ISSN 1301-7667

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

KAAM

YAYINLARI

OLBA

VII

(Özel Sayı)

MERSİN
2003

KAAM YAYINLARI
OLBA
VII
(Özel Sayı)

ISSN 1301-7667

OLBA dergisi hakemlidir ve Mayıs-Haziran aylarında olmak üzere,
yılda iki kez basılmaktadır.
Published each year in May and June.

OLBA'ya gönderilen makaleler aşağıdaki web adresinde yada KAAM tarafından dağıtılan
broşürlerde bildirilmiş olan formatlara uygun olduğu taktirde basılacaktır.
Articles should be written according the formats mentioned in the following web address
or brochures distributed by KAAM

Yayınlanması istenilen makalelerin, her yılın sonuna kadar aşağıda belirtilen
iletişim adreslerine teslim edilmiş olması gerekmektedir.
Articles should be sent to the following correspondence addresses till the end of the year.

OLBA'nın yeni sayılarında yayınlanması 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-MERSİN
TURKEY

Diğer İletişim Adresleri
Other Correspondance Addresses

Tel:00.90.324.361 00 01 (10 Lines)/162-163
Fax: 00.90.324.361 00 46
web mail: www.kaam.mersin.edu.tr
e-mail: kaam@mersin.edu.tr

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

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

(Özel Sayı)

MERSİN
2003

OLBA'nın Basılması İçin Vermiş Olduğu Desteklerden Dolayı
Mersin Üniversitesi Rektörü Prof. Dr. Uğur Oral'a
Teşekkür Ederiz.

Ege Yayınları 2003 - İSTANBUL

İçindekiler/Contents

DIVINITIES AND THEIR IMAGES. PHENOMENA OF ACCULTURATION IN SMOOTH CILICIA

(LEV. 31-34)

Marion MEYER*

ÖZET

Hellenistik döneme ait çoğu sikke motifi Yunan betimleme geleneğinde vardır.. Ancak bu, her zaman Yunan tanrılarının canlandırıldığı anlamına gelmez. Kendine ait ve yabancı geleneklerle ilişkisi tümüyle farklı olabilir. Tarsos sikkeleri üzerinde İ.Ö. 2. ve 1. yy'da iki yerel tanrı gösterilmiştir: Biri, Yunan tarzında tahtta oturan bir Büyük Tanrı ("Baal" ya da "Zeus"), diğeri Anadolu-Mezopotamya betimleme şemasında bir hayvan üzerinde daha doğrusu karışık bir yaratık üzerinde duran tanrıdır (Sandon). Mallos'un Athena Magarsia betimi için başına kadar çektiği uzun örtüsü ve gövdenin her iki yanında bükük kolları (?) ile frontal duruşlu bir figürün Anadolu betimleme şeması Yunan betimleme geleneği unsurları (ponderasyon, peplos, egis, ve Athena'nın miğferi) ile kombine edilmiştir. Aynı yerde tapınım gören Kubaba'nın Hellenistik dönem öncesi bir görünümü olan Hierapolis-Kastabala'nın tanrıçası Perasia, İ.Ö. 2. yy.'ın Yunan giysili figürü (orantı, yüksek kemer) olarak canlandırılmıştır.

İ.Ö. 2. yy.'da bir hanedanlık ismi ve Grek sikke motiflerine sahip olan Rhosos İ.Ö. 1. yy.'da tekrar eski ismini alır ve Suriyenin hava tanrısı Hadad'a denk gelen betimleme şemasında bir tanrıyı gösterir ("Baal").

The title I chose for my presentation might be somewhat too promising. What I have to offer is some information on a project that was planned and organized by R. Ziegler / University of Duisburg and myself and that was actually executed by a team of three colleagues. We chose the title "Divinities and Cults as Evidence for the Processes of Acculturation in Smooth Cilicia"; the span of time covered is the Hellenistic and Roman

* Prof. Dr. Marion Meyer, Akademisches Kunstmuseum und Archäologisches Institut der Universität Bonn, Am Hofgarten 21, D-53113 Bonn

period. The project was financed by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) from November 1999 to February 2002. It was part of a vast research program initiated by the DFG in 1998 under the title "Models and Routes of Acculturation in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea Area in Antiquity".

