the island after the reform is obvious, it is possible to make some further remarks on the subject. Moreover, such an explanation is desperately needed because these coins circulate in a very wide area through Asia Minor. So, it is clearly not a local phenomenon. As mentioned above Lichocka (1997) and Lorber (CPE) elaborated the explanation for such a practice, while the former connects it to the Third Syrian War and the latter to Ptolemaic fleets' activities on the coasts of Asia Minor.

First of all, the fact that they have an intense circulation on the coasts of Asia Minor, from Caria to Cilicia, shows that these coins were scattered throughout the geography with the soldiers. It is well attested that regal bronzes were used in daily payments to soldiers, especially in the Hellenistic period²⁸. When the intense spread of the soldiers from Cyprus, where the punchmark was applied, to the southern coasts of Asia Minor is considered, The Second Syrian War, which took place between 261-255/53 BC, comes to mind. Coins struck in the old weight system must have been validated by punchmarking to meet the need for coins that emerged with the start of the war. Because when we examine the situation on a regional basis, the war in question took place in a wide geography extending from Caria in the west to Cilicia in the east. Antiochus II Theos took back Cilicia, which was occupied by the Ptolemies at the beginning of the war, and dominated the whole of Pamphylia, where Egyptian hegemony had been established for a long time, and a large part of Caria. Lycia remained under the rule of Egypt²⁹. Therefore, the dispatch of troops from Cyprus to these regions must have taken place. This must have been the political event that caused the circulation of soldiers, and therefore of coins in the regions in question. Another interesting point to indicate military connection is that the specimens from the excavations are much higher from the sites where we know to have hosted a military garrison; Patara (11 coins), Limyra (8 coins) and Nagidos (8 coins)³⁰.

As the case in Cilicia is detailed; when the circulation of coins is associated with the Second Syrian War, the reason for their presence in Cilicia becomes more understandable. For, at the very beginning of the war, there was a Ptolemaic presence in Cilicia Pedias, which was previously under the rule of the Seleucids³¹. Accordingly, silver tetradrachms and drachms dated between 261-259 BC. with the portraits of

27 Davesne 1987, 147-148. Also see. Schulze 2001.

28 See. Psoma 2009. It is thought that a low rank Egyptian soldier was paid 1 to 2 obols a day while infantry soldiers were paid between 4 and 8 obols a day in 3rd century BC. See. Fischer-Bovet – Lorber 2020, 171-172.

29 For detailed info see. Ma 1999, 41-45; Huss 2001, 281-287; 338-352; Meadows 2012, 115, fn. 7.

30 For the attestation of a Ptolemaic garrison in Patara in the light of numismatic data, see. Lenger – Dündar 2021; Dündar – Lenger 2022.

31 Grainger 2010, 121-123. Cilicia is listed as a Ptolemaic possession following the First Syrian War (274-271 BC.) as recorded by Theocritus (XVII.86-90). The region might have been captured as early as 280-279 BC. See. Hölbl 2001, 38; 44; Grainger 2010, 77. However, it is possible that it was Cilicia Tracheia where a strict Ptolemaic domination was established. Ma, on the other hand, does not consider a Ptolemaic hegemony over the region before First Syrian War, see. Ma 1999, 39. Regarding eastern Cilicia, after Antiochos II's regain of region during the Second Syrian War (c. 254/253 BC.), Cilician Soloi was captured by Ptolemaic fleet around 246/246 BC. as well as Rough Cilicia one more time, see. Hölbl 2001, 48. Cfr. Ma 1999, 40-41. For the Ptolemaic hegemony over Cilicia also see. Şar 2010.

Ptolemy II were struck in the Tarsus mint³². On the other hand, the Aydıncık hoard, which was found near Kelenderis, was interpreted as an indicator of Ptolemaic domination in Cilicia Tracheia during this war³³. The importance of Nagidos for the Ptolemies is confirmed by the 60 coins found in the excavations³⁴ and it is understood that the city hosted a Ptolemaic garrison³⁵. The 8 coins recovered here have trident punchmarks on the reverse, as mentioned above, confirming the presence in the region during the late 260s-early 250s BC³⁶. On the other hand, as stated above, Ptolemaic activities in Cilicia during the Second Syrian War was controlled from Cyprus, which is clearly the reason why we find these punchmarked coins over the region.

From the Alanya Archaeology Museum collection, 4 coins (out of 39) are punchmarked. The total existence in Cilicia corresponds to approximately 19% of the whole. Undoubtedly, as the coins from excavations and museum collections are published, new data from the region will increase the number and rate.

So, Lorber's comments on the circulation of these bronzes, relating it to the movement of the fleet is confirmed³⁷. On the other hand, Lichočka's explanation for a military activity is plausible, but Second Syrian War seems more plausible.

When were these coins punchmarked?

