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Symbola in Classical Athens: Politics, Communities, Contexts

Edited by Mairi Gkikaki, University of Warwick

Introduction, by Mairi Gkikaki, University of Warwick

1. Scope of the volume and structure

Tokens in Classical Athens: Politics, Communities, Contexts presents thirteen papers of a two-day workshop, held at the British School at Athens on 16th-17th December 2019.

The workshop and the proceedings publication form part of the ‘Tokens and their Cultural Biography in Athens from the Classical Age to the End of Antiquity Project’, a Marie Skłodowska-Curie action, which has received funding under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 794080-2 and carried out at the University of Warwick (2018-2021). Additional funding was covered by the Institutional Research Support Fund of the University of Warwick. The project was hosted by the Department of Classics, which takes pride in a long-standing and continuous tradition not only in the study of Numismatics, but more particularly in the study of tokens after the successful completion of the five-year project ‘Token Communities in the Ancient Mediterranean’ (2016-2021).

The present volume does not stand in isolation. Rather, it should be seen against the backdrop of two recent volumes, both dedicated to tokens: Tokens. Culture, Connections, Communities (London: Royal Numismatic Society Special Publication no. 57, 2019) and Tokens, Value and Identity. Exploring Monetiform Objects in Antiquity and the Middle Ages (Bruxelles: Centre d’Études Numismatiques 2021).

In its own right, the volume has a lot to recommend it. It fits neatly into a gap of modern scholarship: no systematic discussion of the material has previously been undertaken, although tokens have been found by the hundreds in Athens and are catalogued in nineteenth century publications (see below). Athenian tokens were signalled as a special category in Numismatics from an early date, and they were arranged in carefully considered categories: the small bronze tokens with diameters not larger than 8mm cm and with designs or letters on both faces or a letter on one and a design on the other, the bronze jurors’ tokens with letters on at least one face, the lead tokens with their remarkable variety of types, the clay ‘military’ tokens inscribed with names, as well as the clay coin-shaped specimens. This categorisation was the result of successive publications by eminent scholars through the decades: Achilleus Postolakas (1880 and 1884) on the small bronze tokens, Achilleus Postolakas, (1866 and 1868), Arthur Engel (1884), J.N. Svoronos (1900) and Margaret Crosby (1964) on the lead ones, J.N. Svoronos (1898) and Alan L. Boegehold (1960 and 1995) on the bronze jurors’ tokens, Crosby again (1964) on the clay ones, and the J.H. Kroll’s and F.W. Mitchel’s work on the ‘military’ tokens (1980). Nevertheless, discussion on these objects has fallen short over the last century and a half. This happened partly because, from the beginning, tokens caused a certain degree of perplexity, and partly because lead and clay tokens with a find context and in volume size enough to reach conclusions were presented for the first time as late as 1964.¹

Part one of the edited volume uses case studies as a starting point to consider the contribution of tokens to our understanding of social life, politics, and public administration in Athens. Research is here supplemented by the examination of literary sources as well as other relevant material. Part two focuses on three major finds which attempt to revolutionise our knowledge on the functions

¹ Margaret Crosby’s publication as part II of The Athenian Agora Excavations Vol. X.
of tokens. Two studies on iconography provide an outlook on Athenian tokens in the aftermath of the Classical Period and are presented in part three. Part four, with studies centred around Hellenistic Sicily, Early Roman Judaea, and Roman Imperial Ephesos, engages with the question of function, this time from a comparative perspective.

As a response to the above signalled perplexity, the aim of this volume is to delineate a work frame for Athenian tokens. While the main geographic focus is Athens, the volume aspires to place tokens in an international context. On one hand, the archaeological record proves that from the Archaic and Classical periods and continuing into the Roman Period, people across the Mediterranean resorted to tokens as a medium of registering pacts of hospitality and friendship. In the public domain Athens seems to be the only state which issued tokens for authorising participation to the Jury Courts and the Assembly, for public payment and distribution of commodities, and for access to festivals. Was Athens the paradigm that was later followed by other metropolis of the Mediterranean, or should the tokens of Sicily, Ephesos, and Judaea (cases discussed in this volume) be attributed to other circumstances and unique to their specific contexts?

Another concern is the establishment of a methodology for the study of tokens. For the tribal tokens Daria Russo employs procedures acknowledged in numismatics. The relationship of a token to a tribe can be established thanks to a legend with the name of the group or its eponymous hero, an explicit device, or both. Yoav Farhi works on the find context and the possible functions of the objects from the Temple Mount in Jerusalem. Martin Schäfer departs from the thorough study of iconography and the quest for prototypes, in order to put forward a hypothesis on the roles Hellenistic tokens depicting Nike could have played in Hellenistic Athens.

[INSERT FIG1 HERE]

In every case, study involves firsthand examination of the tokens concerned, archival research, and a survey of existing literature. Indeed, for the purposes of the volume pieces, which were otherwise abandoned to obscurity were spotted and studied anew. A particular highlight of the present volume is the CHSYPETAIΩΝ (ΧΣΥΠΕΤΑΙΩΝ) token which has not been viewed since the 1870s and is here discussed by James Kierstead after a fresh examination by the editor of this volume (fig. 1).² The examination confirmed that the token had once also been inscribed on side B, along the irregular cutting. The extant traces of lettering do not permit a positive reconstruction, but it can be reasonably assumed that it bore the name of the tribe to which the deme of Xypetē belonged. These jigsaw clay tokens were used for the allotment of offices to the demes. A total of five hundred tokens were at use, fifty per tribe, which were shared proportionally among the demes, analogous to each deme’s representation in the Council (the so-called bouleutic quota), which in turn derived from the deme’s size and population.

In the individual papers each token type is noted and recorded according to the universally acknowledged numismatic criteria: date (where known), types on each face (obverse/reverse), material, diameter, shape, weight, method of manufacture (where known), region and city of issue. They are accompanied by images and individual specimens of the type (including excavation contexts) noted. Auction catalogues were also consulted, using online databases (Coinarchives.com). Particular attention is given to tokens with known provenance (excavation context and find spot). The tokens found in and around the building complex of the Council

---

² First published by Koumanoudes (1879) with drawing. Finglass in this volume; Kierstead in this volume.
House they present a vivid example of this methodological approach. The types from the Council have a peculiar iconography which can be identified as state iconography, they bear distinctive legends (Δ-Η and Π-Ε) and in total they are very different than all other tokens found in the rest of the Agora Square. The only ‘triobol token’ of the Athenian Agora comes from the area of the Council House (Gkikaki).

The majority of the Athenian tokens preserved today comes from Museum Collections with no information on their provenance. Inevitably, our research focuses on the objects as such. Departing from the notion that each specimen is unique and that its materiality (material, manufacture, iconography, pierced or not, comparison of the same features to other tokens of the same type) preserves information on the function that it had once fulfilled, the authors interpret tokens in the frame of Athenian politics, administration, and every-day life (Russo). Ready-made categorisations in terms of distinguishing between public/state and private issues have to be avoided, because the socio-political contexts from which these tokens derived were invariably more complex.

2. Defining tokens by purpose/function

Defining tokens constitutes a methodological/interpretive challenge, as was acknowledged in the first conference proceedings publication on tokens.3 On a fundamental level, tokens can be more or less abstract, but retain a high degree of ambiguity. The term symbolon ostensibly refers to something incomplete; it had been complete at the moment of its inception however and seeks to be restored to unity of purpose. The term symbolon means something incomplete which upon its inception had once been complete and it now tends to potentially completeness.4 Aristotle thankfully brings us closer to the scholarly discussion of the fifth century BCE and Empedokles’ theory on the issue of genesis, the mechanisms which lead to the generation of new organisms. Here, according to the most satisfactory explanation, each parent contributes only a half complement of seeds or parts.

A quick review of the content of this volume demonstrates that tokens have a great variety. In terms of materiality they can be classified in the four categories described above. Based on their materiality again they can also be separated in two distinct categories: The ‘divided tokens,’ comprised of two joining halves, and the ‘simple’ or individual tokens.5 The first category is clearly attested in the literary sources, without these ever giving explicit evidence of the material they were made of (Finglass). A certain variety evidently existed, and even knucklebones were attested for that purpose (fig. 2).6 The clay tablets inscribed with the names of Athenian demes and tribes and cut along a jig-saw line so that each half can be joined only with its other corresponding part belong to this first category (Kierstead). On the other hand, the single tokens, often coin-shaped, are well attested among the material record of the Democracy in Classical Athens. They are made either of

3 Crisà, Gkikaki, and Rowan 2019, 2–4.
5 Usually tokens refer to a simple, individual token that people would recognize, and this acknowledgement is based on their possession of the ‘matching half.
bronze, clay, or lead and they are stamped on one or both sides with designs, following a technique which resembles coin production. Both categories stand under the umbrella-term ‘tokens’, although the two categories are dramatically disparate when it comes to appearance, material, and technique or production.

Therefore, a new methodological/interpretive parameter deserves our attention in the effort to better define tokens: purpose and function. First and foremost, tokens serve the purpose of identification. The symbola of the Archaic narrations were divided in two such that the bearers of each half could acknowledge a relationship with the bearer of the other, even if the bearers were not personally unacquainted. The dialogue between Agorastocles and Hanno in Plautus’ Poenulus demonstrates their use in ‘hospitality agreements’ (Finglass). The word *xeinos* (stranger who becomes friend after hospitality, ξεῖνος) was highly relevant to the use of the term *symbolon* (σύμβολον) in Herodotus, Sophocles, and Euripides (Finglass).

Tokens were means for confirming identity and by that they were employed in both private and public contexts. The military tokens of late Classical and Hellenistic Athens demonstrate their use as a means of identifying distinguishing one bearer from another in a public, official context, where misunderstandings could not be permitted (fig. 3 and 4). And it is because of this function that tokens entered the realm of public performances where citizen were not personally acquainted. They helped identify their bearer as the person authorized for a certain performance. Jurymen were identified by tokens, and by this same token were authorised to enter the court and take their seats. By the means of another token, the same jurymen were entitled to payment. Tokens sanction procedures, which assigned roles to persons. This may be considered as the second function for tokens. The split tokens shared between the two concluding parties in the story of the Milesian Glaucos, just like the tokens made by the Boule for the King of the Sidonians, served the immediate identification of their bearer (Gkikaki).

This volume offers a fresh approach to the military identification tokens, which were first presented by J.H. Kroll and F.W. Mitchel in 1980. After a fruitful exchange of ideas between Patrick Finglass, John H. Kroll, and Mairi Gkikaki, it has been established that the tokens inscribed with the name of the *peripolarchos* (the commander of the borders), Xenokles of the deme Perithoidai, were in fact split (fig. 3). One part was given out to the carrier, safeguarding his safe passage and confirming his identity upon arrival. One of the two tokens excavated in the Athenian Agora shows clear signs of having been attached to something – likely a message or an object. In that case, the token guaranteed that what was consigned had not been tampered with. The Kleinias Decree describes such a function for the tokens which were prepared for the allies of the Athenian League. With these tokens, the allies had to seal the writing tablet on which the sum of the tribute is recorded (Gkikaki). Therefore, symbola were issued and employed with the express intention of preventing deceitful action. This is their third function.

[INSERT FIG4 HERE]

Not all military tokens were split. The tokens for Pheidon from the deme of Thria, who was *hipparchos* (cavalry commander) for Lemnos (twenty-five specimens survive), for Nikoteles, the General on Samos, and the *hipparchos* Antidoros from the deme of Thria (fig. 4) were coin-like, and they were not split. Nevertheless, the carrier should have been identified and the identification was likely made against a record kept by the authority. Therefore, the carrier’s half piece of

---

7 Kroll and Mitchel 1980.
information is compared to the authority’s other half, to see if it ‘fits’. The same practice applies for the tokens for the Assembly. The Convenors of the People (syllogis tou demon), three from each tribe, would have checked the credentials/civic identity of the citizens arriving at the entrance to the Assembly against records kept by the city or their own knowledge of the tribesmen.

With this main function for confirming identity on one hand and with the ambiguity between incomplete and complete on the other as starting points, the split tokens with the names of demes and tribes enabled apportionment procedures and random distributions (Kierstead). The lead tokens with the simple yet elusive inscriptions of tribal names were probably used for such random distributions or lotteries, an assumption which cannot be proved. Great distance separates the split clay tokens of the fifth century BCE and the lead, coin like tokens of the late Classical and Hellenistic periods. The missing links in the chain cannot be readily identified among the material of the Athenian Agora.