When I first read the announcement of this program I immediately thought of Cilicia. For the issue that interests me –the survival and transformation of traditional local divinities under the pressure of political and socio-cultural changes– Cilicia offers very interesting evidence. It is possible to study visual representations of divinities due to the substantial publication of at least one group of material with images (I mean coins), and it is possible to study some aspects of the religious practice and the names given to the divinities due to literary evidence and due to inscriptions that survived in this region in high numbers. Both kinds of sources don't match and seldom overlap. Coins are an official medium, minted in and for cities and commissioned by the authorities of the respective cities or the central government. Inscriptions can be of official character and they can refer to affairs of cities, but the bulk of the material was found in rural, rather remote areas of Cilicia and commissioned by private individuals. Both kinds of sources have to be considered in combination: Sometimes images can tell you more about a god or a goddess than names can. The images, however, would remain mute without the literary and epigraphical sources.

The nature of the evidence demanded the competence of several disciplines. The epigraphist Mustafa Sayar was the one to study the inscriptions, and he was also the one who had found most of them. The coins needed a historian with numismatic experience as well as an archaeologist skilled in iconographical analysis. The research job was organized as follows: The archaeologist Daniela Pohl studied the numismatic evidence of the Hellenistic period, the historian Kay Ehling dealt with the material of the Roman period, and the entire team, including R. Ziegler and myself, met regularly to discuss the drafts and controversial questions.

As to the definition of "acculturation" we adopted the one proposed by the American Social Science Research Committee in their "Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation" of 1936: "Acculturation comprehends those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having

different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original patterns of either or both groups"[1]. In our case, the different cultures are the Cilician one and the Greek one. By Cilician culture I mean all phenomena which are not Greek, and I am aware of the fact that this Cilician culture must be the result of preceeding processes of acculturation. The same, of course, holds true for the Greek culture. The groups whose behaviour we can study and the original patterns that might have changed are very limited due to the nature of our sources. The groups responsible for the design and the emission of the civic coins were the local authorities of the cities, and the groups responsible for the commission of the inscriptions were mostly private individuals. The change we can study or rather deduce from the evidence is the change of images and iconography and the change of names and preferences for gods and goddesses.

It is not customary to present the results of research done by somebody else, and I would not do so in front of any other audience. I do think, though, that at least the scope of our project should be known to the special friends of Cilicia even before the book is ready for distribution. I will not give a summary of the entire manuscript, but select some aspects. As my interests focus on the Hellenistic period I will mostly refer to the research and the results of Daniela Pohl who studied the images of Hellenistic times.

We know very little about the cults in Cilicia before the Hellenistic period. There is a large number of images of divine beings on coins issued by cities (since ca. 430 B.C.)[2], by military leaders in Achaemenid service (ca. 390 - ca. 370 B.C.)[3], and by the satrap of Cilicia, Mazaios (ca. 360-334 B.C.)[4]. In most cases the reason for the choice of the images and their possible relations to the pantheon of the respective city escapes us – with one exception. Coins minted in Tarsos under the command of Pharnabazos, Datames and Mazaios from the 70ies to the 30ies of the 4th

1 Redfield et al. 1936, p. 149ff.

2 Davesne 2000, p. 153ff.; Casabonne 2000a, p. 21ff.

3 Tiribazos, Pharnabazos and Datames/Tarkumuwa: Le Rider 1997, p. 152ff. pl. 1.2.

4 Le Rider 1997, p. 154.156.159ff. pl. 2; Briant 2000, p. 268f.; cf. note 5.

century B.C. show an enthroned male god whose scheme recalls the presentation of Greek father-gods; the Aramaic inscription calls him "Baal Tars", thus giving not only his name but also linking him to a particular city and indicating his importance for this city (fig. 1-3)[5].

In the times of Antiochos IV (175-164 B.C.) five cities in Eastern Cilicia started to mint municipal coins[6]. Tarsos had probably begun to do so somewhat earlier, more cities joined in later. In the 1st century B.C. twelve cities in the Pedias minted their own coins. Their reverse sides were the place for the presentation of the cities´ gods and goddesses. Most of them belong to the vast repertoire of figures that the Greek tradition had to offer: for example, Artemis on coins of Mopsos[7] or Zeus Nikephoros on coins of Adana[8]. The open question is: Do all Greek images show Greek gods and goddesses? Unfortunately the tradition of the divinities depicted can be revealed in only few cases. Let us have a look at one of them.

Of the three earliest coin types of Tarsos, one shows an enthroned male god whose superior position in the pantheon is indicated by the scepter he holds. This staff is crowned by a bird of stylized wings (fig. 5)[9]. We have no evidence for the name of this god, but we do have clues that he was not a newly adopted Greek god and that his relevance for Tarsos was not due to cultural change subsequent to contact with the Greek world.