As suggested by researchers, these coins were obviously punchmarked following the bronze coinage reform of 265/60 BC. during the reign of Ptolemy II. Anytime following this period is possible. However, a very long gap, just like Lichočka suggested, is unlikely. Because, beside coins of Ptolemy II dated between 275/74-265/60, there are punchmarked coins of Ptolemy I from 294 BC. as well. Therefore, although it is correct for Lichočka to attribute the punchmark application to a military sub-reason, it does not seem plausible to date it to 240 BC. This seems to be a very late date. So, if these coins were really punchmarked during the Second Syrian War,

32 For the coins, see. CPE, n. 400-403. On the subject, also see. Davesne 1999, 129-131. After a short period of Egyptian domination, the region was again under the rule of the Seleucids in c. 259 BC, while the war was still going on. During the Third Syrian War the Cilicia region was regained by Ptolemies, see. Bagnall 1976, 114-115; Hölbl 2001, 48-49.

33 Davesne 1994; Grainger 2010, 123-124. Also see *IGCH* VIII, 284; *CH* IX, 486; *EH* I, 51; CPE I, 495. As the hoard is dated to c. 260/258-257 BC., it shows that Kelenderis was abandoned at that time and the Seleucids prevailed.

34 See. Tekin 2007. Cfr. Tatar 2022, 632-641.

35 Bagnall 1976, 114-116; Durugönül 2001, 436; 2007a, 7; 2007b, 13.

36 Coins from Nagidos (60 pcs.) clearly support the Ptolemaic activity in Cilicia Tracheia from 280s BC. to the last quarter of the 3rd century. Out of certainly attributable 45 coins, 3 are Ptolemy I's (7%), 22 are Ptolemy II (49%), 16 are Ptolemy III (35%), 1 is Ptolemy IV (2%), 1 is Ptolemy V (2%), 1 is Ptolemy VI (2%) and 1 is Ptolemy III or Ptolemy IV (2%). See, Tekin 2007, 379-381; 437-438. Cfr. Tatar 2022, 632-641.

37 In Cyprus, coins from off-island mints are very scarce, especially as can be seen from current Paphos (Bodzek 2020) data. Such a dispersal by the navy is very likely in the case of the Ptolemies. It is thought that the Egyptian kingdom, which paid great importance to the navy beginning from the Ptolemy I period, had over 3,000 warships during the reign of Ptolemy II, see. Grabowski 2020, 132. The mentioned navy forces were constantly present in the Aegean basin, especially in this period. For detailed info, see. Fischer-Bovet 2014, 55-64; Grabowski 2020.

a date between 260-255/53 BC. can be suggested. On the other hand, if the Aydıncık Hoard from Kelenderis was really buried in 258/257 BC., and the city was conquered by Seleucid army, Nagidos, which is only 40 km from there, must have been the next in line. So, at least we can speculate that the punchmarked specimens from Nagidos might have reached there around 260-257 BC³⁸.


Conclusion

As a result, it is clear that there was a short-term coin supply problem during the reign of Ptolemy II. Therefore, the reason for the punchmarking of these coins is that they could remain in circulation under the guarantee of the state, alongside the new and reformed coins. The place where they were punchmarked is most likely Cyprus. Because archaeological finds become dense there. Asia Minor data shows a wide geographical distribution. It does not point to a specific center. As we know the find location for sure the excavations provide a more reliable data flow and examples from excavations vary from Euromos in the west of Caria to Nagidos in Cilicia. The reason for its spread along the coasts of Asia Minor, as Lorber argues, must stand in connection with the movement of the soldiers in the Ptolemaic fleet. At the moment, however, there is no data to confirm that the navy itself and not a royal mint may have struck the mark as Lorber suggests. Finally, the reason for the wide spread of punchmarked bronze coins from Caria to Cilicia must stand in relation with the soldiers who arrived in southern Asia Minor during the Second Syrian War.

38 For the hoard and dating see. Davesne 1994. Also see. Grainger 2010, 123-124.

CATALOGUE**Ptolemy I Soter****Alexandria****from 294 BC.*****AE Obol***

Obv. Head of Alexander right in elephant headdress

Rev. ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ. Eagle with spread wings standing left on thunderbolt,  in left field


Ref.: Svoronos, n. 235 (Alexandria, 305-285 BC.); CPE, n. B43

1. 21 mm. 7.05 gr. 12h*Alanya Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 10244³⁹=Tatar 2022, 784, n. 1, Rev. [ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field**2.** 21 mm. 6.05 gr. 10h*Alanya Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 954⁴⁰=Tatar 2022, 784, n. 2, Rev. [ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ] [ΒΑΣ]ΙΛΕ[ΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field**3.** 19/22 mm. 5.78 gr. 12h

*Burdur Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 29001=Tatar 2022, 767, n. 3, Rev. [ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ] ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ, trident punchmark in right field

Ptolemy II Philadelphos**Alexandria****from c. 275/274 BC.*****AE Diobol***

Obv. Laureate Head of Zeus right

Rev. ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ. Eagle with spread wings standing left on thunderbolt, shield in left field,  above