Tokens are related to narratives and practices of agreement, pact, accordance and friendship. This accordance is sealed by tokens and concluding parties used tokens to sanction agreements. Accordance and agreements are evident in the narratives of friendship and hospitality on tokens inscribed in Celtiberian, Carthaginian, and Etruscan and coming from the western Mediterranean (Finglass). Accordance on the level of the state and its internal affairs is no less evidenced by the ‘jigsaw’ clay tokens from the Athenian Agora. They indicate that an agreement had been reached stipulating a certain balance of power having been reached between the influence exercised by the demes (the pre-existing ‘population and geographic entities’ of the Athenian state) on the one hand, and the ten tribes (newly founded, larger and overarching ‘populations and geographic entities) on the other (Kierstead).

It cannot escape our attention that Sophocles in Oedipus Rex closely associates symbola with the term xéinos on one hand and the term citizen on the other (Finglass). This interplay alerts us once more to the connections of the symbola, in both the private and the public sphere simultaneously. Oedipus considers himself to be a stranger who possesses some symbolon which sanctions his efforts to investigate the past, for only later did he become a citizen. But in fact things are very different: Oedipus possesses a symbolon which makes him a citizen by birth. He had always been citizen of Thebes. But what is the role of symbola? – Their role is precisely to connect people who were strangers by means of friendship and hospitality, and to authorise a citizen in participating along with his fellow citizens in the government and administration.

3. Tokens in the Aftermath of the Classical period.

In Athens during the Hellenistic and Roman Imperial periods, tokens demonstrably borrow coin imagery. This relationship is not limited to only Athenian coin types, but it is also evidenced in coin types of other city states during the Hellenistic period and Roman coin types. It should be stated from the beginning that such tokens are not imitations of coins in lead, as can be judged by the manufacture of the design and overall appearance (fig. 5).

In the next paragraphs we will attempt to discuss the question as to whether the ‘pseudo-coin’ appearance of tokens was the result of a meaningful process, and whether the tokens acted as a model for coins rather than tokens borrowing from coins.
From the beginning, tokens were identified as a distinct category, and special care was taken to distinguish them from coins. For the bronze jurors’ tokens – considered to be the earliest category (certainty antedating the lead and probably the clay specimens) – particular care was taken to craft the head of Athena in such a way that it should not be misunderstood as a coin. The goddess sports a distinctive helmet type and she is turned to the left, while the established coin type in the Athenian history was to have her turned to the right (fig. 6).

Tokens and coins derive their iconography from a common source. During the Hellenistic period, the owl in various postures and Panathenaic amphora were the types which are commonly found shared by tokens and coins. This shared imagery formed part of the repertory of state images used on a variety of media: tokens, coins, weights and measures, seals and others.8

Tokens with ‘coin iconography’ are easily understood as ones of state/official purpose. Among them, types inspired from the Myths of Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries (kernos, ear of wheat and poppyhead, Tripotlemos in serpent car, mystic ring) stand prominently. This should not surprise us much because such types belong to the state repertoire of images par excellence. Nevertheless, future research will demonstrate their significance. This volume also contains an addition to the already known ‘Eleusian’ token types: the piglet-on-staff type. This refers to the participation rites of the Eleusian Mysteries, and is found on a lead token, paired with iconography relating to the Hippothontis tribe’s foundation myth (Russo). While there is an obvious connection between the Hippothontis tribe and Eleusis (Eleusis belonged to the territory of the Hippothontis tribe), there is more to investigate relating to the function of this token: was it used for a religious/festival purpose? Were the issuers related in any way to the festival and the faire?9

It is not always possible to examine the issue of chronology for the iconography of these two distinct categories – coins and tokens – on account of the lacunose evidence. A systematic survey will probably prove that some designs make early appearances on tokens before becoming common types of Hellenistic coin issues. This is yet another piece of evidence for the role this object category played in the administration and the government. The kernos offers a vivid example. In the filling of Pnyx III, where reconstruction began ca. 346-22 BCE, the token with the lidded kernos on fig. 7 proves that the type can antedate 346 BCE and that therefore the design of kernos appears makes a very early appearance on tokens. This is earlier than the earliest appearance of kernos on bronze coins dated to the early and mid-330s BCE.10

In the Roman period, tokens copy coinage, including both Athenian and Roman Imperial coinage. The Alexander type borrows from numismatic iconography of contemporary Asia Minor and this choice of subject may be due to the fabulous destiny of that man who was particularly admired in the Roman period. In particular, for Roman Athens the civic elite took pride in a lineage ascending back to Alexander the Great (Mondello). The find spots of the ‘Alexander tokens’ reveal the interplay between the public and private spheres. The majority of the specimens were found in the

---
8 Gkikaki 2020, 103–09.
9 Russo in this volume, type H2, presented by just one specimen kept in the Numismatic Museum, Athens. It was known to Svoronos but was misinterpreted.
10 Kroll 1993, 41 no. 39 (Symbol on the reverse of the bronze issue 39)
Stoa of Attalos, which at that time housed the offices of the Sacred Gerousia. A few were also found in what seems to be a Roman House, but this could equally have been the meeting place of a club.

4. Tokens and value

That the tokens ever functioned as coins in the city of Athens is still open to debate and seems to be fueled at times by new finds. Athenian economy and society was highly monetized, and even the smallest denominations were in circulation in the Agora to conduct everyday transactions. In the late fifth century BCE, at the end of the devastating Peloponnesian War, the Athenians commented scornfully on the ‘cunning bronzes’ the *sibaerata*, which were state issued, probably on credit, to be later exchanged with silver ones of normal weight. But around that time – in the last decade of the fifth century BCE – the Athenians permitted the use of bronze for issuing jurors’ tokens. This earliest series features Athena head left with helmet with cheek coverings bound beneath the chin. It is of solid workmanship with diameters up to 25mm, hammered flans, and clearly defined incuses on the reverse (fig. 6).

The Athenians were notoriously reluctant towards fiduciary coinage and only as late as in the 340s BCE did they concede to coining bronze for the small denominations. Obviously, it was this change that brought about the beginning of use of lead for tokens. Lead was cheaper, could be effortlessly procured, and could be easily recycled because of its low melting point.

The discovery of tokens from the Agora of Koile is one such find that re-opens the question of tokens functioning as money. The excavator thinks that this is a mixed hoard of coins and tokens and that they form the humble gains of a prostitute. The tokens in the hoard may be regarded as an index not for money, but of small coins (Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou). It is precisely the tokens’ connection to value which should be further explored and can potentially offer valuable conclusions to the question of whether tokens did ever function as money in some capacity.

[INSERT FIG8 HERE]

In order to properly discuss this, there are two finds which should be examined here. First, the find in the Well B1 in Kerameikos. This was a hoard of ten lead tokens dated to the middle or the third quarter of the third century. Nine of them bear signs of money values and constitute a coherent group. These nine tokens can be grouped in five different ‘denominations’ or ‘values’. No 1 bears the value of four drachms and three obols, nos. 2-5 bear the value of one drachm and

11 Gkikaki forthcoming in Newby, ed.
12 Gkikaki 2019.
13 Aristophanes, Frogs ll. 718–33, in particular 725–26, first presented 406/5 BCE.
14 Svoronos 1898; Kroll per litteras to the author and Cf. Agora Museum Inv. No. B1158 from a context of the fifth century BCE.
15 Braun 1970, 193 (pl. 57.1).
16 Chronology based on stamped amphora handles and ninety-two coins which were found together: Grace and Kroll 1974.
17 Of these ten tokens just one stands apart: it is a uniface lettered token, a jurors’ token of the Hellenistic period.
one and a half obol, nos. 6-7 the value of three and half obols and a quarter of an obol, no 8 one obol and a half, and no. 9 two obols (fig. 8).

The precision with which these peculiar sums of money are recorded qualify these tokens for unique transactions. One can only speculate on the goods or services with which these vouchers would have been exchanged for. Nevertheless, it is almost certain that the issuer of tokens was the same as the one who would have redeemed their value for a good or service.

The tokens from the cistern to the SE of the Acropolis are certainly later because they bear simple numeric values, rudimentary recorded on the flans. (Karra). They are ‘enfranchised' from the direct relevance to money, but they were still redeemable against a particular good or service.

To the above discussed three finds, three more can be added. The includes a mixed hoard of coins and tokens, dated to the 260s BCE, or a little later. It contained ninety-two bronze coins, two silver ones and four uniface lead armor tokens and came from a shallow tile-lined shaft from a house in the SW corner of the Agora. The deposit also contained pottery and other finds.18

[INSERT FIG9 HERE]

There is also the well-known find of the eight armor tokens and one Nike token found along with the tablets from the cavalry archive (fig. 9).19 All nine tokens are lettered (they bear either the letter A, B, or Δ on side b).

The last hoard has been known already to Svoronos but was only recently published. It contains ninety-three lead tokens, which belong to just two different types. The majority (eighty-two specimens) bear an owl standing on an ear of wheat. The find was spotted very near the rural deme of Koropi in eastern Attica. It is believed that the tokens were to be exchanged in a grain distribution.20

How is one to determine the “value” of the material in these token hands? On the one hand, they were made for unique transactions compared to coins, which were ‘universally' exchanged. On the other hand, they were destined for specific individuals, or specially qualified groups, who were already well-versed in how to handle tokens. In the latter instance, this would fit into the broader understanding of tokens, of which ‘sharing a code’ may be acknowledged as a basic feature.21

The hoards discussed above have several features in common. The hoarded tokens are very homogenous. The specimens contained complement each other and they belong to the same issue/series (they are also from the same issuer). The armor tokens, the tokens with money values, and the tokens with numeric values, the tokens with the ‘owl-on-an-ear-of-wheat’, and even the clay lettered tokens (for which it has been ascertained that they derive from the same lot found on the Mouseion Hill: see Makrypodi), are all uniform in their respective hoards (contexts).

---

18 IGCH 157; Agora Deposit A 18:8, Kroll 1977(b), 144; Bubelis 2010, 185 with n. 45
19 Kroll 1977(b); Schäfer 2019, 42–43 with figs.
20 Ralli 2009, 235–45.
21 Rowan 2019, 102.
On the contrary, the find from Koile poses a riddle. The disparate assemblage of tokens was accompanied by equally dissimilar coins which range from the late Archaic period to the second century BCE, seems more probable to constitute a fortuitous accumulation of small objects across

5. Tokens, authority and roles

In as much as the tokens with numeric or monetary values may be connected with the realm of money, they were also distinct from official coinage and ought to be considered as such. This observation relies on the unofficial, trivial designs of the tokens from the ‘Kerameikos hoard’ (fig. 8) and the tokens from the Makrygiannis plot (Karra). This can lead promptly to another significant question, namely: what relationship did tokens have to authority? To put it more simply, who was the issuing authority for tokens in Classical and Hellenistic Athens and elsewhere?

Tokens display a multivalent relationship to authority, operating on several levels – often simultaneously. An institution no less than the Delphic Oracle was the sanctioning authority for the tokens of the private agreement between the Spartan and the Milesian narrated by Herodotus (Finglass). The divine intervention grants particular power to tokens and enforces their acceptance by both parties. The story should not be treated as an isolated episode, but rather as a broad indication of, and in acceptance with the critical weight of tokens.

While state authority and its attendant institutions is a prerequisite for money to develop and function in a society, tokens can come into being under any form of authority, including private individuals or groups of private individuals. This is partly because one of the main functions of tokens is that it authorises/empowers its carrier. In Sophocles’ Oedipus Rex the king declares he is authorised to make an inquiry on Laios’ death because he has a token which connects him to the Thebans. Likewise, in Euripides’ Philoctetes, Philoctetes is persuaded to follow Neoptolemus because he is convinced that the latter’s token is genuine. In Herodotus’ narration about the money that a Milesian had deposited with the Spartan Glaucus, the Milesians’ sons are authorised to claim their father’s money because of the tokens they showed to Glaucus (Finglass).

With the four different types of military tokens of fourth century BCE Athens, state couriers were authorised to bring a message to a commander. The tokens served as a passport and as a means of confirming their status and identity to the military commander on arrival. In all cases the military tokens are inscribed with the name of the military commander (cf. figs. 3 and 4).