The general scheme –a majestic enthroned male god– resembles the god labelled Baal Tars on coins minted in Tarsus in the 4th century, under Achaemenid rule (fig. 1-3; see note 5). A similar figure was to be seen on the Alexander tetradrachms, introduced in Macedonia and minted in the

---

5 Pharnabazos: SNG Levante 71-74; SNG France (2) 251-257; Le Rider 1997, p. 153 pl. 1,5; Casabonne 2000a, p. 34ff.63f. pl. 7,9; Lemaire 2000, p. 129ff. - Datames: SNG Levante 83-88; SNG France (2) 282-300; Le Rider 1997, p. 154 pl. 2,11-13; Lemaire 2000, p. 133f.; de Callatay 2000, p. 110 pl. 13,12-16. - Mazaios: SNG Levante 100-115; SNG France (2) 312-360; Le Rider 1997, p. 154f. pl. 2,14-17; Lemaire 2000, p. 134ff. pl. 16,3.4; Mildenberg 2000, p. 9f. pl. 1,12.

6 Meyer 2001, p. 505ff.515 fig. 1.

7 von Aulock 1963, p. 237f. no. 1.2 fig. 1,1-5; Houghton 1983, no. 503; SNG Levante 1302.

8 Levante 1984, p. 81ff. no. 1.2.25 pl. 17; Ziegler 1988, no. 838 pl. 45; SNG France (2) 1838. 1839.1841.

9 Earliest issues (as "Antiocheia on the Kydnos"): SNG Levante 913.914; Ziegler 1988, no. 620 pl. 31; SNG France (2) 1277.1278. - After the middle of the 2nd century B.C. (as "Tarsos"): SNG Levante 918-923 (920 = fig. 5); SNG France (2) 1285-1294.

whole empire (in Tarsos since 333 B.C.; fig. 4)[10]. The Baal Tars of the Achaemenid period and the god of the Alexander tetradrachms are obviously not the same divinity. The Baal Tars is the Lord of Tarsos, the superior god of the local pantheon; the god shown on the Alexander tetradrachms is the pan-Hellenic god Zeus depicted on the silver coins of Alexander in all his mints. Their similar appearance does, however, suggest a certain similarity of competence and rank.

When Tarsos started its municipal coinage in the early 2nd century, one of the motifs was another enthroned male god with a staff (fig. 5; see note 9). The question is: Does the majestic god on the municipal coins derive from the Alexander coins, or is he a revival of the local Baal? I am not asking whether the god depicted on the Hellenistic coins of Tarsos was called Zeus or Baal. As we do not know the ethnic diversity and the cultural backgrounds of the population of the Hellenistic city we cannot say anything about the name. I am talking of tradition or innovation as far as the cult and the image are concerned.

Zeus was not only the god of Alexander, he was also one of the dynastic gods of the Seleucids. There are examples for the adoption of a common image of royal coinage into civic coinage[11]. So we would like to know: is the god on the municipal coins of Tarsos a newcomer, an adoption of the pan-Hellenic Zeus, or is he the same old local god that had been depicted in the pre-Hellenistic period? The iconography links him to Greek images of Zeus; his competence and majesty is shown by the throne and the staff; he is stripped of any pictorial element that is not in line with the common representation of Zeus; he has neither the grapes nor the incense burner of Baal Tars (see fig. 1-3).

We have the following clues for an interpretation of the depicted god. The city started its municipal coinage with three coin types[12], and these same types, with only minor changes, were used throughout the Hellenistic period. Of these types, the two most common ones show

---

10 Price 1991, passim; Tarsos: p. 369ff. pl. 84-87.

11 Meyer 2001, p. 509 (Zeus Nikephoros); cf. the figure of a standing Zeus on the earliest municipal issues of six cities: Meyer 2001, p. 510.516 fig. 3.

12 See notes 9.14.16; - Meyer 2001, p. 508 n. 15; p. 516 fig. 2.

divinities on the reverse; either the enthroned god (fig. 5), or a figure type convincingly identified as the local god Sandan (fig. 7.). The fact that these images were constantly used, for a period of nearly two centuries, allows the conclusion that the gods depicted were of constant great importance for the city. The assumption of adherence to local traditions and local gods is supported by the following observation: Tarsos never minted municipal coins with a ruler's portrait – although there was a royal mint at Tarsos that did so, and the models would have been easily available. I cannot deal at greater length with another matter that points into the same direction: The recurring obverse image, the female head or bust with or without veil (fig. 5.7), cannot possibly be taken as the representation of an established goddess. The written sources of the Imperial period mention no female divinity besides Athena[13]. If there had been a goddess important enough to be shown on two of three Hellenistic coin types over a period of nearly 200 years she could hardly have escaped the attention of later writers. The female head must be the representation of the city itself and as such the counterpart of the king on royal coinage. He was depicted on the obverse, his name written on the reverse side (cf. fig. 9.10). On the municipal coins we read the name of the city in the form of the ethnic of its citizens, and the city itself appears on the obverse side. All these features combine to a pattern; apparently the local authorities were determined to point out the particular tradition of the city, making use of the traditional name and traditional divinities. This strongly favors an interpretation of the majestic god as the local Lord of Tarsos who was depicted in a contemporaneous figure type used for the superior Greek god. The image was a modern one, the god, however, was not a new one.