Ref.: Svoronos, n. 600 (Cyprus, c. 285-270); CPE, n. B166; Picard-Faucher 2012, Series 2

4. 29 mm. 14.37 gr. 12h

*Fethiye Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 4884=Ashton 2002, n. 23=Tatar 2022, 295, n. 95, Rev. trident punchmark in right field

5. 29 mm. 14.25 gr. 12h

*Patara 2018 (Tepecik I-18) Inv. No. 373=Lenger

– Dündar 2021, n. 22=Tatar 2022, 295, n. 96, Rev. ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ [Β]ΑΣΙΛΕ[ΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field

6. 28 mm. 16,60 gr. 12h

*Patara 2017 (Nero Bath DC. Trench Sounding I) Inv. No. 036=Tatar 2022, 295, n. 97, Rev. [ΠΤΟ]ΛΕΜΑ[ΙΟΥ] [ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field

7. 28 mm. 16.03 gr. 12h

*Milas Museum Inv. No. 2018/455 (2016, YKEÛTAŞ Excavations, Belentepe.)=Tatar 2022, 592, n. 2, Rev. trident punchmark in right field

8. 28 mm. 15,28 gr. 12h

*Patara 2014 (Tepecik L18) n. 060=Lenger – Dündar 2021, n. 23=Tatar 2022, 295, n. 98, Rev. [ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field, countermark in left field?

9. 28 mm. 14.41 gr. 12h

*Milas Museum Inv. No. 2019/101 (2018 Euromos excavation)=Tatar 2022, 591, n.1, Rev. [ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ] ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ, trident punchmark in right field

10. 27 mm. 15,37 gr. 12h

*Antalya Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 7178=Tatar 2022, 295, n. 99, Rev. trident punchmark in right field

11. 27 mm. 14,70gr. 12h

*Fethiye Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 8443=Tatar 2022, 296, n. 100, Rev. [ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ] ΒΑΣΙ[ΛΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field

12. 27 mm. 14,47 gr. 12h

*Patara 2018 (Tepecik I-17) Inv. No. 235=Lenger – Dündar 2021, n. 24=Tatar 2022, 296, n. 101, Rev. [ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ] ΒΑΣΙΛΕ[ΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field

13. 25 mm. 13,99 gr. 12h

*Patara 2019 (Tepecik i-18) Inv. No. 254=Lenger – Dündar 2021, n. 25=Tatar 2022, 206, n. 102, Rev. [ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field

14. 25 mm. 9,18 gr.

*Patara 2018 (Tepecik I-17) Inv. No. 240=Lenger – Dündar 2021, n. 26=Tatar 2022, 296, n. 103, Rev. [ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field

Obv. Laureate Head of Zeus right

39 Purchased. Finding place is recorded as “around Alanya”.

40 Purchased.

Rev. ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ. Eagle with spread wings standing left on thunderbolt, illegible letter/monogram between legs, shield in left field, \sum above

Ref.: Cfr. Svoronos, n. 553; 560; 563; 568; 571; 576; 580; 586; 593; 598; 600 (Cyprus, c. 285-270 BC.); CPE, n. B166; B168; B170; B172-B175; B177-B181; Picard-Faucher 2012, Series 2, n. 150-169

15. 29 mm. - -

*Aydın Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 40247⁴¹=Tatar 2022, 664, n. 16, Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in the center

16. 29 mm. 17,76 gr. 12h

*Patara 2019 (Tepecik i-19/a Surface-1) Inv. No. 627=Lenger – Dündar 2021, n. 31=Tatar 2022, 296, n. 105, Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ] ΒΑΣ[ΙΛΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field

17. 28.5 mm. - -

*Aydın Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 8811⁴²=Tatar 2022, 664, n. 15, Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ] ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ, trident punchmark in the center

18. 28 mm. 18,54 gr. 12h

*Patara 2019 (Tepecik J-18) Inv. No. 532=Lenger – Dündar 2021, n. 32=Tatar 2022, 296, n. 106, Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field

19. *Limyra excavations Inv. No. Li 83/59=Tatar 2022, 596, n. 4

20. *Limyra excavations Inv. No. Li94/NU 108=Tatar 2022, 596, n. 5

21. *Limyra excavations Inv. No. – (surface finding)=Tatar 2022, 596, n. 6

22. *Limyra excavations Inv. No. Li85/NU 1 (surface finding)=Tatar 2022, 596, n. 7

23. *Limyra excavations Inv. No. -=Tatar 2022, 596, n. 8

24. *Limyra excavations Inv. No. Li95/NU 605-4 (Castle hill, west wall tower)=Tatar 2022, 596, n. 9

25. *Limyra excavations Inv. No. Li88/NU 101 (Necropolis, inside the tomb, number 7) =Tatar 2022, 596, n. 10

Obv. Laureate Head of Zeus right

Rev. ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ. Eagle with spread wings standing left on thunderbolt, Λ? between legs, shield in left field, \sum above