The above narratives provide in some cases a public and in other cases a private setting for the functioning of tokens. Consequently, the authority established to claim something that one was entitled to could be either private or public. Sometimes, the borders between these spheres were less than clear. The military tokens bear no state insignia and they are inscribed with private names. Nevertheless, it is the authority exercised by commanders in their official capacity and the couriers’ need to authenticate their state mission that qualify these tokens as state/official tokens. In Glaucus’ story, tokens are exchanged between two private persons and the transaction assumes a private character. Nevertheless, this private transaction attracts general, public attention, not least because of the parties involved: two powerful states were involved, and the Oracle at Delphi was required

---

22 Any authority can issue tokens, such as the state authority, but by entrusting the handling of these tokens to an individual or group this authority is transferred, and the persons or groups in question are empowered.

23 Kroll and Mitchel 1980.
to mediate the dispute. In short, the narrative uses this private transaction to illustrate the universal (i.e. public) importance of honesty.

In Classical and Hellenistic Athens, tokens helped authenticate Athenian citizens to their functions and duties and therefore to their civic roles. Half-tokens were worn around the necks of the men who had been appointed by lot to offices after the allotment procedure in the Theseion. This is the procedure reconstructed in an account of the jigsaw clay token inscribed with the demonym ΧΣΥΠΙΕΤΑΙΩΝ (Kierstead). This tentatively reconstruction is indirectly corroborated by the account of the assumption of office by the allotted jury men, according to the Αθήναιόν Πολιτεία. In this, the jurors received a token upon entering the court, in which they were to sit. The author of the Αθήναιόν Πολιτεία neither explains the purpose of this token, nor does he describe it further than the accompanying adverb ‘σύμβολον δη[μοσίᾳ]’. The token in question has been convincingly associated with the well-known issues of bronze lettered tokens which assigned jurors to seating areas in the court room. The adverb should be translated simply as ‘publicly’, a meaning which encompasses ‘at public expense’, by public consent’, or ‘on public service’, and can be extended to cover the undertaking of public duties.

Seating at the Courts, the Council, the Assembly meant a variety of roles and well-defined duties for the citizens and compliance to collective identity and state authority. These public roles were collectively undertaken by the citizens who manned the civic bodies and enabled the functioning of the democratic institutions. Iconography chosen for the jurors’ tokens borrows from state symbols and expresses the state’s authority. Similar observations can be made for the iconography of the tokens used in the Council (Gkikaki), the Assembly (Makrypodi), and for the workings of the tribes (Russo).

6. Tokens and the Athenian society through the centuries

It is impossible to approach tokens in Athenian society and everyday practice without first engaging with the relevant notions and concepts in tragedy and philosophy. This is essential for understanding that, in order to fulfill their role, tokens were split in two, even if this is not immediately apparent. The ‘hospitality’ tokens of the ancient Mediterranean were split in two so that the bearers of each half could acknowledge a relationship with the bearer of the other. Likewise, the Assembly tokens are compared against a record which authorised citizens to access the Assembly meeting.

It is a striking feature of ancient literature that authors consider in some detail the notion of forged tokens and their implications. Tokens were potentially disruptive media, as evidenced by Neoptolemus’ deception of Philoctetes; the story the former invents is anything by the ‘clear token’ (σύμβολον σαφές) that Philoctetes naively believes. In this context, tokens emerge as ‘anti-heroic’ symbols and their employment questions the straightforward honesty, which is normally attributed to epic heroes. The above described ‘ideological background’ focused on tokens inevitably influenced perceptions and practices when tokens were introduced in the administrative procedures of the Athenian Democracy.

If we think of that the jig saw clay tokens first introduced in the mid-fifth century BCE and of the jurors’ lettered tokens of the late fifth century BC as the earliest tokens known to be involved in

the administration of Athens, then it becomes apparent that the beginnings of tokens in Athens coincide with various socio-political crises. The split clay tokens with the names of tribes and demes were introduced at the time immediately following Ephialtes’ reforms, when Pericles began his political career becoming head of the state. What was at stake at the time was the participation of all male citizens regardless of social class and wealth. The split clay tokens helped avoid a severe state crisis which came about when the poorer Demes began selling offices while the richer ones were eager to buy the offices offered in order to increase their influence. Once more, the lettered tokens formed a response to a crisis, this time after the oligarchic coup of 411 BCE. It is generally accepted that the seating by letter which was introduced in 410/9 BC was a democratic measure, which aimed at preventing conspirators from sitting together and manipulating discussions and democratic procedures, or even from shouting together en masse to drown out the orators. Although the attitidograph Philochoros relates the practice of seating by letter to the Council (FGrHist 328 Philochoros F140), the earliest extant lettered tokens are the ones of the Jury Courts.

According to Margaret Crosby ‘a quick review in the workings of the Athenian Democracy shows the need for some such objects (originally in vast numbers and in great variety) to be used either as entrance tickets to the Greater Dionysia or as evidence of attendance at the assembly, the law courts, and probably the council’. The declaration made by the eminent scholar in the seminal publication of the Athenian Agora excavation tokens (1964) has haunted scholarship ever since. In the subsequent decades the view has prevailed that Athenian tokens are state tokens. Indeed, it appears increasingly certain that the carefully manufactured jurors’ tokens, which are preserved in relatively high numbers, were in fact issued by the state. In terms of purpose and function the Jurors tokens are very similar to the Assembly tokens. A true challenge for research constitutes the identification of the pay tokens, i.e. the tokens which were exchanged for the Jurors’ pay and the Assembly pay.

The iconography and functions of the tokens underwent important changes with the passing of centuries. The iconography mirrors the ideological upheavals and the concerns of the society at a given time. The female head representing the personification of Demokratia or of the Athenian Council can be considered as a token for a state function – although which function exactly remains open to speculation (fig. 10). However, not all tokens in Athens were state tokens. The unassuming designs of the Hellenistic period, just as the ones found in the Agore of Koile, make plausible candidates for private issues (Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou). Were they issued in order to provide access to social events? Were the issuers groups or individuals? There were certainly the issues of individuals who, in some official capacity, issued and distributed tokens. The lead token of Polykleitos and Nikagoras is an eloquent example of two magistrates issuing tokens for an official occasion and having their names along with the ‘official stamps’ of a tripod and a cicada on tokens (fig. 11). To the ‘official stamps’ of the Hellenistic period the design of Nike may be added. A survey of Hellenistic Athenian tokens with Nike has proven that the design does not necessarily copy some sculpture in the round, but rather reflects original concepts especially prepared for tokens (Schäfer).
In Athens during the Roman Imperial, period private issues became proportionally more frequent. This may be the result of the ongoing continuation of certain procedures, these practices considered traditional and typically Athenian, perhaps. The state continued to run its affairs while keeping alive certain traditions of the Classical period. The iconography of the Roman period issues closely copies contemporary coin types probably as a means for sanctioning authority. Alexander the Great on Athenian tokens originates from collective concepts of the time on ‘Hellenism’ and at the same time expresses the ideological orientation of the Athenian elite (Mondello).

7. Model for other ancient societies

Research has often considered that Athens served as the model for the tokens (tesserae) of the Roman world. Nevertheless, it was the Roman tesserae, with their abundant and explicit inscriptions, which have shed light to the study of the Athenian tokens. By means of analogy, the function of tokens as tickets for spectacles or vouchers for grain distributions were thought applicable also to Athens. While this approach has proven to have its merits, in this volume three new studies on the material of Hellenistic Sicily, Roman Jerusalem, and Roman Ephesos have demonstrated the diversity of the parameters which prompted the use of tokens beyond Athens and probably independently from Athens. In each case, tokens were locally produced to serve the needs of local communities, although these local communities were inspired to some extent by their more prestigious neighbour(s). It is inevitable that the token-issuers in the two great centres of the later centuries, Rome and Ephesos, ‘borrowed’ from each other in terms of functions and iconography (Geelmuyden Bulgurlu and Hazinedar Coşkun).

Nonetheless, there are overarching patterns and numerous similarities. In these local communities tokens gave responses to a whole set of everyday circumstances and especially enabled access to social events. As issuing authority they may have served a private person or a group of persons, or even person(s) in an official capacity. In any case the event of distribution reinforced status and reputation. Tokens strengthened the bonds between group members and helped create particular communities within the community. The practice of sharing tokens bears reference to the common cultural background of the eastern Mediterranean. Therefore, a univocal definition of tokens in the Graeco-Roman World is possible, despite the local character in terms of ‘distribution radius’ (Crisà).

Captions

Fig. 1. The jigsaw clay tokens inscribed ΧΣΥΠΕΤΑΙΩΝ on one side; the other side was also inscribed across the irregular cutting. Pierced. National Archaeological Museum, Athens, Inv. No. 11235.

Fig. 2. Split Knucklebones (symbola ?), length: 37mm. Agora Museum Inv. No. BI732.

Fig. 3. Split Clay Tokens for the peripolarchos, Xenokles of the deme of the Perithoidai. Published by Kroll and Mitchel 1980, 87–89 pl. 13a-b. Agora, Museum Inv. Nos. MC1245 and SS8080.

26 Rowan 2019, 102.
Fig. 4. Black-glazed clay token, bearing the inscription Antidoros of Thria, *hipparchos* (ΑΝΤΙΔ[Ω]ΡΟΣ ΘΡΙΑ | ΙΠΠΑΡ). Published by Kroll and Mitchel Hesperia 1980, 92–93, pl. 13f, g; SEG 30.114. National Archaeological Museum Inv. No. 11179. Ø 42 mm diameter.

Fig. 5. Uniface lead token with poppyhead between two ears of wheat. Uniface, 13mm. AS-Pb-085, Archaeological Museum of the University of Göttingen. Published: Gkikaki 2020, 132 cat no. 55. The type copies Hellenistic coin types of Athens.

Fig. 6. Bronze jurors’, late fifth century BC, diameter 27mm. Obv. Athena head left wearing helmet with cheek pieces, Rev. Sampi (Π) in square incuse. Cf. Svoronos 1923-26, pl. 100, 16. Excavated 1973, on the Road leading from Kerameikos to Plato’s Academy (Plataion Str. 30-32). Ephory of Athens City, Inv. No. N921 (Deposit at Plato’s Academy).

Fig. 7. Uniface, lead token with myrtle sprays through the handles, 13 x 11mm. Agora Museum, inv. No. PN M69. Published in Davidson and Thompson 1943, 106 (cat. no. 8 fig. 8 on p. 107).

Fig. 8. Hoard of ten lead tokens from Well B1 in the Kerameikos, dated to the third quarter of the third century BCE. It contained nine tokens with money-values and one lettered token (letter Γ). Photo-Archive of the German Archaeological Institute at Athens. Published by Braun (1970, 193 pl. 57,1).

Fig. 9. The hoard of the armor tokens. Published by Kroll (1977, 141–46 pl. 40).

Fig. 10. Lead token, 17mm. Side A: Female head right (personification of the Council or of Demokratia), side B: Helmeted Athena head left in round incuse. From context of fourth century BCE. Agora, Museum Inv. No. IL1040. Published by Crosby (1964, 93 L67 pl. 21).

Fig. 11. Lead token, 13 mm, side A: Cidada, POLYKLEITOS, side B: Tripod, NIKAGORAS. Formerly in the collection of Archaiologiki Etaireia, Athens. Published by Engel 1884, 18 (cat. no. 169 pl. V).
Tragic tokens: Sophoclean symbola in context
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Abstract
The commonplace symbolon makes a number of appearances in Greek tragedy. This paper begins by surveying the archaeological and literary evidence from classical Greece for split symbola – that is, symbola divided in two such that the bearers of each half could acknowledge a relationship with the bearer of the other even if the bearers were personally unacquainted – and for the association between symbola and strangers/hospitality (xenia) both in Greece and across the Mediterranean. In the light of this material, the paper then focuses on two Sophoclean passages. First, Philoctetes 403–4, where Philoctetes tells Neoptolemus that, though a stranger (xenos), he has a symbolon of grief that matches his own, which thus permits him to recognise him as a fellow-sufferer at the hands of the other Greeks. But the tale told by Neoptolemus, which has elicited this response from Philoctetes, is false: his ‘token’ is a forgery, designed to match Philoctetes’ story in order to convince him of Neoptolemus’ good will. Second, Oedipus the King 219–23, where Oedipus tells the assembled Thebans that, though a stranger (xenos), he has a symbolon that connects him with them: he has been made a citizen, and thus has standing to investigate the killing of their long-dead king Laius. Yet the ‘token’ that connects him to the Theban people represents a profounder link than he realises: he is no mere adopted citizen, it will be discovered, but his people’s legitimate king, and both son and killer of the man whose killer he is now seeking. Both passages exploit ambiguities intrinsic to the symbolon, which is such a potentially fallible tool; this paper explores how that image evokes ideas of deception and ignorance bound up in this everyday, apparently unremarkable object.