Later in the Hellenistic period, a new coin type introduced another image of the enthroned god: following the traditional iconography of Greek Zeus (cf. note 8), the majestic Tarsian god was depicted in the scheme of Zeus Nikephoros, being crowned by Nike (fig. 6)[14].

---

13 Dio Chrys. or. I, 33,45; Scheer 1993, p. 282ff.

14 SNG Levante 939.971-977; Ziegler 1988, no. 643-648 pl. 31; SNG France (2) 1354-1372 (1360 = fig. 6). The obverse side shows a club within an oak wreath. This had been the obverse motif of one of the three earliest coin types of Tarsos (reverse side: cornucopia), minted with dynastic and traditional name: SNG Levante 915.916.924; SNG France (2) 1279-1284. This coin type was apparently given up and replaced by the new one; thus, its introduction will not be earlier than the late 2nd century B.C. - The same Zeus Nikephoros appears on coins of the 1st century B.C. in combination with a representation of the city goddess: Meyer 1999, p.189f. pl. 39 fig. 5.

The second divinity depicted in full figure on Hellenistic coins of Tarsos was identified as Sandan mainly on the basis of coincidence: In imperial times Sandan is the only local, pre-Hellenic god mentioned in literary sources[15], and this is the only non-Greek figure type on Tarsian coins. It appears on coins of that city from the early 2nd century B.C. until imperial times (fig. 7.8)[16]. Sandan is a Luwian god with no iconographical tradition[17]. The figure type –a god standing on a monster– definitely betrays him as a non-Greek god.

So we learn that the divinities chosen by the local authorities as images of the Hellenistic coins were both pre-Hellenic, local gods. That is what they have in common. One of them, Sandan, had never been depicted on coins, and there is no undisputed representation of him in any other medium. The other one, the enthroned god, had already been depicted and labelled on coins of the pre-Hellenistic, Achaemenid period. Sandan at first glance reveals his non-Greek origin because the iconographical pattern of a god standing on an animal is rooted in Anatolian and Mesopotamian traditions. The second god appears in a figure type that completely blends in with the representation of pan-Hellenic Zeus.

We will never learn the actual reasons why the local authorities decided to use a contemporary, modern, Greek image along with a definite non-Greek one. But we can, I think, deduce that this choice was not due to the lack of an alternative –there had been older images of the god (fig. 1-3)– nor to the ambition of showing the same god as the Greek foundations did. The reason may have been the easy availability of contemporary images of Zeus that were considered suitable for the Tarsian god.

One may doubt the awareness for issues of tradition and innovation as far as coin types are concerned. Neither the ordinary Tarsian nor the Tarsians active in the local administration were archaeologists concerned

---

15 Amm. Marc. 14,8,3; Scheer 1993, p. 283f.296f.

16 Earliest issues (as “Antiocheia on the Kydnos”): SNG Levante 910-912; SNG France (2) 1270-1276. - Later issues (as “Tarsos”): SNG Levante 925 (= fig. 7) -932.963-970; Ziegler 1988, no. 624-629 pl. 31; SNG France (2) 1295-1306.1344-1353; SNG Levante Suppl. (1) 254. - Imperial times: SNG Levante 996 (= fig. 8).1010.1054.1076.1140; SNG France (2)1407-1409.1432.1522.1553. 1612.1707.1708.

17 Scheer 1993, p. 296f. and n. 171; Müller 2001, p. 38. - The iconography of Sandan was studied for our project by D. Pohl, forthcoming.

with iconography. There is, however, a very interesting reaction to the choice of the Tarsian coin types.

During the reign of Demetrios I (162-150 B.C.) the Seleucids began to adopt images of local divinities as reverse motifs of their silver coins (cf. note 19).The royal mint of Tarsos did so in the time of Alexander Balas (150-145 B.C.) – and it was Sandan that was chosen (fig. 9)[18]. I think that he was chosen not because he was the most important god but because it was his image that was specific for Tarsos. The enthroned god was not; on a Royal issue he might have been taken for a Seleucid god.