Ref.: Cfr. Svoronos, n. 580 (Cyprus, 275 BC.); CPE, n. B175; Picard-Faucher 2012, n. 163

26. 26 mm. 16,30 gr. 12h

*Fethiye Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 3164=Ashton 2002, n. 13=Tatar 2022, 298, n. 127, Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ] ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ, trident punchmark in right field

27. 24 mm. 14.8 gr. 12h

*Nagidos Exc. Inv. No. 2001/495=Tekin 2007, 379, n. 160=Tatar 2022, 632, n. 5, Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field

28. *Limyra excavation Inv. No.: -=Tatar 2022, 596, n. 2

Obv. Laureate Head of Zeus right

Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ] ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ. Eagle with spread wings standing left on thunderbolt, P between legs, shield in left field, \sum above

Ref.: Svoronos, n. 593 (Cyprus, 269 BC.); CPE, n. B178

29. 27 mm. 15.81 gr. 12h

*Marmaris Mus. Inv. No. 2010/585⁴³=Tatar 2022, 697, n. 14, Rev. trident punchmark in right field

c. 275/274-260s BC.

AE Diobol

Obv. Laureate Head of Zeus right

Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ]. Eagle with spread wings standing left on thunderbolt, O or Θ between legs, shield in left field, \sum above

Ref.: Cfr. Svoronos, n. 568; 587 (Kıbrıs, MÖ. 271); CPE, n. B177; B195

30. 28 mm. 13,87 gr. 12h

*Fethiye Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 5301=Ashton 2002, n. 7=Tatar 2022, 300, n. 138, Rev. trident punchmark in right field

260s BC.

AE Diobol

Obv. Laureate Head of Zeus right

Rev. ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ. Eagle with

41 Purchased.

42 Purchased.

43 Confiscated.

spread wings standing left on thunderbolt, illegible letter/monogram between legs, shield in left field, Σ above, \times below

Ref.: Cfr. Svoronos, n. 557; 561; 581; 587; 589; 591 (Cyprus, c. 285-267 BC); CPE, n. B185; B187-B187A; B190; B192-B200A; Picard-Faucher 2012, Series 2, n. 150-169

31. 26 mm. 14 gr. 12h

*Fethiye Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 8866=Tatar 2022, 301, n. 141, Rev. trident punchmark in right field

32. 25 mm. - 12h

*Fethiye Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 5462=Tatar 2022, 301, n. 142, Rev. ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙ[ΟΥ] [ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field

33. 24 mm. 13,9 gr. -

*2011 Gagai Rescue Excavation, Etüt No. 874=Tatar 2022, 301, n. 143, Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field

Obv. Laureate Head of Zeus right

Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ] [Β]ΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ. Eagle with spread wings standing left on thunderbolt, illegible letter/monogram between legs, shield in left field, Σ above, \times below

Ref.: Cfr. Svoronos, n. 557; 561; 572; 577; 581; 587; 589; 594 (Cyprus, c. 285-267 BC.); CPE, n. B185; B187-B190; B192-B200A

34. 27 mm. 10.6 gr. 12h

*Bodrum Mus. of Underwater Arch. Inv. No. 1286⁴⁴=Konuk 2004, n. 23=Tatar 2022, 686, n. 29, Rev. trident punchmark in right field

Obv. Laureate Head of Zeus right

Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ] ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ. Eagle with spread wings standing left on thunderbolt, Δ between legs, shield in left field, Σ above, \times below

Ref.: Svoronos, n. 563 (Cyprus, 282 BC.); CPE, n. B187; Picard-Faucher 2012, Series 2

35. 27 mm. - -

*Aydın Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 7949⁴⁵=Tatar 2022, 665, n. 18, Rev. trident punchmark in the center

Obv. Laureate Head of Zeus right

Rev. ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ. Eagle with spread wings standing left on thunderbolt, Δ between legs, shield in left field, Σ above, \times below

Ref.: Svoronos, n. 581 (Cyprus, 275 BC.); CPE, n. B190; Picard-Faucher 2012, Series 2, n. 164-166

36. 29 mm. 18 gr. 12h

*Fethiye Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 5711=Ashton 2002, n. 14=Tatar 2022, 302, n. 151, Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ] ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ, trident punchmark in right field

37. 28 mm. 15.75 gr. 12h

*Alanya Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 2000⁴⁶=Tatar 2022, 785, n. 9, Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ] [ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field

38. 28 mm. - 12h

*Fethiye Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 7.4.66.55=Ashton 2002, n. 30=Tatar 2022, 302, n. 152, Rev. [ΠΙΤ] ΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ [ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field

39. 27 mm. 16,44 gr. 12h

*Patara 2009 (Tepecik Acropolis E-12) n. 509=Lenger – Dündar 2021, n. 34=Tatar 2022, 302, n. 153, Rev. [ΠΙΤ]ΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ [ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in the center