1. INTRODUCTION

ἔχοντες, ὡς ἐοικε, σύμβολον σαφές
λύπης πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ὦ ξένοι, πεπλεύκατε,
καὶ μοι προσάδεβε’ ὡστε γιγνώσκειν ὅτι
tαῦτ’ ἐξ Ἀτρείδων ἔργα καὶ Ὁδυσσέως.

Possessing, as it seems, a clear token of grief, you have sailed to me, strangers, and the harmony of your song with mine is such that I recognise that these deeds come from the sons of Atreus and from Odysseus.
Philoctetes addresses Neoptolemus, who has recently arrived on the island of Lemnos, where Philoctetes was abandoned ten years ago by the Greek army on their way to Troy. Neoptolemus has just delivered a lying speech describing how the Greeks had dishonoured him when he arrived to join them there; upon demanding the armour and weapons of his dead father Achilles, he was informed that they now belonged to Odysseus, and as a result he has abandoned their cause and is sailing home. This story has been crafted to ensure that Philoctetes will find Neoptolemus sympathetic, see in him a fellow-sufferer at the hands of the Greeks, and trust him as a result. Neoptolemus plans to exploit that trust to bring Philoctetes, against his will, to Troy, which (the Greeks have been told in a prophecy) will not fall without Philoctetes’ assistance. It is in response to Neoptolemus’ tale that Philoctetes tells his interlocutors that, although they are ξένοι, ‘strangers’, to him, they have a σύμβολον, a ‘token’ or ‘tally’ of grief, which allows them to establish a relationship. As a consequence, when Neoptolemus subsequently announces his intention to depart (461–65), Philoctetes begs him to take him with him (468–503), which has been Neoptolemus’ intended outcome all along.

What does Philoctetes mean by this ‘token/tally’ of grief? With a question like this we naturally turn to the commentaries; and Jebb’s detailed note does not disappoint. He defines the phrase σύμβολον . . . λίπης as ‘grief-token’, that is ‘a token consisting in your grief . . . σύμβολα were tallies, sometimes consisting of dice . . . or knuckle-bones . . . sawn in two. A message or request, purporting to come from a friend at a distance, could thus be tested. The bearer was asked to produce the other half of the divided token.’ He cites various passages to illustrate this, from Herodotus, Euripides, Plato, Plautus, Aelius Aristides, plus an inscription. The image is also treated in a more recent analysis of the play, which describes how the first part of the deception plan ‘was completed when Philoctetes said that Neoptolemus and the chorus came as a symbolon of pain (403). A symbolon was a sign of friendship in the Classical period. Sophocles’ metaphorical use of xenia as the friendship of damaged and injured people suggests that this operation will involve an abuse of fundamental values. This kind of transgression can be justified only by an extreme emergency.’

Elucidation of this passage requires more scope, however, than the necessarily limited scope of a commentary. This chapter therefore examines this reference to the symbolon more closely. It begins by considering the evidence, both literary and archaeological, for divided tokens, in Greece. Not all ancient tokens are in fact divided –in fact the great majority are not – and it is important to identify the evidence for this practice; I hope
that this examination will be of more general use, since discussions of the issue by literary scholars often assume that divided tokens must always be at issue, when these are only a small subset of ancient tokens. It goes on to demonstrate the association of tokens, both divided and non-divided, with hospitality: a fundamental feature of tokens not just in Greece, but across the ancient Mediterranean. Having established these foundations, the chapter proceeds to argue that the Philoctetes passage is indeed a reference to the specific concept of divided tokens, and analyses its significance, paying close attention to Philoctetes’ vocative ἔνοι, ‘strangers’, which, though ignored by commentators, turns out to be no mere filler. The chapter concludes with a further passage involving the symbolon, from Oedipus the King, where the meaning of the word has long been disputed; the previous discussion illuminates this particularly difficult occurrence of the word.

2. DIVIDED TOKENS: THE GREEK EVIDENCE

The term σύμβολον represents a complex idea and the significance of individual instances of the word need to be weighed with care.29 As Kroll and Mitchel put it:30

In its primary sense the word σύμβολον denoted an object comprised of two joining halves, each one kept by a separate party for identifying the bearer of the other half. The term was more generally applied to anything used for identification as well as to ordinary tokens of bronze, lead, and clay employed as admission and seating tickets and as vouchers to be exchanged for pay, allotments of grain, and the like. 31

Or in Gauthier’s words, in his monograph dedicated to the subject, a symbolon is ‘un objet incomplet, qui doit être rapproché d’un autre pour prendre toute sa signification’.32 But despite this primary sense, the word clearly could refer to a simple, individual token that people would recognise; of the hundreds of surviving tokens,


30 Kroll and Mitchel 1980, 93–94. For the etymology see Müri 1931; Struck 2004, 78.

31 Other chapters in this volume discuss different aspects of the use of tokens mentioned here: so for identification tokens enabling the apportionment of citizens to offices as well as the participation in the Athenian Council, Assembly and courts (regulating seating, and exchanged for pay after attendance) see the chapters by Mairi Gkikaki, James Kierstead, John H. Kroll, and Stamatoula Makrypodi. Given the reference to ‘seating tickets’ above, it is worth noting that tokens were not used for entrance to the Athenian theatre (Roselli 2011, 82–84); and that tokens found in Mantinea from the late fifth century onwards seem to be connected with that city’s democracy rather than with theatrical performances (Csapo and Wilson 2020, 514–17; for these tokens see further Robinson 2011, 37–38).

32 Gauthier 1972, 65; cf. Crosby (1964, 77) on the distinction between symbola tetmêmena and single objects.
almost none actually involve matching halves. What evidence do we actually have, then, for divided tokens in the ancient Greek world?

Herodotus’ story of Glaucus, who was entrusted with a sum of money by a stranger, provides one of the two earliest literary references to divided *symbola* (6.86.α.5–β.1):

σὸ δὴ μοι καὶ τὰ χρήματα δέξαι καὶ τάδε τὰ σύμβολα σοῦ: λαβὼν· ὃς δ’ ἂν ἔχων ταῦτα ἀπαίτη, τοῦτο ἀποδοῦναι. ὁ μὲν δὴ ἀπὸ Μιλήτου ἦκον ξείνος τοσαῦτα ἔλεξε, Γλαύκος δὲ ἐδέξατο τὴν παραθήκην ἑπὶ τῷ εἰρημένῳ λόγῳ. χρόνου δὲ πολλοῦ διελθόντος ἦλθον ἐς Σπάρτην τοῦτο τὸν παραθεμένον τὰ χρήματα οἱ παῖδες. ἐλθόντες δὲ ἐς λόγους τῷ Γλάύκῳ καὶ ἀποδεικνύντες τὰ σύμβολα ἀπαίτεον τὰ χρήματα.

You receive the money and take these tokens and look after them; and give the sum to whoever in possession of these tokens should ask for it. That was what the stranger who came from Miletus said, and Glaucus accepted the deposit on the stated terms. After a long time had passed the depositor’s sons came to Sparta, met with Glaucus and, showing him the tokens, requested the return of the money.

The mechanism of identification in this passage clearly involves divided σύμβολα, ‘probably knuckle-bones, or tablets broken in two’, according to the latest commentators;33 Glaucus is given one set, the depositor retains the other, and the matching of the divided parts will confirm to Glaucus that anyone requesting the money has the authority to do so. We should also note the word ξείνος, which will be relevant later in our discussion: σύμβολα are an ideal means of confirming identity between strangers. The story goes on to explain how Glaucus denies knowledge of the arrangement, asks the Delphic oracle whether he can withhold the money, and receives a critical response in reply; his punishment is clear, the narrator states, because he no longer has any surviving descendants (6.86.δ). The key offences here, deceit and theft, are manifested by the failure to act as agreed when the *symbola* were duly presented.

Perhaps earlier than Herodotus, however, and if later then certainly not by much, is the use of the idea in Empedocles, as cited by Aristotle (*On the Generation of Animals* 722b6–17):34

33 Thus Hornblower and Pelling (2017, 206) noting that this ‘is one of the earliest literary attestations of such σύμβολα’, and citing Gauthier (1972, 67–68).

34 Translation from Balme (2012, 37), taken from *Oxford Scholarly Editions Online*. The curly brackets indicate a passage found in the manuscripts which modern editors believe was not written by Aristotle.
Further, if it comes equally from all of both parents, two animals are produced; for they will have every part of each parent. Therefore, if this is the right way to speak, Empedocles’ account seems the most consistent with it {just to this extent; but if a different way is right, his account is not good}. For he says that the male and the female contain as it were a tally, and that neither produces a whole, ‘But sundered is limbs’ nature, part in man’s . . .’ Otherwise why do not the females generate from themselves, if in fact the seed comes from all the body and they have a receptacle? But, as it seems, it either does not come from all the body, or comes in the way that Empedocles says, not the same things from each parent, and this is why they need intercourse.

In the course of an argument against Democritus’ theory of pangenesis, which ‘holds that the seed is drawn “from all the body”, in such a way that it contains all the bodily parts, drawn from the corresponding parts of the parent’,35 Aristotle states that Empedocles ‘proposed a form of pangenesis that is marginally more satisfactory: each parent contributed not a whole complement of seeds or parts, as Democritus and others said, but only a half complement.’36 The details of the biological argument do not need to be pursued here; the key point is that Empedocles’ metaphor relies on widespread familiarity with the concept of divided tokens.

The same concept lies behind a more famous passage, from Plato’s Symposium. In a context where the different characters are explaining the nature of love, the comic playwright Aristophanes declares that each individual human being is but a symbolon of a person, and the two symbola need to come together to form the original whole (191d):

Each of us, then, is a tally of a human being, having been sliced like flat-fish, two from one; and each person is always searching for the tally that belongs to them.

36 Leitao 2012, 274.
In the words of one scholar, the metaphor is ‘characterized by lack: a symbol has something missing, and this incompleteness begs to be resolved. The symbol rings with both lack and potential wholeness, something incomplete and something always potentially complete.’ And again, the story makes sense only if this cutting of symbola was a recognised practice, familiar to anyone.

The metaphor recurs in another philosophical text, Aristotle’s *Eudemian Ethics* (1.230b23–32):

On the score of utility, however, it is the contrary that is friends with the contrary. For what is like X is useless to X, and therefore master needs slave and slave needs master and husband and wife need one another. A contrary is pleasant and desirable because it is useful—not as a constituent of the end, but as contributing towards it. When a thing has got what it desires, it has attained its end, and no longer has any appetite for its contrary: the hot does not want the cold nor the dry the wet. Yet in a manner love of the contrary is love of the good: the two are drawn to each other through the mean. They have an affinity like the matching parts of a tally, and when they come together they form a single intermediate entity.

Though less famous than the *Symposium* passage, this discussion is along similar lines and testifies to the attraction of divided symbola: as Herman points out, ‘Such objects were so familiar in Athenian life that a series of complex philosophical ideas could be expressed by reference to them.’

Finally, we find the idea referred to in a fragment of the fourth-century comic poet Eubulus (fr. 70 PCG):

---

37 Struck 2004, 79.

38 Translation from Kenney (2012, 37), taken from *Oxford Scholarly Editions Online*.

39 Herman 1987, 62.
. . . all things sawn in half, accurately, like tallies

The fragment is brief and the context is unclear, but divided *symbola* are clearly at issue, and again used as a metaphor to describe something else. Here is yet another genre for which the fundamental concept of the divided token provides an apt metaphor.