The Tarsian coins turned out to be good evidence for a process of acculturation. Tarsos held on to its traditional gods and presented only civic images throughout the Hellenistic period, including a non-Greek image that stuck out conspicuously (fig. 7.8). But even this city readily adopted a contemporary image of a powerful, dignified god for its own powerful, dignified god. This can be taken as a proof for the deep intrusion of Greek conventions into Cilician life at least in the cities. By the 2nd century B.C. (and maybe later) there was an awareness of the differences between Greek and non-Greek iconography, but Greek images had become so common that they were regarded as suitable visualizations of non-Greek contents, too.

The following example presents a third possibility for dealing with two different cultures.

The first non-Greek image ever to appear on any Seleucid coin was a female goddess on tetradrachms of Demetrios I (162-150 B.C.)[19]. The scheme of the figure recalls the one used for various Anatolian goddesses: upright standing position, arms outstretched to both sides, with a veil covering the entire back of the figure from head to soil (fig. 10.11). The arms are supposed to be bended forward as we know from related figures represented in the round, for example the Artemis Ephesia. Then there are various elements unknown to Anatolian tradition: the weight of the body

---

18 For drachms; Houghton 1983, no. 475; Houghton 1984, p. 97. - Later drachms: Houghton 1983, no. 479 (= fig. 9); no. 486.487.491.492.497.

19 Houghton 1983, no. 505; Houghton 1984, p. 91ff. no. 1 pl. 12 (= fig. 10). - Later issues: Houghton 1983, no. 507; Houghton 1984, p. 91ff. no. 2-26 pl. 12.13 (no. 14 = fig. 11).

is not equally balanced on both legs, but there is a differentiation between the straight right leg and the somewhat bent, free left leg. The figure wears a helmet and a Greek peplos; the veil appears as an aegis, the standard attribute of Greek Athena; the disk in front of the belly might very well be a gorgoneion.

I consider this image as a combination of an Anatolian scheme with certain Greek traits. This combination testifies the willingness to adopt elements of Greek iconography where it seemed suitable. These elements were integrated into a non-Greek iconographical tradition.

This goddess later appears on municipal coins of Mallos (fig. 12)[20] a city that in the times of Demetrios I had not yet minted coins. F. Imhoof-Blumer in 1883 identified her as Athena Magarsia for the simple reason that Mallos had an important cult for this goddess at least since the times of Alexander the Great who sacrificed to her[21]. Nowadays we have more evidence to support this identification.

Athena Magarsia is mentioned in two inscriptions. The older one was found in Karata, ancient Magarsos, the harbor of inland Mallos. Due to prosopographical reasons it can be dated to the middle of the 2nd century B.C.[22] It contains regulations for the settling of a dispute over territories between Mallos and its neigbor Tarsos (listed under its dynastic name). As the inscription was to be set up in the sanctuary of Athena Magarsia, it is a reasonable assumption that Karata, its findspot, was Magarsos. In a second inscription of the 1st century A.D. a citizen of Mallos is honored by the priests of Athena Magarsia[23].

The name of this goddess suggests an indigenous origin and certain similarities with Athena. Her sanctuary was situated at the harbor of Mallos. On municipal coins of Mallos we see the figure of a goddess whose appearance points to an indigenous origin with certain traits

---

20 SNG Levante 1263 (= fig. 12); Ziegler 1988, no. 895-897 pl. 47; SNG France (2) 1920.1921.

21 Imhoof-Blumer 1883, p. 114.125f.

22 Werner 1951, p. 325ff. pl. 32; SEG XII 511; SEG XIV 900; Robert 1951, p. 256ff.; Cohen 1995, p. 359f.362 note 4; Curty 1995, p. 207f.

23 Heberdey-Wilhelm 1896, p. 9 no. 21. - Information about this inscription was given by M.H. Sayar.

adopted from Greek Athena – most conspicuous, of course, the aegis and the helmet. I think it is a safe conclusion that the figure depicted on these and the Seleucid coins is Athena Magarsia.

Gods and goddesses with Greek names and local toponyms are a well known phenomenon in Asia Minor; the best known example is probably Artemis Ephesia. R. Fleischer studied this and similar divinities in his book on Artemis Ephesia and related goddesses[24]

This figure of Athena Magarsia appears with only minor variations on municipal coins of Mallos until imperial times[25.] It is very probable that it depicts a cult statue. This statue must have been created before the middle of the 2nd century B.C. (when it was represented on royal coins for the first time, see above note 19). The combination described is thus evidence for a process of acculturation that dates back at least to the beginning of the 2nd century B.C. if not to earlier times.