40. 27 mm. - -

*Aydın Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 14131⁴⁷=Tatar 2022, 666, n. 24, Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕ]ΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ, trident punchmark in right field

41. 25 mm. 12.81 gr. 12h

*Marmaris Mus. Inv. No. 2010/598⁴⁸=Tatar 2022, 699, n. 27, Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕ]ΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙ[ΛΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field

42. 27 mm. 14.26 gr. 12h

*Bodrum Mus. of Underwater Arch. Inv. No. 1389⁴⁹=Konuk 2004, n. 14=Tatar 2022, 685, n. 22, Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ] [ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field

43. 25 mm. 16.35 gr. 12h

*Marmaris Mus. Inv. No. 2010/599⁵⁰=Tatar 2022, 699, n. 26, Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ] ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ, trident punchmark in right field

46 Donated.

47 Purchased.

48 Confiscated.

49 Purchased.

50 Confiscated.

44 Purchased.

45 Purchased.

44. 26 mm. 15.64 gr. 12h

*Bodrum Mus. of Underwater Arch. Inv. No. 7540⁵¹=Konuk 2004, n. 16=Tatar 2022, 685, n. 23, Rev. ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ [ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field

45. 26 mm. 17.36 gr. 12h

*Marmaris Mus. Inv. No. 2010/603⁵²=Tatar 2022, 699, n. 25, Rev. ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ [ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field

Obv. Head of Alexander right in elephant headdress

Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ] [ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ]. Eagle with spread wings standing left on thunderbolt, Π between legs?, shield in left field, Σ above, Χ below?

Ref.: Cfr. CPE, n. B193

46. 26 mm. 17,12 gr. 12h

*Fethiye Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 40.4.66.88=Ashton 2002, n. 32=Tatar 2022, 304, n. 167, Rev. trident punchmark in right field

Obv. Laureate Head of Zeus right

Rev. ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ. Eagle with spread wings standing left on thunderbolt, Π between legs, shield in left field, Σ above, Χ below

Ref.: Svoronos, n. 589 (Cyprus, 270 BC.); CPE, n. B196; Picard-Faucher 2012, Series 2, n. 167

47. 29 mm. 17,89 gr. -

*Patará 2019 (Tepecik, H-17) Inv. No. 308=Lenger – Dündar 2021, n. 36=Tatar 2022, 301, n. 140, Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field

48. 26 mm. - -

*Aydın Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 9637⁵³=Tatar 2022, 668, n. 35, Rev. ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙ[ΟΥ] ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩ[Σ], trident punchmark in right field

49. 25.5 mm. - -

*Aydın Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 41002⁵⁴=Tatar 2022, 668, n. 37, Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜ]ΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛ[ΕΩΣ], trident punchmark in right field

Uncertain Mint 22, Probably on Cyprus

Probably Early 260s BC.

AE Diobol

Obv. Laureate Head of Zeus right

Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ] ΒΑΣΙ[ΛΕΩΣ]. Eagle with closed wings standing left on thunderbolt, ear of grain in left field, ΔΙ? above

Ref.: Cfr. Svoronos, n. 381; CPE, n. B317

50. 28 mm. 14,81 gr. -

*Patará 2019 (Tepecik i-18) Inv. No. 300=Lenger – Dündar 2021, n. 46=Tatar 2022, 311, n. 209, Rev. trident punchmark in right field

Alexandria

283-246 BC.

AE Diobol

Obv. Laureate Head of Zeus right

Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ] [ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ]. Eagle with spread wings standing left on thunderbolt, shield in left field?

51. 25 mm. 17,20 gr. 12h

*Fethiye Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 7.10.82.4104 (1981 Kaunos excavation)=Ashton 2002, n. 35=Tatar 2022, 331, n. 447, Rev. trident punchmark in right field

52. 25 mm. 12,73 gr. 12h

*Fethiye Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 1806=Ashton 2002, n. 36=Tatar 2022, 331, n. 448, Rev. trident punchmark in right field

Obv. Laureate Head of Zeus right

Rev. [ΠΙΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ]. Eagle with spread wings standing left on thunderbolt, shield in left field, Σ above

53. 26 mm. 16 gr. 12h

*Nagidos Exc. Inv. No. 2001/421=Tekin 2007, 380, n. 174=Tatar 2022, 634, n. 16, Rev. trident punchmark in right field

54. 27 mm. 15.8 gr. 12h

*Nagidos Exc. Inv. No. 1999/Na. 99.105. Müze Inv. No. 4.17.99=Tekin 2007, 380, n. 176=Tatar 2022, 634, n. 17, Rev. trident punchmark in right field

51 Purchased.

52 Confiscated.

53 Purchased.

54 Purchased.

Ptolemy I Soter or Ptolemy II Philadelphos**from 294 BC. – Early 260s BC.*****AE Diobol***

Obv. Laureate Head of Zeus right

Rev. Legend illegible. Eagle with spread wings standing left on thunderbolt

Ref.: Cfr. Svoronos, n. 235; 356; 363; 379; 382; 582; 602; CPE, n. B43; B110; B115; B117; B184; B191; B318