[INSERT FIG1 HERE]

Our evidence for divided tokens in classical Greece is not limited to these literary texts. [Fig. 1] Three terracotta tokens, discovered in 1950 in a rubbish pit in the Athenian agora, and dating to the third quarter of the fifth century BC, had been cut in two; the cut was deliberate, effected in such a way as to provide a unique match between the two halves. In each case, we have only one half of the original complete token. The middle one [in Fig. 1] has the word ‘Halimous’ painted on one side, the name of a coastal deme, and ‘Leo’ on the other, an abbreviation for the tribal name Leontis, which was evidently written before the cut, in such a way that the cut would split the name in half. The other two tokens also have tribal names, again split between the two halves of the token: Leo for Leontis again, and Ere for Erechtheis. As Lang notes, ‘It is clear that the cut through the middle of the tribal name was intended to leave that name legible on both halves and so to serve to bring the two halves together.’ But on the other side instead of a demonym these two tokens both have the letters ‘Pol’ painted on. The ‘Pol’ probably designates an office of πωλήτης, as Lang argues, an official responsible for selling public contracts and confiscated property, of whom there were ten in the classical period, one for each tribe. The tribal name was written on the token before it was cut in two; then the name of one of the demes belonging to that tribe was written on one half of each of the tokens, whereas some (not all) of the other halves of the tokens had the name of a magistracy written on them. Putting the tokens back together allowed a random distribution among the demes of the office or offices. [Fig. 2] Another such token-half, discovered at the Dipylon gate, also has a demonym name written on (Xypetaion, denoting the deme of Xypete). In the original publication no tribal name was recorded on the other side. The token had not been seen since 1879 and was

40 Thompson 1951, 51–52. For these tokens seen further James Kierstead’s chapter in this volume.

41 Lang 1959, 81.

42 Lang 1959, 82, 86.

43 Following Herman (1987, 62), Humphreys (2018, 117 744) declares that ‘these clay objects are recognition tokens and are not likely to have been used in allotment’, noting (n. 63) her agreement with Herman, but saying that he ‘goes too far in totally rejecting the association with demes, tribes, and office’. But this somewhat confused commentary does nothing to counter Lang’s convincing interpretation. See further Whitehead (1986, 250–86) and the detailed account of the dispute in Kierstead’s chapter.

44 Koumanoudes 1879, 237.
known only through the drawing published by Koumanoudes; but Dr Mairi Gkikaki recently rediscovered it at the deposits of the National Archaeological Museum. Having examined it, she reports that a few traces of a name written across the cut can still be discerned, so the same mechanism seems to have been at work there too.\(^{45}\)

[INSERT FIG 2 HERE]

Since these are the only surviving instances of such tokens, we may imagine that the particular apportionment process in which they were employed did not last long.\(^{46}\) Nevertheless, we have evidence that it was used, at least twice; and when dealing with evidence from the ancient world, that is often more than we could reasonably hope for. Moreover, these are not the only split tokens which have survived in the archaeological record. Two mid-fourth-century clay tokens, discovered in the Athenian Agora and stamped with the phrase ‘Xenokles of Perithoidai, Peripolarchos’ in the accusative (i.e. with the name and military rank of an Athenian commander), were evidently intended to be used by official state couriers on their way to bring a message to a commander outside the city (which is where the Peripolarchos would have been stationed, in charge of the ‘peripoloi’ or troops guarding the frontiers), serving as a passport on the way and as a means of confirming their status to the military commander on arrival.\(^{47}\) Professor Kroll now points out (personal communication) that the tokens were clearly intended to be split: a third one belonging to the same series and now in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France is actually split and only half survives, whereas the two from the Athenian Agora are divided in two diagonally in the same area where the now split token was divided. As Kroll says (personal communication), ‘they were made to be divided with one piece given out for secure identification of the carrier later’. In all three cases the smaller piece intended to be broken off from the rest includes the first letter of Xenokles’ name and at least part of the second letter (whereas the word ‘Peripolarchos’ is not divided at all on one of the tokens): it may be significant that the commander’s name, the part of the text most obviously connected with identity and recognition, becomes whole again only once the two pieces of the token are brought back together.

Overall, then, the combination of literary and archaeological evidence indicates that the idea of split tokens/tallies was familiar and widespread in classical Greece; and the Herodotus passage and the Xenokles tokens in particular demonstrate their use as a means of identifying one bearer to another in both private and public contexts.

3. TOKENS AND STRANGERS

\(^{45}\) See the chapter by James Kierstead.

\(^{46}\) Cf. Carawan 2016, 399 n. 33: ‘these rare artifacts probably represent a short-lived experiment with an office especially ripe for corruption’.

\(^{47}\) Kroll and Mitchel 1980, plate 13a–c with 87–9, 94–96. For the Peripolarchos and peripoloi see Kozak (2013, 309–10).
I noted above that the word ξένος was highly relevant to the use of the term σύμβολον in the passage of Herodotus. The association between symbola and hospitality/strangers will turn out to be important for understanding Sophocles’ use of the term too; but before we return to that, let us examine the evidence for the link more generally, a link prominent in the very subtitle of Gauthier’s classic book on symbola, namely Les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques.48

A clear example of the association is found in Euripides’ Medea, where Jason assures the title character (612–13):

ἔτοιμος ἢφθόνοι δοῦναι χερὶ
ξένοις τε πέμπειν σύμβολ’, οἵ δράσουσί σε ἐδ.

I am ready to give with unstinting hand and to send tokens to guest-friends, who will treat you well.

Jason attempts to assuage Medea’s anger at his decision to abandon her in favour of his new Corinthian bride, by offering tokens to enable her to obtain hospitality from his guest-friends.49 Like all Jason’s assurances in this speech, though, the offer rings hollow: the responsibility for taking care of Medea’s interests should lie with him alone, given all the assistance which he has derived from her; yet he is abandoning her and allowing her to be exiled from Corinth. Moreover, as the play makes clear, Medea need not rely on the promise of mere tokens given to her by a deceitful ex-husband; she can create her own networks and opportunities, persuading Aegeus to give her sanctuary in Athens. The offer underlines Jason’s profound misreading of the situation, in terms of both his own responsibilities and the power relationship between the pair – and from our point of view, it relies on the ready recognition by an audience of symbola as a means of establishing the identity of a person to his or her xenoi.

48 Gauthier 1972; cf. Faraguna 2014, 176. In the Greek passages cited below, unlike the Herodotus passage referred to above, nothing suggests specifically divided tokens, even if many commentators assume that they do; the scenarios presupposed in all of them make sense with a normal, undivided token. That is why I did not cite them above; some of them are nevertheless regularly cited in lists of divided tokens, when in fact these need to be carefully distinguished.

49 The scholia – i.e. comments by ancient commentators surviving in the margins of manuscripts of the play – claim that these were divided tokens (II 175.27–32 Schwartz). But the scholia have no special authority in determining the sense of the words – they provide an interpretation, written at least two centuries after Euripides wrote the play, which we are not compelled to accept.
Exactly the same idea, though in a real, public, and civic context rather than a literary, private, and personal one, underlies the following inscription from probably 378–376, where the Athenian people employ symbola in their relationship with a foreign friendly state (IG II–III² 141):³⁰

ποιησάθω δὲ καὶ σύμβολα ἡ βολὴ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα τὸν Σιδωνίων, ὅπως ἄν ὁ δήμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων εἰδῇ ἓ γὰρ τι πέμπῃ ὁ Σιδωνίων βασιλεὺς δεόμενος τῇς πόλεως, καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ Σιδωνίων εἰδῇ ὅταμ πέμπῃ τινὰ ὡς αὐτὸν ὁ δήμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων.

Also the Council shall make tokens with the king of Sidon, so that the people of Athens shall know if the king of Sidon sends anything when in need of the city, and the king of Sidon shall know when the people of Athens send any one to him.

The process envisaged by this inscription parallels the fourth-century clay tokens published by Kroll and Mitchel and mentioned above (p. YYY).³¹ So too these σύμβολα . . . πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα would identify their bearer to the King of Sidon, as would the tokens carried by his messengers. Two foreign peoples thus managed their alliance by means of these small but significant objects.

Returning to tragedy, the term symbola in the sense of ‘contracts’, ‘agreements’, a clear development of the basic sense ‘token’, is closely connected with strangers when the chorus of Aeschylus’ Suppliant Women sing (698–703):³²

ϕυλάσσοι τ’ εὐ τὰ τίμια ἀντοίχι
τὸ δύσιον, τὸ πτόλειν κρατύνει,

---

³⁰ Rhodes and Osborne 2003, 86–91 §21, their translation: https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/RO/21. For this text see further Mairi Gkikaki’s chapter in this volume. This is the inscription mentioned by Jebb in his commentary on the Philoctetes passage, as noted above. It is not surprising to see Jebb, a central figure in the foundation in 1886 of the British School at Athens (where the conference which produced this book was held), drawing on inscriptional evidence to elucidate a literary text in this way at a time when such an approach by literary scholars was scarcely commonplace.


³² Text and translation from Sommerstein (2008, 378–79); see further his note on 701, Sommerstein (2019, 281).
προμαθὲς εὐκοινόμητις ἁρχῇ·
ζένοις τ’ εὐζωμβόλους,
πρὶν ἐξοπλίζειν Ἀρη,
δίκας ἀτερ πημάτων διδοΐν·

And may the people, which rules the city,
protect well the citizens’ privileges,
a government acting with craft and foresight for the common good;
and to foreigners may they offer
painless justice under fair agreements
before arming the god of war.

This chorus has come from Egypt to Argos to put themselves under the protection of that city as they flee from forced marriage with their cousins, who are pursuing them; as international refugees, they thus have an interest in a system that would assure ‘to foreigners . . . painless justice under fair agreements’. Though tokens as such are not at issue, the passage can still be adduced as evidence for the association between *symbola* and hospitality/strangers.

This association is attested beyond classical Greece. In Plautus’ *Poenulus* the comparing of one token with another secures the recognition of one of the characters (1045–52): 53

Agorastocles:  *siquidem Antidamai quaeris adoptaticium,*

*ego sum ipsus quem tu quaeris.*

Hanno:  *hem! quid ego audio?*

Agorastocles:  *Antidamae gnatum me esse.*

Hanno:  *si ita est, tesseram*

*conferre si uis hospitalem, eccam attuli.*

---

53 Text and translation from W. de Melo (2011–12); taken from the digital Loeb Classical Library.
Agorastocles: *agedum huc ostende. est par probe. nam habeo domi.*

Hanno: *o mi hospes, salue multum! nam mi tuos pater patritus hercle hospes Antidamas fuit.*

*haec mi hospitalis tessera cum illo fuit.*

Agorastocles: If you’re looking for the adopted son of Antidamas,

I am the very man you’re looking for.

Hanno: Oh! What do I hear?

Agorastocles: That I’m the son of Antidamas.

Hanno: If this is the case and if you want to compare your shard of hospitality, look, I’ve brought mine along. (produces it)

Agorastocles: Go on, show it to me. (inspecting it) It’s the proper counterpart: I have mine at home.

Hanno: O my guest-friend, many greetings! Your father Antidamas was my father’s guest-friend.

I had this shard of hospitality with him.

(Note *conferre,* where the *con-* prefix is doing the same duty as the *sym-* in *symbolon.*) Here we encounter an example of a divided token being used to establish a relationship of guest-friendship. The Latin term found in this passage, *tessera hospitalis,* was used in the title of the book *De tesseris hospitalitatis liber singularis* (1647), where the topic of tokens was first analysed in scholarly terms by the Catholic bishop Jacopus Philippus Tomasini (1595–1655) [*Fig. 3*].54 Hence the modern designation of this subset of *symbola,* whatever their origin, as *tesserae hospitales.*

[INSERT FIG6 HERE]

Beyond the cultures of Greece and Rome, a recent study of the archaeological material has identified 64 surviving instances of *tesserae hospitales* from the western Mediterranean, particularly from Spain, mostly from the second and first centuries BCE; the languages found on them (in decreasing order of frequency) are Celtiberian, Latin, Etruscan, and Greek (from the Roman period).55 The oldest two, both from the mid-sixth

54 Tomasini 1647; Crisà 2018(a).

century, are both Etruscan. Each involves an animal sculpted in relief on one side of the tessera, whereas the other side is flat and contains an inscription; the implication is that the object was meant to match up with a corresponding tessera to establish a relationship between the bearers, one of whom was likely to be a foreigner. First, an Etruscan inscription ‘Araz Silqetenas Spurianas’ is carved on the back of half an ivory lion, from Rome [Fig. 4]; this is probably a personal name, perhaps also with a reference to the city of Sulcis in Sardinia. Second, in a tomb in the Sainte-Monique cemetery at Carthage, an Etruscan ivory plaque representing a hoofed mammal is inscribed ‘mi puinel karθazies vesϕ+[---]na’, again probably a name, also with the person’s place of residence (Carthage) [Fig. 5]. Six more sixth-century Etruscan tesserae have been recovered from Poggio Civitate in Tuscany, made of ivory, again in the shape of animals, and with what seem to be names written on the flat side of each.