The image of Athena Magarsia is probably older than the images of the enthroned god and Sandan depicted on coins of Tarsos. It is not possible, however, to draw a straight line from images that combine both traditions (Greek and local) –as the Athena Magarsia does– to images that belong to either the Greek or the local tradition – as the Tarsian gods do. It is the actual use of an image that counts; the Athena Magarsia had her first appearance on coins after the Tarsian coins had given diverse examples for dealing with iconographical traditions. And there is even more diversity, as the next example will show.

Coins of Hierapolis-Kastabala that were minted during and after the reign of Antiochos IV show an enthroned goddess wearing a chiton and a cloak wrapped around the lower part of her body (fig. 13.14)[26] – the standard combination of clothes of Greek females. The proportions of the body are typical for figures created in the 2nd century B.C., which means

---

24 Fleischer 1973, passim.

25 SNG Levante 1265.1268.1269.1272.1276.1278.1280; SNG France (2) 1926; Ziegler 1988, no. 900-903.906 pl. 47.

26 Robert 1964, p. 68ff. no.7.8.10-13 pl. 22.23 fig.14-20.23-40 (pl. 23 fig. 31 = fig. 14); SNG Levante 1563-1565; SNG France (2) 2207-2209 (2208 = fig. 13); Meyer 2001, p. 510.517 fig. 10.

that this image probably was created as a coin motif and does not depict an older statue. The goddess holds a short staff in her hand. She could not be labelled on the basis of her undistinctive iconography. Without external evidence this goddess would remain anonymous.

As this figure is the only anthropomorphic reverse image of Hierapolis in Hellenistic times, it must represent the divinity whose sanctuary made Kastabala a "Holy City". Strabon calls her Artemis Perasia, two inscriptions of the Imperial period give her the name "Thea Perasia"[27].

There is older evidence for the cult of this goddess. One of the few Aramaic inscriptions of Achaemenid times informs us about the sacred territory of a goddess called Kubaba Piwassura in Kastabala[28]. The name Perasia is surely derived from this pre-Hellenistic name. The city adopted a Greek name as well: Hierapolis on the Pyramos. It appears on the coins of the time of Antiochos IV for the first time.

The name of the goddess was Hellenized. Her image was not; it was a Greek type apparently created for the specific purpose to serve as a coin motif. But why was this image chosen? Because there were no older ones? Because the coinage, the name of the city, the language was Greek?

There was a definite tendency in Hierapolis to be modern. The Cilician cities that had adopted new, dynastic names –Tarsos, Adana and Mopsos– dropped them after the middle of the 2nd century B.C. and returned to their original ones[29]. Hierapolis continued to present itself as Hierapolis, and it continued to add "on the Pyramos". The extension "on the Pyramos" is rather intriguing as the river flows at a distance of 8 km. In order to distinguish itself from other "Holy Cities" –for example, the one in Syria near Antioch– the name of the goddess would have been appropriate: "Holy City of Perasia". However, Kastabala adjusted to a general pattern of coinage in Seleucid Empire – the cities, especially the ones in Cilicia, used their geographical situation as a means of distinction. Kastabala fitted in.

---

27 Strab. 12,2,7 p. 537; Dupont-Sommer 1964, p. 33ff.

28 Dupont-Sommer 1964, p. 9ff.; Lemaire - Lozachmeur 1996, p. 104 no. 6.

29 von Aulock 1963, p. 233.239; Levante 1984, p. 81ff.; Meyer 2001, p. 506f.509.

The choice of a figure type designed according to the latest models can be seen as an attempt to point out that this goddess was up-to-date, that her cult was of current importance and not just a matter of tradition. The city might have seen the necessity to compete with sanctuaries in less remote areas.

The choice of this figure type is another indication of the wide acceptance and diffusion that Greek images had reached in Smooth Cilicia in the 2nd century, even when the divinities depicted were not Greek.

However, the intrusion of Greek pictorial elements into Cilician life was not a one way street as I want to demonstrate with one example. In the 2nd century B.C. the city of Rhosos for a very short time issued rare coins, and it did so under the name of "Seleukeia at the gulf of Issos" (as R. Ziegler recently showed). For its reverse side it chose current attributes of Greek gods – a thyrsos for Dionysos, ears of grain for a divinity of fertility[30].

When the city started its regular municipal coinage in the first century B.C. it had dropped the dynastic name. The reverse side of these later coins shows a non-Greek figure type: a stiffly standing man with outstretched arms, holding ears of grain and grapes, accompanied by two bulls (fig. 15)[31]. This figure type is known from representations of Syrian gods that were responsible for the weather and for fertility, may they be called Baal or Hadad (fig. 16)[32]. The local god of Rhosos holds ears of grain in his hand. In this competence as a divinity of fertility he is very probably the same divine being that had been alluded to with the ears of grain on the earlier coins (see note 30). So as we might have continuity as far as the cult is concerned, we do not have continuity as far as the "language" of the images is concerned.