55. 26.5 mm 9.95 gr. 12h*Alanya Arch. Mus. Inv. No. 945⁵⁵=Tatar 2022, 790, n. 38, Rev. trident punchmark in right field**Ptolemy I Soter, Ptolemy II Philadelphos or Ptolemy III Euergetes*****AE Diobol***

Obv. Laureate Head of Zeus right

Rev. Legend illegible. Eagle with spread wings standing left on thunderbolt

56. 26.7 mm.-12h

*Kaunos Dal-304: KNS 06 Et. N. 5: (Lab 157, Stoa, in front of the Aprodite Euploia Sanctuary)=Tatar 2022, 584, n. 22, Rev. trident punchmark in right field

Probably Ptolemy II Philadelphos**Alexandria?**

Obv. Head of Alexander right in elephant headdress

Rev. Legend illegible. Eagle with spread wings standing left on thunderbolt, trident punchmark in left field

57. - - - Souther Caria Surface Survey, Konuk 2001, 78-79, n. 19=Tatar 2022, 644, n. 1**Ptolemy II Philadelphos?*****AE Diobol***

Obv. Laureate Head of Zeus right

Rev. [ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ]. Eagle with spread wings standing left on thunderbolt

58. 29 mm. 13.9 gr. -

*Nagidos Exc. Inv. No. 2000/317=Tekin 2007, 380, n. 178=Tatar 2022, 640, n. 53, Rev. trident punchmark in right field

59. 28 mm. 16 gr. 12h

*Nagidos Exc. Inv. No. 2001/516=Tekin 2007, 380, n. 175=Tatar 2022, 640, n. 51, Rev. trident punchmark in right field

60. 27 mm. 14.5 gr. 12h

*Nagidos Exc. Inv. No. 2000/179=Tekin 2007, 380, n. 177=Tatar 2022, 640, n. 52, Rev. trident punchmark in right field

61. 26 mm. 14.5 gr. 12h

*Nagidos Exc. Inv. No. 2000/170=Tekin 2007, 380, n. 180=Tatar 2022, 640, n. 51, Rev. trident punchmark in right field

62. 21 mm. 6.2 gr. 12h

*Nagidos Exc. Inv. No. 2001/531=Tekin 2007, 380, n. 181=Tatar 2022, 639, n. 49, Rev. trident punchmark in the center

Bibliography and Abbreviations

- Ashton 2002 Ashton, R. H. J., "The Ptolemaic Coins in Fethiye Museum", Numismatic Circular CX/1, 7-12.
- Ashton – Arslan – Dervişağaoğlu 1996 Ashton, R. H. J. – M. Arslan – A. Dervişağaoğlu, "A Ptolemaic hoard in Fethiye Museum", NC 156, 269-272.
- Bagnall 1976 Bagnall, R. S., The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions Outside Egypt, Leiden.
- Bodzek 2020 Bodzek, J., "Coin Finds", Paphos Agora Project (PAP), Vol. I (ed. E. Papuci-Wladyka), 377-400.
- Cavagna 2010 Cavagna, A., La crisi dello stato tolemaico tra inflazione e svalutazione del denaro, Milan.
- Cox 1959 Cox, D. H., Coins from the Excavations at Curium, 1932-1953. ANS NNM 145, New York.
- CPE Lorber, C. C., Coins of the Ptolemaic Empire, Part I, Vol. I-II, New York 2018.
- Davesne 1987 Davesne, A., "Une contremarque au trident sur certaines monnaies de Ptolémée II Philadelphe", BSFN 42/2, 145-149.
- Davesne 1994 Davesne, A., "Le trésor d'Aydıncık", Trésors et circulation monétaire en Anatolie antique (ed. M. Amandry – G. Le Rider), Paris, 37-43.
- Davesne 1998 A. Davesne, "Réflexions sur la valeur des bronzes des premiers Ptolémées", RN 153, 49-60.
- Davesne 1999 Davesne, A., "La deuxième guerre de Syrie (ca. 261-255 av. J.-C.) et les témoignages numismatiques", Travaux de numismatique offerts à Georges Le Rider (ed. M. Amandry – S. Hurter), London, 123-134.
- Davesne – Le Rider 1989 Davesne, A., G. Le Rider, *Gülner II. Le trésor de Meydancikkale (Cilicie Trachee, 1980) I-II*, Paris.
- Durugönül 2001 Durugönül, S., "Nagidos'un Tarihteki Yeri", Kilikia: Mekanlar ve Yerel Güçler (ed. A. M. Dinçol – E. Jean – S. Durugönül), Istanbul, 429-443.
- Durugönül 2007a Durugönül, S., "Coğrafi-Topografik Özellikler ve Tarihi Gelişim", Dağlık Kilikia'da Bir Antik Kent Kazısının Sonuçları: Nagidos (ed. S. Durugönül), Istanbul, 1-7.
- Durugönül 2007b Durugönül, S., "Mimari", Dağlık Kilikia'da Bir Antik Kent Kazısının Sonuçları: Nagidos (ed. S. Durugönül), Istanbul, 9-21.
- Dündar – Lenger 2022 Dündar, E. – D. S. Lenger, "A Ptolemaic Hoard from Patara", AJA 126/2, 201-217.
- Farhi 2016 Farhi, Y., Khirbet Qeiyafa, Vol. 5: Excavation report 2007-2013: the numismatic finds: coins and related objects, Jerusalem.
- Faucher 2013 Faucher, T., Frapper monnaie: La fabrication des monnaies de bronze à Alexandrie sous les Ptolémées, Alexandria.
- Fischer-Bovet 2014 Fischer-Bovet, C., Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt, Cambridge.