This same format, an animal in relief on one side of the object, with an inscription on the other, flat, side, is characteristic of Latin and Celtiberian tesserae too. For example, among the Latin ones is a late-third- or second-century bronze token from Trasacco near Rome in the shape of a ram’s head, inscribed on its flat side with text indicating a relationship of hospitium between two men [Fig. 6]: T. Manlius T. f. | hospes | T. Staiodius N. f. The many Celtiberian examples also contain text referring to relationships of guest-friends. In some of them the half-animal shape is replaced by a very complex join, as if to eliminate any possibility of forging a matching piece [Fig. 7].

4. BACK TO NEOPTOLEMUS’ TOKEN

Returning to the Philoctetes passage, we can see that there is no explicit reference to one symbolon matching another. Philoctetes says that Neoptolemus has come with a symbolon of grief, but does not add that he himself has a matching symbolon; we must ask, then, whether this is a case of a single token that involves no split, since as we have seen, not every reference to symbola necessarily evokes divided tokens. However, the context makes

56 Beltrán Lloris et al. 2020, 490–1.
58 Naso 2017b, 1700–1; Dridi 2019, 148.
59 Beltrán Lloris et al. 2020, 491–1.
60 Luschi 2008; also Beltrán Lloris et al. 2020, 494–5.
61 Beltrán Lloris 2010; Simkin 2012, 100–2; Woudhuizen 2015; Lowe 2017; Beltrán and Jordán 2019, 275–79; Beltrán Lloris et al. 2020, 499–503.
the idea of division the more attractive option here. Philoctetes’ point is not simply that Neoptolemus has demonstrated that he is afflicted by grief (which is what the meaning would be if a single, undivided token was at issue); Philoctetes is not expressing disinterested compassion for the suffering of another person. Rather, Philoctetes’ point is that Neoptolemus’ tale of woe matches his; like Philoctetes, Neoptolemus too has been betrayed by the Greeks. The audience already knows that this was the purpose of Neoptolemus’ tale. His closing remarks ὁ δ’ Ατρείδας στηνόν ἐμοὶ θαυμαζόμενος καὶ θεοὶς εἰς φίλος (‘May the person who hates the Atridae be my friend and the gods’ equally’, 389–90) put further emphasis on this point – such strong emphasis, indeed, that audience members might even question whether he is overplaying his hand. But the guileless Philoctetes accepts what he hears, and though his phrase καὶ μοι προσήλεξθ' transposes this idea of unity onto a musical plane: just as their symbola fit together, so too their stories harmonise.

The attestation of divided tokens in an Athenian military context – first demonstrated by Kroll in this chapter, above p. YYY – may add another dimension to the symbolon here. The archaeological evidence cited above is from the mid-fourth century, and we must be wary about automatically retrojecting Athenian practices back into the late fifth. But peripoloi are mentioned in late-fifth-century texts, and although the office of Peripolarchos is not, these troops at the frontier will have needed a commander, and he will have needed a method of receiving messages sent to him from Athens. If, then, the Athenians of the late fifth century were familiar with the use of tokens in the military sphere in this or some other context(s), the establishment of a relationship between Philoctetes and Neoptolemus by means of a metaphorical symbolon will have carried a significant irony in its evocation of this military practice. At a surface level this nexus between an abandoned, apparently useless warrior, and a deserter from the army, is the antithesis of the well-ordered military machine whose functioning the efficient transfer of symbola would have enabled. In fact, however, Neoptolemus is no deserter but a man instructed by his military superiors to present exactly this metaphorical symbolon to the target of his mission. And that target is someone on the fringes of an ongoing conflict, and to that extent like the Peripolarchos; except that the Peripolarchos exists on the margins as the leader of a group in order to further the aims of the state which sent him there, whereas Philoctetes has been abandoned on Lemnos on his own because he was viewed as useless, indeed a hindrance, to his army. Nevertheless, with both the Peripolarchos and with Philoctetes, the central authority communicates with and exerts control over far-flung members of the army by means of symbola.

A further relevant aspect of symbola here is their particular significance for ἥνω; as we have seen, this association was so fundamental that it is attested in many different ancient Mediterranean cultures. That apparently innocent word ἥνω now has a productive ambiguity: Neoptolemus and his soldiers were originally merely strangers to Philoctetes, but now, thanks to their matching, harmonising tales of grief, they have become ‘guest-friends’, people from afar who have discovered that they have a relationship in common. But since Neoptolemus’ tale is false, the relationship that Philoctetes feels is entirely illusory. It is characteristic of Sophocles that this simple vocative ἥνω turns out to be no mere filler, but a word pregnant with meaning and fraught with irony.

It is natural to ask at this juncture whether forged tokens play a part in other ancient literary works. A passage in the Theognidean corpus (whether or not by the sixth-century poet Theognis of Megara himself) condemned unjust men, among whose offences was αἰσχρὰ κακοῖς ἐργαὶ σύμβολα θηκάμενοι (1150); the reference seems to be to ‘shameful contracts’ rather than forged tokens, though the use of the same term for both these ideas indicates the close association between them, as already noted above on the passage from Aeschylus’ *Suppliant Women*. For a forged token we must turn to Plautus’ *The Two Bacchises*, where the slave Chrysalus makes up a story to his master Nicobulus that his son was wrongly accused of producing one in Ephesus (258–68).

Nicobulus: *quid fecit?*

Chrysalus: *quid non fecit? quin tu id me rogas?*

*primum dum in sias ire coepit filio,*

*negare se dure tibi triobulum.*

*continuo antiquum hospitem nostrum sibi*

*Mnesilochus aduocauti, Pelagonem senem;*

*eo praeex homini extemplo ostendit symbolum,*

*quem tute dederas, ad eum ut ferret, filio.*

Nicobulus: *quid ubi ei ostendit symbolum?*

Chrysalus: *infit dicere*

*adulterinum et non eum esse symbolum.*

*quotque innocenti ei dixit contumelias!*

*adulterare eum aibat rebus ceteris.*

Nicobulus: What has he done?

Chrysalus: What has he not done? Why don’t you ask me that question? First he began to deny everything before your son,
to say that he doesn’t owe you a farthing.

---

64 Theognis 1150; cf. Gauthier (1972: 68).

65 Text and translation from W. de Melo (2011–12); taken from the digital Loeb Classical Library.
Mnesilochus immediately called on our longstanding friend, old Pelago, for help.

In his presence he promptly showed him the token, the one you yourself had given your son to bring to him.

Nicobulus: And when he showed him the token?

Chrysalus: He began to say it was a forgery and not that token.

And how many insults he heaped on this innocent chap!

He said he was a forger in other business affairs as well.

As Jenkins notes, ‘Chrysalus – or Plautus –has inserted the story to make a thematic point: not all signs are to be trusted. Chrysalus turns out, in fact, to be a master of semiotic manipulation, an expert forger in a highly specialized sense’,66 pointing to the forged letter which Chrysalus will subsequently dictate to another character for him to write. Similarly, in Philoctetes the metaphorical forged token proffered by Neoptolemus to Philoctetes is an element of, we might almost say symbolic of, a play where deceit is to the fore.

Symbola can be employed with the express intention of preventing deceitful action, as in the Kleiniás decree (425/4 BC or not long afterwards), which set out regulations for the payment of tribute from Athens’s Delian League allies. It opens as follows:67


The Council and the officials in the cities and the inspectors shall take care that the tribute is collected each year and brought to to Athens. Tokens shall be made for the cities so that it shall not be possible for those bringing the tribute to do wrong. The city shall write on a tablet the tribute which it is sending, and shall seal it with the token and send it to Athens; those bringing the tribute shall hand over the tablet in the council to be read when they hand over the tribute.

Symbola (here used to imprint a seal rather than cut in half) are here envisioned as a means of upholding justice, of ensuring that the tribute paid by an Athenian ally is delivered in full without being subject to theft by its conveyer. Yet as we saw from our first example, in Herodotus, symbola were ironically fallible even in the hands of a man as famed for justice as Glaucus; Sophocles’ Philoctetes, too, shows on a metaphorical level how symbola can be employed to effect the most unjust of outcomes.

6. OEDIPUS’ TOKEN

As a codicil, let us consider a second passage from Sophocles whose understanding depends on an appreciation of the real-life symbolon. In a long, formal speech from Oedipus the King, Oedipus asks the Theban people to tell him if they know who killed their former king Laius, whose unavenged death is causing the city to be afflicted by plague. But in the build-up to asking that question and to declaring the rewards for speaking out and the penalties for staying quiet, Oedipus establishes his right to make this formal proclamation, as follows (219–26): 69

68 Gkikaki in this volume.
69 See further Finglass 2018, 239–42 ad loc., referring to earlier literature on the passage; add Herold 1993.
What is this *symbolon*? People often have taken it to mean ‘clue’, something that Oedipus now has, and that is assisting him in his hunt for Laius’ killer. But what clue is meant? And what would be the relevance of referring to a clue in this context, where Oedipus is not talking about possible paths in the inquiry but establishing his right to make an inquiry at all? People have also taken it to refer to a clue that Oedipus would have obtained if he had previously (i.e. shortly after Laius’ death) pursued an investigation; if only Oedipus had been around at the time, he would have investigated and acquired at least some information. But as David Kovacs, points out, ‘it seems both pointless and rhetorically counter-productive for [Oedipus] to disparage the Thebans’ intelligence by insisting that he would have been successful had he been in their shoes’.70 These two explanations also involve arbitrarily assigning the word a sense – ‘clue’ – which is unparalleled, rarely a wise move in a difficult passage of any ancient author.

Crucial for our understanding of the word is its position between prominent, repeated instances of the words ξένος and ἀστός. We might therefore infer that it is likely to be associated with them, an inference confirmed by the particular connections of the *symbolon* with *xenia* demonstrated above. Oedipus (in his view) may be a stranger to the story of Laius’ death, but he does have an association with the city and people of Thebes, as a citizen, and also their king and saviour from the Sphinx. He feels a true sense of connection with the Theban people, and they feel a connection to him, as is clear from the opening scene. There the Theban people implore him to rescue them from the plague, certain in their knowledge that he knows how to save them and has the ability to effect their rescue; in the same scene, Oedipus demonstrates his profound compassion for his people, saying that he is prepared to go to any lengths to rescue them, something confirmed by his later actions, including attacking the prophet Tiresias when he seems unwilling to match the king’s commitment. The fit between them, we might say, seems perfect. It is this relationship, conveyed by the metaphor of the *symbolon*, that gives him the legal standing to make a proclamation concerning the killing; this sense also seems presupposed by υἱὸς in 222, which contrasts with the preceding counterfactual supposition that Oedipus had no connection with the Thebans.

But as Tiresias will point out, Oedipus is wrong on both counts: ‘he was no stranger to the deed, but its perpetrator, and so far from becoming a citizen of Thebes as a man, he was a Theban citizen, indeed a Theban prince, from the moment of his birth. Consequently, what seem mere preliminaries turn out to be fundamental misunderstandings that impede the entire inquiry.’71 And these misunderstandings affect his use of the imagery of the *symbolon*. It turns out that Oedipus’ tally, his *symbolon*, matches all too well not just with the people of Thebes but with its murdered king; they fit together, disastrously, as father and son. (It hardly takes much effort to extend the metaphor to his relationship with Jocasta, where, in marrying his mother, he has found an appallingly close sexual fit.) The tallies which Athenians used to validate their political alliances and apportion their magistracies, and which people all across the Mediterranean used as a means of recognising their friends and allies, here metaphorically cause Oedipus to be recognised as his father’s killer and cast him down from the

---

70 Kovacs 2007: 106–7; see also his translation, Kovacs 2020

highest political power, thanks to the link between him and another person, someone whom he had once regarded as a complete stranger, but with whom he in fact had all too perfect a match.

In Philoctetes, the metaphorical token is a weapon wielded by Neoptolemus to overmaster the trusting Philoctetes; in Oedipus the King it provides an image which Oedipus deploys without realising the full, awful extent of its applicability. In both plays the metaphor reinforces the dominant theme of the work – deceit in the one, ignorance, late-learning, and recognition of identity in the other – and in each the subtlety and power of the image can be understood only in the contemporary context of everyday Greek, and Mediterranean, life.

Captions

Fig. 1 Allotment tokens, Athenian Agora, 450-430 BCE.