---

30 Franke 1993, p. 183 pl. 14,5; Ziegler 2001, p. 95f. fig 1.2.

31 Levante 1985, p. 237ff. no. 1-25 pl. 42 (no. 1 = fig. 15); SNG Levante 1853-1856; SNG France (2) 2420.

32 Cf. Hadad of Damascus on Seleucid coins of the early 1st century B.C.: Houghton 1983, no. 864 (= fig. 16).

At this point I would like to stop and present the following results:

1) The majority of coin types of Hellenistic Cilicia show figure types of Greek tradition. That is: Greek iconography was widely accepted at least for the medium coin by the 2nd century B.C. This is a distinct phenomenon of acculturation.

2) On the other hand, the cases of the enthroned god on the coins of Tarsos (fig. 5) and the Perasia on coins of Kastabala (fig. 13.14) warn us: The images of both divinities are purely Greek. However, in both cases the meagre pre-Hellenistic evidence suggests that they are local, pre-Hellenic gods in Hellenistic figure types, that is: a traditional divinity in a modern image. So we learn: We must not take the Greek images as evidence for Greek contents. Some of the images of other cities might as well show indigenous gods or goddesses in Greek disguise, so to speak – not recognizable for us because we only have the images and not the original context. Not all of the divinities that look perfectly Greek have to be Greek gods or goddesses.

3) There are some, if few, examples of non-Greek figure types in Hellenistic times (fig. 7.9.15). The adoption of Greek images was not quite as comprehensive as the adoption of the Greek language – there are no non-Greek inscriptions in Cilicia in the Hellenistic period. But this might be somewhat deceptive. From the use of the Greek language for coins and inscriptions we must not deduce that Luwian was not spoken any more. Likewise from the use of Greek images and iconography we must not deduce that every such image shows a newly adopted god.

4) The phenomena of acculturation are diverse: The Hellenistic foundations depicted Greek gods; in the traditional Cilician towns there is a wide adoption of purely Greek images, sometimes for definitely traditional gods (as Perasia, fig. 13.14); there is at least one example for the combination of traditional and Greek iconography (Athena Magarsia, fig. 10-12), and there is an example for insistence on non-Greek traditions (Sandan, fig. 7-9).

5) Furthermore, we see that there is no gradually proceeding acculturation towards a continuous adoption of Greek names or images. Rhosos designed a non Greek image for its god in the 1st century B.C. (fig. 15), Tarsos insisted on its non-Greek image of Sandan (fig. 7).

Abbreviations and Bibliography

von Aulock 1963	von Aulock, H., "Die Münzprägung der kilikischen Stadt Mopsos", Archäologischer Anzeiger 1963, p. 231-276
Briant 2000	Briant, P., "Numismatique, frappes monétaires et histoire en Asie Mineure achéménide", in: Casabonne 2000, p. 265-274
de Callatay 2000	de Callatay, F., "Les monnayages ciliciens du premier quart du IVe s. av. J.-C.", in: Casabonne 2000, p. 93-127
Casabonne 2000	Casabonne, O. (ed.), Mecanismes et innovations monétaires dans l`Anatolie achéménide, Istanbul
Casabonne 2000a	Casabonne, O., "Conquête perse et phénomène monétaire: l´exemple cilicien", in: Casabonne 2000, p. 21-91
Cohen 1995	Cohen, G.M., The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor, Berkeley - Los Angeles
Curty 1995	Curty, O., Les parentés légendaires entre cités grecques, Genf
Davesne 2000	Davesne, A., "Remarques sur le développement des monnaies divisionnaires d`argent en Cilicie", in: Casabonne 2000, p. 153-158
Dupont-Sommer 1964	Dupont-Sommer, A., "Une inscription araméenne et la Déesse Kubaba", in: Robert 1964, p. 7-15
Fleischer 1973	Fleischer, R., Artemis von Ephesos und verwandte Kultstatuen aus Anatolien und Syrien, Leiden
Franke 1993	Franke, P.R., "Aufgaben und Möglichkeiten der antiken Numismatik zur Erforschung des antiken Kleinasiens", in: G. Dobesch - G. Rehrenböck (eds.), Hundert Jahre Kleinasiatische Kommission der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien 1993, p. 177-188
Heberdey – Wilhelm 1896	Heberdey R. – Wilhelm A., Reisen in Kilikien, Wien
Houghton 1983	Houghton, A., Coins of the Seleucid Empire from the Collection of Arthur Houghton, New York
Houghton 1984	Houghton, A., "The Seleucid Mint of Mallus and the Cult Figure of Athena Magarsia", in: A. Houghton ed al. (eds.), Festschrift für Leo Mildenberg, p. 91-110
Imhoof-Blumer 1883	Imhoof-Blumer, F., "Mallos, Mégarsos, Antioche du Pyramos", Annuaire de numismatique 7, 1883, p. 89-127
Lemaire – Lozachmeur 1996	Lemaire A. – Lozachmeur H., "Remarques sur le multilinguisme en Asie Mineure à l`époque perse", in: Briquel-Chatonnet, F. (ed.), Mosaique de langues, mosaique culturelle. Le bilinguisme dans le Proche-Orient ancien, Paris 1996, p. 91-123