Fischer-Bovet – Lorber 2020

- Fischer-Bovet, C. – C. Lorber, “Getting paid in Ptolemaic Egypt in the second century BC”, *Money Rules! The Monetary Economy of Egypt, from Persians to the Beginning of Islam* (ed. T. Faucher – A. Suspene), *International Colloquium, Caire*, 171- 203.
- Forestier 2006 Forestier, J. B., *Les contremarques sur les monnaies grecques antiques: histoire d'un procédé monétaire*, (Unpublished PhD), Université Paris IV (Sorbonne), Paris.
- Grabowski 2020 Grabowski, T., “The Activity of Ptolemy II’s Fleet in the Aegean Sea”, *Electrum* 27, 131-148.
- Grainger 2010 Grainger, J. D., *The Syrian Wars*, Leiden-Boston.
- Hölbl 2001 Hölbl, G., *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, Oxon-New York.
- Huss 2001 Huss, W., *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit 332-30 v. Chr.*, Munich.
- Jenkins 1967 Jenkins, G. K., *The monetary systems in the early hellenistic time with the special regard to the economic policy of the Ptolemaic Kings, The patterns of monetary development in Phoenicia and Palestine in Antiquity* (A. Kindler), Jerusalem, 53-74.
- Konuk 2004 Konuk, K., “The Ptolemaic Coins in the Bodrum Underwater Archaeology Museum”, *The Salmakis Inscription and Hellenistic Halikarnassos* (ed. S. Isager – P. Pedersen), *Halicarnassian Studies*, vol. IV, Odense, 165-175.
- Le Rider 1969 Le Rider, G., “Monnaies trouvées a Mirgissa”, *RN* 11, 28- 35.
- Le Rider 1975 Le Rider, G., “Contremarques et surfrappes dans l’Antiquité grecque”, *Numismatique antique, Problèmes et méthodes* (eds. M. Dentzer – P. Gauthier – T. Hackens), *Actes du Colloque organisé à Nancy du 27 septembre au 2 octobre 1971, Louvain*, 27-56.
- Lenger – Dündar 2021 Lenger, D. S. – E. Dündar, “Attestation of a Ptolemaic Garrison in the Light of Coins: Tepecik Settlement at Patara, Lycia”, *AIIN* 67, 37-70.
- Lichocka 1997 Lichocka, B., “Une Contremarque au Trident sur des Monnaies de Ptolemee II”, *Wiadomosci Numizmatyczne*, R. XL, 1996, z. 1-2 (155-156), 9-17.
- Lorber 2005 Lorber, C. C., “The development of Ptolemaic bronze coinage in Egypt”, *L’exception égyptienne? Production et échanges monétaires en Egypte hellénistique et romaine* (eds. F. Duyrat – O. Picard), Caire, 135-157.
- Le Rider – Callatay 2006 Le Rider, G. – F. De Callatay, *Les Séleucides et les Ptolémées: L’héritage monétaire et financier d’Alexandre le Grand*, Paris.
- Ma 1999 Ma, J., *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford.
- Meadows 2012 Meadows, A., “Deditio in Fidem: The Ptolemaic Conquest of Asia Minor”, *Imperialism, Cultural Politics, and Polybius* (ed. C. Smith – L. M. Yarrow), Oxford-New York, 113-133.
- Meadows 2020 Meadows, A., “Weighing up the Coinage Reform of Ptolemy Philadelphus”, *Money Rules! The Monetary Economy of Egypt, from Persians until the beginning of Islam* (ed. T. Faucher), Caire, 89-103.
- Morkholm 2000 Morkholm, O., *Erken Hellenistic Çağ Sikkeleri: Büyük İskender’in tahta çıkışından Apameia Barışı’na kadar* (İ.Ö. 336- 188), Trns.: O. Tekin, İstanbul.
- Nicolaou 1990 Nicolaou, I., *Paphos, Vol II: The Coins from the House of Dionysos*, Nicosia.