Fig. 2. Image: from Koumanoudes (1879, 237). IG I² 916. [Not in IG I3]. Found near the Dipylon Gate
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Fig. 4. Etruscan Tesserae (one of the two joining halves) from Sant’ Omobono, Rome. The piece has two faces, one of which the figure of a lion is portrayed in relief and the inscription is incised on the flat face, 41x 68mm. Image from https://www.antrodithoth.com/2020/11/12/le-origini-totemiche-del-culto-di-santomobono/ (last accessed 6/12/2021)

Fig. 5. Etruscan Tesserae (one of the two joining halves) from Carthage. The piece has two faces, one of which the figure of a boar (?) is portrayed in relief and the inscription is incised on the flat face. Image from https://www.leaders.com.tn/article/23864-le-19-janvier-2018-la-grande-nuit-du-musee-national-de-carthage-une-vitrine-nouvelleannonce-un-nouveau-musee (last accessed 6/12/2021)

Fig. 6. Latin Tesserae Hospitalis from Trasacco (Aquila, Italy). Image from https://blogs.warwick.ac.uk/numismatics/entry/tessera_hospitalis_a/ (last accessed 6/3/2021)

Fig. 7. Two geometric Celtiberian Tesserae Hospitales from Viana. They are joined together. One with a Celtiberian text and the other anepigraphic.
The Athenian Jigsaw Tokens

James Kierstead

Victoria University of Wellington

In his report on the 1950 excavations in the Athenian Agora carried out by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Homer Thompson included the ‘three small terracotta plaques’ pictured in Figure 1 below, which were found in a pit behind the Stoa of Attalos.73 These were each about 3 cm long and wide, and around 0.8 cm thick, of good ceramic fabric (similar to that of ‘contemporary official measures’), and showed (as E.S. Staveley would later note) ‘little sign of repeated use.’74 Most strikingly, each of them had a single serrated or ‘jigsaw’ edge, suggesting that they each represented halves of larger rectangular tokens.

Thompson suggested that a similar terracotta plaque, which had been found in the excavations conducted by the Greek Archaeological Society at the Dipylon Gate and published by Stephanos A. Koumanoudes in 1879, was ‘another example of this same series.’75 This is pictured in Figure 2; it had a similar irregular cut along one edge, as well as similar lettering, at least on one side.76 The lettering on Koumanoudes’ token clearly reads ΧΣΥΠΕΤΑΙΩΝ (Ξυπετιών, ‘Xypetian’), the demotic of the deme Xypete, and this should also lead us to place it in the same series as Thompson’s tokens. The middle piece in Figure 1, after all, clearly reads ΗΑΛΙΜ/ΟΣ (Ἅλιμος, or Halimous), the name of another deme.77

The other side of that token has ΛΕΟ written on it along the serrated edge (with only the upper half of the letters now showing), almost certainly an abbreviation of the tribal name Λεόντις (Leontis). That abbreviation also appears on the reverse of the first token. As for the third token, Thompson was confident enough to fill out the script on it as ‘Ere(chtheis).’78 Gabriel Herman is not wrong in calling this reading of the letter traces ‘insecure’ in itself, but I believe Thompson was almost certainly right that ERE, like LEO, is an abbreviation of a tribal name – and that Koumanoudes’ token likely ‘bore the appropriate tribal name on its reverse: Kek(ropis), the paint of which may well have flaked.’79 I also believe that Thompson was right to suggest that ΠΟΛ (POL),

72 I am grateful to a number of people for helping with this paper: Patrick Finglass, Stephen Lambert, Julien Faguer, Matt Simonton, Simon Perris, Diana Burton, Peter Londey, Lynette Mitchell and, in particular, Mairi Gkikaki, Georgia Boundouraki, and Daria Russo.

73 Thompson 1951; Agora Museum nos. MC 820, 821, and 822.

74 Thompson 1951, 52; Staveley 1972, 70.

75 Thompson 1951, 51; Koumanoudes 1879, 237 (no. 6).

76 I am very grateful to Mairi Gkikaki for photographing this token at the National Archaeological Museum in Athens (no. 11235). The token has to my knowledge previously been studied only through the drawing in Koumanoudes’ publication (as it is by Herman 1987, 62).

77 Note that the writing on Koumanoudes’ token also has an Attic feature, χς for ξ, which almost certainly dates it to before the reforms of Eukleides in 403/2, after which the Ionic alphabet came into official use. Thompson’s tokens also have Attic features (ο for ου in Ἅλιμος, Η as consonantal heta, the L-shaped or Attic lambda in ΛΕΟ).

78 Thompson 1951, 51.

79 Herman 1987, 62.

80 Thompson 1951, 51. Traces of paint now visible in the photograph of the reverse (Fig. 2) and reported by M. Gkikaki, who ‘rediscovered’ and studied the piece, may now support Thompson’s suggestion.
which appears clearly on the obverse side of the first and third token, stands for πωλητής (πωλητής), ‘Seller,’ an important financial magistracy.\(^{81}\)

I believe all these things because I take what I will call the ‘standard theory’ about these tokens to be largely correct. According to the standard theory as it was developed by Mabel Lang, Eastland Staveley, and David Whitehead, these tokens were involved in the process for allotting a set of minor magistracies mentioned in the Aristotelian treatise on the Athenian constitution ([Arist.] Athēnaiōn Politeia 62.1).

In this contribution, I will first present an overview of the standard theory and of the allotment procedure these tokens were most likely a part of. I will then turn to why I think some more recent commentators (such as Herman and Sally Humphreys) have erred in rejecting the standard theory. Next, I will take up the question of when the procedure involving these tokens was in operation, and for how long. In the last section of the article, I will look at why the procedure was discontinued, what replaced it, and what all of this might tell us about the evolution of Athens’ democracy through the classical period.

**The Standard Theory**

Near the end of its overview of Athens’ magistracies (50-62), the Aristotelian Athēnaiōn Politeia comments:

> αἱ δὲ κληρωσαὶ ἄρχαι πρότερον μὲν ἦσαν αἱ μὲν μετ᾽ ἐννέα ἀρχόντων ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς ὅλης κληροζοῦμεναι, αἱ δ᾽ ἐν Θησείῳ κληροζοῦμεναι δημοῦντο εἰς τοὺς δήμους: ἐπειδή δ᾽ ἐπώλουν οἱ δήμοι, καὶ ταύτας ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς ὅλης κληροζοῦσι, πλὴν βουλευτῶν καὶ φρουρῶν: τούτους δ᾽ εἰς τοὺς δήμους ἀποδίδονται. (62.1)

‘Of the allotted offices, some were formerly allotted with the nine archons from the whole tribe, while others allotted in the Theseion were distributed among the demes. But, since the demes were selling their offices, these too they allot from the whole tribe, apart from the councillors and guards; these are devolved to the demes.’\(^{82}\)

It is the selection of the more minor magistracies, which are said to have been ‘allotted in the Theseion’ and were at one point ‘distributed among the demes,’ that Lang in an article published in 1959, suggested that our tokens were involved in.\(^{83}\)

Lang also outlined a procedure involving the tokens that she thought both explained the writing on them and was consistent with the passage from the Athēnaiōn Politeia above. Staveley in large part accepted

\(^{81}\) Thompson 1951, 51; cf. also Lang 1959, 82. With regard to Koumanoudes’ token, see the fleck of paint circled in the second photograph in Figure 3, which suggests that there were letters on this side of the token, and which may have formed part of the letters KEK.

\(^{82}\) Translation adapted from Rhodes (2017).

\(^{83}\) Lang 1959.
Lang’s model, but he also suggested a couple of alterations. What follows is my own amalgam of Lang and Staveley’s reconstructions of the procedure. At the beginning of the procedure, there must have been some number of tokens large enough to allow them to be ‘distributed among the demes’ in the way the *Athēnaiōn Politeia* says they were. Five hundred is the most likely number (with fifty tokens for each of the ten tribes), since the Council of Five Hundred was divided among the demes on the basis of their bouleutic quotas, and so five hundred tokens would have been easy to distribute among the demes on that same basis.

[INSERT FIG3 HERE]

Figure 3 illustrates a likely sequence of subsequent stages. First the names of the tribes were written across the middle of the tokens, with each of the ten tribes ending up with its name on fifty of the tokens. They were then cut in half with an irregular, jigsaw cut that divided the tribal names into two. Next the tokens were turned over so that the side which was still blank faced up; they were then thoroughly mixed around on a flat surface the way one would mix around the pieces of a puzzle on a tabletop.

The next step was to paint the names of the offices being allotted on the bottom halves of the tokens, and the names of the demes on the top halves, with the number of top halves that were painted with the name of a particular deme corresponding to that deme’s bouleutic quota. So HALIMOS, for example, would have had been written on three of the half-tokens (that deme’s bouleutic quota being three) – and these three half-tokens would also have had half of the name of the tribe written along the cut on their other sides (and this could be checked by quickly flipping the half-tokens over). Note that the fact that the half-tokens had already been thoroughly mixed around would have made it impossible for even those painting the deme- and office-names on the tokens to predict which would be matched with which in advance.

The clay tokens would then have been fired. They were later taken out of the kiln and turned over so that the names of the demes and offices faced down and only the half-names of tribes were visible. The half-names, along with the jigsaw line of the edge, functioned as a guide as the half-tokens were pieced back together. Once all the half-tokens had found a partner, they were turned over one last time to reveal which demes would fill which offices that year.

So much for my amalgam of Lang and Staveley’s reconstructions. But a point made by David Whitehead should also be integrated into the standard theory. This is that it is probable that every token, not just a few, awarded someone a post. Lang and Staveley had both supposed that there would only have been fourteen or fifteen offices allotted in the Theseion per tribe, i.e. that there would have been somewhere between around 110 and 150 posts on offer in

---

84 See Lang 1959, esp. 85-86; Staveley 1972, 70-72. Note that if our tokens were used to allot the more minor magistracies that were, according to *Athēnaiōn Politeia*, selected in the Theseion, this rules out the possibility that ΠΟΑ stood for πολέμαρχος, since (as *Athēnaiōn Politeia* also notes) the nine archons were selected from whole tribes, which would have made the deme-names on our tokens otiose; see Lang 1959, 87.

85 Lang 1959, 84; Staveley 1972, 70.

86 The mixing phase is my own addition; neither Land nor Staveley mentions one, but the individual half-tokens must have been moved around in order to introduce an element of unpredictability to the process. Otherwise, there would have been no point in dividing them in two in the first place. It is possible that the tokens were divided into tribal groups and then mixed around; this would have ensured both that demes were written on tokens corresponding to their tribes and that, when it came to offices held once each by the ten tribes, there was no chance of any tribe being allocated more than one of these positions.

87 Lang (1959, 85) has the deme-names painted on before the tokens were cut in two; I follow Staveley (1972, 70) in having them added afterwards, since adding the deme- and office-names separately to isolated half-tokens would mean nobody could be sure which offices would be allotted to which demes before allotment day.

88 Whitehead 1986, 278–86.
total during the above procedure. 89 They also believed that only fourteen or fifteen of the tokens for each tribe would have had the name of an office painted on their reverse side. 90 When the half-tokens were re-united, some demes would find their names paired with a blank half-token, meaning no office had been awarded them in that instance. One of the purposes of the allotment would thus have been to figure out which demes were allotted any offices at all that year, not simply which offices were awarded to which demes. 91

Lang and Staveley, however, were both working with a much lower figure for magistracies in Athens than has since become the consensus. 92 The lower figure was based on skepticism towards the Αθηναίων Πολιτεία’s report that there were ‘up to seven hundred domestic’ offices in Athens in the fifth century. 93 In 1985, though, M.H. Hansen reviewed the evidence and demonstrated that the Αθηναίων Πολιτεία’s estimate is probably not far off, and that there were very likely something just short of seven hundred domestic magistracies in the city. 94 Unfortunately we cannot say exactly how many of these offices were allotted in the Theseion; but, given the sheer number of magistrates, it is not improbable that there were something in the region of five hundred posts up for grabs on allotment day. If we suppose that the Athenians arranged things so that were exactly five hundred offices available, then there could well have been five hundred tokens at each year’s allotment, every one of which had an office written on it; each deme would thus have been assured of being allocated at least one post.

Defending the Standard Theory
According to the standard theory, then, the tokens in Figures 1 and 2 were used in the allotment of minor magistracies in the Theseion. In the years since Whitehead’s book, however, a few scholars have suggested that our tokens were private identification or recognition tokens. 95 These would have been irregularly cut in half, like our jigsaw tokens, and then the two halves given to two different parties; a man could later identify himself to the other party by supplying the missing half.