Lemaire 2000	Lemaire, A., "Remarques sur certaines légendes monétaires ciliciennes (Ve - IVe s. av. J.-C.)", in: Casabonne 2000, p. 129-141
Le Rider 1997	Le Rider, G., "Le monnayage perse en Cilicie au IV^{e} siècle", Numismatica e antichità classiche 26, 1997, p. 151-169
Levante 1984	Levante, E., "Coinage of Adana in Cilicia", The Numismatic Chronicle 144, 1984, p. 81-94
Levante 1985	Levante, E., "The Coinage of Rhosus", The Numismatic Chronicle 145, 1985, p. 237-245
Meyer 1999	Meyer, M., "Die sog. Tyche von Antiocheia als Münzmotiv in Kilikien", in: Durugönül, S. - Durukan, M. (eds), Olba II,1 (1999), p. 185-194
Meyer 2001	Meyer M., "Cilicia as Part of the Seleucid Empire. The Beginning of Municipal Coinage", in: Jean, E.- Dinçol, A.M.- Durugönül, S. (eds.), La Cilicie: Espaces et pouvoirs locaux. Actes de la Table ronde international d`Istanbul, 2-5 novembre 1999. Varia Anatolica XIII, Istanbul 2001, p. 505-518
Mildenberg 2000	Mildenberg, L., "On the So-Called Satrapal Coinage", in: Casabonne 2000, p. 9-20
Müller 2001	Müller, H.-P., in: Der Neue Pauly 11, Stuttgart - Weimar 2001, p. 38 s.v. Sandon
Price 1991	Price, M.J., The Coinage in the Name of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaeus I, Zürich - London
Redfield et al. 1936	Redfield R. – Linton R. – Herskovits M.J., "Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation", American Anthropologist 38, 1936, p. 149-152
Robert 1951	Robert, L., "Contribution à la topographie de villes de l`Asie Mineure méridionale", in: Comptes Rendus de l`Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres 1951, p. 254-259
Robert 1964	Robert, L., La Déesse de Hiérapolis Castabala (Cilicie), Paris.
Scheer 1993	Scheer, T., Mythische Vorväter, München
SNG France (2)	Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. France 2. Cabinet des médailles: Cilicie, Paris - Zürich 1993
SNG Levante	Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. Switzerland I. Levante - Cilicia, Bern 1986
SNG Levante Suppl. (1)	Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. Switzerland I. Levante - Cilicia. Supplement 1, Zürich 1993

Werner 1951 — Werner, S. and R., “Eine griechische Inschrift aus Karataş”, Jahrbuch für kleinasiatische Forschung 1, 1950/51, p. 325-327

Ziegler 1988 — Ziegler, R., Münzen Kilikiens aus kleineren deutschen Sammlungen, München

Ziegler 2001 — Ziegler, R., “Seleukeia am Golf von Issos”, Epigraphica Anatolica 33, 2001, p. 95-103

Fig. 1 AR (stater)
Datames/Tarkumuwa, Tarsos

Fig. 2 AR (stater)
Mazaios, Tarsos

Fig. 3 AR (stater)
Mazaios, Tarsos

Fig. 4 AR (tetradrachm)
Alexander, Tarsos

LEVHA 32

Fig. 5 AE Tarsos

Fig. 6 AE Tarsos

Fig. 7 AE Tarsos

Fig. 8 AR (tetradrachm) Tarsos

Fig. 9 AR (drachm) Antiochos VII

Fig. 10 AR (tetradrachm) Demetrios I

Fig. 11 AR (tetradrachm) Antiochos VII

Fig. 12 AE Mallos

LEVHA 34

Fig. 13 AE Hierapolis-Kastabala

Fig. 14 AE Hierapolis-Kastabala

Fig. 15 AE Rhosos

Fig. 16 AR (tetradrachm) Antiochos XII