- Noeske 1995 Noeske, H. C., "Gegenstempel auf ptolemäischen Bronzemünzen", *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 51, 195-206.
- Picard 1998 Picard, O., "Remarques sur la monnaie de bronze dans l'Égypte lagide", *Commerce et artisanat dans l'Alexandrie hellénistique et romaine: Actes du colloque d'Athènes* (ed. J. Y. Empereur), 11-12 décembre 1988, Athènes-Paris, 409-417.
- Picard – Faucher 2012 Picard, O. – T. Faucher, "Les monnaies lagides", *Les monnaies des fouilles du Centre d'Études Alexandrines: Les monnayages de bronze à Alexandrie de la conquête d'Alexandre à l'Égypte moderne* (ed. O. Picard, et al.), Alexandrie, 17-108.
- Psoma 2009 Psoma, S., "Τὰς Σιτάρχιας τῶν Μισθῶν ((ARIST.), OEC. 1351B) Bronze Currencies and Cash-allowances in Mainland Greece, Thrace and the Kingdom of Macedonia", *RBN* 155, 3-38.
- Schulze 2001 Schulze, W., "A 'trident' countermark from Cyprus on bronze coins of Ptolemy II Philadelphus", *Numismatic Circular*, December 2001, 363-365.
- Sellers 1993 Sellers, O. R., *The citadel of Beth-Zur: a preliminary report of the first excavation conducted by the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago, and the American School of Oriental Research, Jerusalem, in 1931 at Khirbat al Tubeiq, Philadelphia*.
- Seyrig 1966 Seyrig, H., *Antiquités Syriennes*, Vol. 6, Paris.
- Shahin 2005 Shahin, M., "A Ptolemaic Bronze and Silver Hoard from Kom Trouga", *L'exception égyptienne? Production et échanges monétaires en Égypte hellénistique et romaine: Actes du Colloque d'Alexandrie* (eds. F. Duyrat – O. Picard), 13-15 avril 2002, Caire, 91-116.
- Sidebotham 2005 Sidebotham, S. E., "III. The Numismatic Evidence", *ADAJ* 49, 432-435.
- Strootman 2020 Strootman, R., "The Ptolemaic Sea Empire", *Empires of the Sea: Maritime Power Networks in World History* (eds. R. Strootman – F. van den Eijnde – R. van Wijk), Leiden, 113-152.
- Svoronos 1904-1908 J. N. Svoronos, *Τὰ νομίσματα τοῦ κρατοῦς τῶν Πτολεμαίων*, Athens 1904-1908/*Ta Nomismata tou Kratous ton Ptolemaion* (Ptolemaic Coinage), Translated by C. Lorber.
- Şar 2010 Şar, E., *Kilikia'da Ptolemaioslar*, Istanbul University Unpublished PhD, Istanbul.
- Tatar 2022 Tatar, Ö., *Nümismatik veriler ışığında Lykia Bölgesi'nde Ptolemaios Egemenliği*, Akdeniz University Unpublished PhD, Antalya.
- Tekin 2007 Tekin, O., "Sikkeler", *Nagidos, Dağlık Kilikia'da Bir Antik Kent Kazısının Sonuçları* (ed. S. Durugönül), Istanbul, 193- 197.
- Van Driessche 1988 Van Driessche, V., "A propos du monnayage des Ptolémées au IIIe s. av. J.-C.", *RevArchHistArtLouvain* 21, 63-74.
- Von Reden 2001 Von Reden, S., "The politics of monetization in third-century BC Egypt", *Money and Its Uses in the Ancient Greek World* (ed. A. Meadows – K. Shipton), Oxford-New York, 65-76.
- Von Reden 2007 Von Reden, S., "The Ancient Economy and Ptolemaic Egypt", *Ancient Economies, Modern Methodologies: Archaeology, comparative history, models and institutions* (ed. P. F. Bang – M. Ikeguchi – H. G. Ziche), Bari, 161-177.
- Wolf 2013 Wolf, D., "A Metrological Survey of Ptolemaic Bronze Coins", *AJN* 25, 49-118.
- Wolf 2015 Wolf, D., "The Bronze Coinage Reform of Ptolemy II", *XV. International Numismatic Congress Taormina Proceedings*, Roma, 540-545.



Fig. 1 Bronze coin of Ptolemy II Philadelphos with a trident shaped punchmark on the reverse side (Fethiye Museum Inv. No. 5711=Ashton 2002, n. 14=Tatar 2022, n. 151.)



Fig. 2 Excavations where punchmarked bronze coins were found



Fig. 3 Museums where punchmarked bronze coins are recorded

	Diobol	Obol	Hemiobol
Former Weight System (c. 294-late 260s BC.)	28 mm. 16 gr.	22 mm. 8 gr.	16 mm. 4 gr.
New Weight System (c. late 260s BC.)	30 mm. 22 gr.	24 mm. 11 gr.	18 mm 5 gr.

Fig. 4 Bronze denominations after the reform of Ptolemy II and the denominations of the previous system