Herman, who seems to have been the first to diverge from the standard theory, believes that our tokens had an exclusively private use, and served for ‘identification between friends and dependants of xenoi,’ that is, ‘guest-friends’ – a type of relationship that could be passed down through generations. Perhaps these half-tokens, too, could be passed down from fathers to sons as a way of confirming a connection that had been forged between families in the past. 96 Humphreys has a slightly different view: while she does not think our tokens were used in allotments and she agrees with Herman that they were identification tokens, she does think they had something to do with Athens’ magistracies. For her, our half-tokens would have been given to men who had been allocated an office so that they could identify themselves when they went to take up their post. As Humphreys puts it, these tokens

89 The exact figure depends on the precise combination of offices that is imagined as being allotted, and, in particular, on how many of them were boards of ten as opposed to boards of five (or of some other number). Lang (1959, 84) imagines ‘at least eleven boards of ten’ featuring alongside other magistracies (she mentions in n. 15 the εισαγωγείς and ὀδοποιοί).

90 This was consistent with Koumanoudes’ token as he described it (1879, 237 no. 6), i.e. with no office-name on its reverse side.

91 Lang 1959, 86; Staveley 1972, 71; Whitehead 1986, 286.

92 Whitehead 1986, 278, 286. Note also that the traces of paint on the reverse of Koumanoudes’ token (Fig. 2) suggest that it, at least, also bore an office-name.


94 Hansen 1980.

95 Rocchi (2000, 101) rightly mentions our tokens in the context of allotment procedures in passing.

96 Herman 1987, 62.
guaranteed that the candidate who turned up with the deme half had indeed been appointed by his deme to fill the office assigned to it.’97

Let us look first at Herman’s suggestion that, while ‘HALIMOS and XSYPETAION are deme names… LEO could be an abbreviation of a personal name,’ as could POL.98 There are a number of problems with this. First, personal names do not seem to have been regularly abbreviated in Athens in official contexts. Abbreviated forms of personal names are regularly avoided in official inscriptions (in contrast with Roman practice); military tokens; jurors’ tickets (pinakia); and even in ostracisms, where we might have expected them to be extremely tempting to semi-literate Athenians wanting to get rid of their least favourite politician.99 Abbreviations of tribal names are not much more common; but there were only ten tribal names, and everyone knew them, which would have made abbreviated forms of them much easier to recognize than any given personal name, of which there were many.100 There were (as we have seen) almost 700 magistracies, but most would also have been well known.101

Second, although names beginning with ‘Pol-’ and ‘Leo-’ were not uncommon in Athens, what are the chances that two of the four jigsaw tokens that have been excavated both belonged to men with names beginning with ‘Pol-’?102 They could not have been the same man if LEO and ERE are indeed tribal names, since they would then have been from different tribes. If LEO stands for a personal name, we have the improbability of two of our tokens belonging to men with the same prefix in their names.

Third, though Herman is right that the reading ERE on the first token is not absolutely certain from the traces, it is highly likely. We can see enough of a middle horizontal to be sure the first letter is an ‘E’; the tip of the hasta means the second letter must be a R or a K; and though only a few specks of black glaze are visible where the third letter was, their position and the two relatively pale strips at right angles make clear we are dealing with another ‘E’. If this is not an abbreviation for Erechtheis, what are the chances that something looking very much like one (an abbreviated personal name, for instance) would turn up on one token at the same position as where the other two tokens have LEO (also very likely a tribal name)?103

Fourth, if we accept (as I think we must) that these are tribal names, what would they be doing on identification tokens? Herman is right that Athenians used their demotics in business transactions, but how often do they mention their tribes? And in any case, I do not know of any other private, divisible identification tokens from Athens that feature tribal names.104 If the standard theory is correct, these tribal names have a clear purpose. If we follow Herman, their presence will need to be explained further.

This last question – what is the purpose of the tribal names? – also causes problems for Humphreys’ version of the claim that these are recognition tokens, even though she rightly says that Herman ‘goes too far in totally rejecting the association with demes, tribes, and office.’ If our tokens simply served to identify men who had been appointed as pōlētai, what need would there have been for these citizens’ tribal names to be added to the tokens?105

97 Humphreys 2018, II 744.
98 Herman 1987, 62.
99 For military tokens: see Kroll and Mitchel 1980. The norm of writing out full names on sherds involved in ostracisms was apparently so strong that citizens who ran out of space often insisted on adding the remaining letters elsewhere (e.g. above or below the previous letters): Sickinger 2017, 454.
100 A few abbreviations of Athenian tribal names on tokens are noted by Svoronos (1900); see esp. 331 no. 149 pl. II, 31 (ΛΕΙΩ); 330 no. 141 (ΕΕ), and 331 no. 146 pl. II, 28 (KEK). See also Russo’s paper in this volume.
101 We do also have a few abbreviations of the names of magistracies on tokens: see again Svoronos 1900, esp. 332–338 (nos. 159, 247), though there are no tokens with ΠΟΛ listed there.
102 A search of the online LGPN turns up 386 names beginning with ΠΟΛ and 147 beginning with ΛΕΙΩ; the volume dedicated to Attica contains 6,423 names in total.
103 Besides, the Attic section of LGPN only records 11 instances of names beginning with EPE.
104 As opposed to the rather different tokens mentioned in n. 27 above.
105 Humphreys (2018, II 745 n. 64), writes that ‘since the names of demes and offices were painted on the tokens before firing, the assignation of offices to demes was known in advance. It would not be Athenian practice to have
That the standard theory has been met with scepticism in some quarters is to some extent understandable. After all, there is nothing on the tokens or in *Athēnaiōn Politeia* 62.1 that explicitly connects the two pieces of evidence. Lang’s suggestion that our tokens were involved in the allotment of minor magistracies mentioned there is nothing more than a hypothesis; and the procedure I described in the first section of this paper is largely the product of speculation by modern scholars.

Nevertheless, I believe that the evidence as a whole makes the standard theory by far the most likely explanation for the purpose of our tokens. If they were not used in a procedure like the one described, it is difficult to account for all of the facts as we know them: the jigsaw cut, the office- and deme-names, and (above all) the tribal names. If the standard theory is right, all of these features are readily explicable.

All that is, but one. This is the hole through Koumanoudes’ token – the only small hole, we might say, in the standard theory. As the photographs in Figure 2 make clear, the hole passes ‘all the way through’ (as Koumanoudes put it) and space has been left for it between the letters Ω and N. This is, then, a deliberate feature that was added at the time the token was made; it is not a result of accidental damage or of re-use in a later period. Why is it there?

Koumanoudes also thought that the hole’s being ‘completely unworn,’ ruled out the token ever having been worn on a string, but I am not so sure. In fact, I think that this possibility, mentioned by Herman, is the most likely explanation for the hole. There is, after all, nothing to prevent us from accepting part of Humphreys’ theory, and supposing that the tokens, after they were used to pair demes with offices, were eventually given to the men who had been appointed to those offices, who could then use them to prove their identity. At which point they might well have worn their half-token around their necks.

John Kroll has now suggested that the clay tokens inscribed with the name of Xenokles, the demotic Perithoidēs, and the title *peripolarchos*, which he had previously published with Fordyce Mitchel were also separated and re-connected along a thin cut which passed through some of the lettering. Kroll and Mitchel proposed that these and other similar tokens were used as ‘passports’ by military officers taking up their commands in distant theatres. The *peripolarchia* probably commanded garrisons near the boundaries of Attica and would likely need to identify themselves when they arrived. If Kroll and Mitchel are right, we now have a parallel for the use of reconnectable tokens for identification purposes by citizens taking up offices – though in our case, the citizens were not travelling from the centre to peripheral garrisons to take up military commands, but from demes to central institutions to take up civic magistracies.

But why do none of Thompson’s three tokens have a hole through them? It is impossible to say for sure, but it may be that Koumanoudes’ token represents a slightly later development in the system. Initially, the tokens were produced without holes, just for use in the allotment procedure. Then the demes started to give the men who had been selected for certain offices the relevant half-tokens before they headed into the city-centre to take up their posts. Finally, once this became customary, it was decided to make it easier for men to carry their tokens by adding holes to them when they were made.

---

106 Koumanoudes 1879, 237: the token has nothing on it besides the writing of the deme name and a whole passing all the way through ‘μίαν τῷπαν διαμπερές’.

107 Herman 1987, 62.

108 Kroll and Mitchel 1980, 86-89 pl. 13, a-c; and see further Finglass’s paper in this volume.

109 That Koumanoudes’ token was part of a different batch of tokens is now supported by the photographs in Figure 2, which show that this token is different in a few minor ways – the way the letters are painted, for example, and the type of clay used. It is also thicker (11mm) than the tokens from the Agora (MC 820 and 822 are 8mm, MC 821 7mm thick). The differences also reinforce the idea that these tokens changed slightly through time, which in turn bolsters the idea I will argue for in the next section – that our tokens were in use for more than only one or two years.
This scenario obviously depends upon these tokens having been in use for some time – at least long enough for the phases outlined above to have taken place. This brings us to the question of how long our tokens were in use for, and to chronological issues more generally.

**Chronological Issues**
When Thompson first published our tokens, he noted that they had been found with ‘a mass of broken pottery of the second half of the 5th century’; this, along with the letter-forms, led him to date the tokens to ‘near the middle of the 5th century.’\(^{110}\) We could add the Attic orthographic features we noticed above, which also point to a fifth-century date.\(^{111}\)

*Athēnaiōn Politeia* 62.1, for its part, says that it was ‘formerly’ (proteron) the case that some magistracies were allotted from whole tribes, while others were allotted in the Theseion. As Lang, Staveley, and Whitehead all note, when the *Athēnaiōn Politeia* looks back to what happened formerly in this way, he tends to be referring to the fifth century, before the great series of constitutional changes that occurred around the turn of the century.

Both our tokens and *Athēnaiōn Politeia* 62.1, then, would seem to lead us to the conclusion that the allotment procedure described in the standard theory was operative in the fifth century. Whitehead, though, suggested that ‘the tiny number of *symbola* so far discovered, in an area so extensively and intensively excavated as the environs of the Agora’ points to ‘a very short period of use – perhaps even a single year.’\(^{112}\) And Humphreys says something very similar: ‘since so few of these tokens have been found it is likely that they represent an experiment that lasted at most for a few years.’\(^{113}\) But if our procedure fell out of use in the 360s (as we will see is likely, and as both these scholars accept), and only lasted at most a few years, would that not imply that our tokens must also have been produced in the 360s or 370s – even though the evidence we have just looked at would place them unambiguously in the previous century?\(^{114}\) Not necessarily: our procedure may have been introduced at some point in the fifth century and then fallen out of use, replaced by some other method of distributing the relevant offices among the demes by sortition – until this method, too, was supplanted by the introduction of allotment machines in the 360s. This is what Whitehead suggests happened.\(^{115}\) And, as he notes, both Lang and Staveley describe simpler forms of allotment (involving drawing beans or lots from a container) that could have been used both before the procedure involving our tokens was introduced, and after it was discontinued.\(^{116}\)

Presumably, though, the procedure involving our tokens was introduced for a reason: probably because 1. it allowed posts to be allotted proportionally to demes in a single procedure (impossible using beans or lots) and 2. the deme-names on the tokens made it more difficult (but still not impossible) for demes to sell the positions they had been awarded.\(^{117}\) If that is right, how likely is it that the Athenians would have done away with the system only to go back to a previous procedure that had already been found wanting in these two regards? As we have already seen, at some point even the procedure involving our tokens was deemed to have failed, and the Athenians stopped distributing all but a couple of their allotted offices among the demes; then in the 360s these offices began being allocated from whole tribes using allotment machines. I would submit that the most likely possibility is that these last two steps happened at the same time, and that the Athenians starting using allotment machines to allocate these magistracies at the point at which they retired the procedure involving our tokens.

---

110 Thompson 1951, 51-52.
111 See above, n. 5.
112 Whitehead 1986, 286.
113 Humphreys 2018, II 744.
114 Staveley 1972, 72 has the same problem.
115 Whitehead 1986, 286–87; Lang (1959, 85) is consistent with Whitehead’s theory.
117 Cf. Lang 1959, 85.
In my view, then, some magistracies were distributed among the demes in allotments from some point in the early fifth century on (and possibly even from the years following the revolution of 508/7). At some date after that, perhaps sometime in the middle decades of the fifth century, the procedure utilizing our tokens was introduced. This procedure then continued to be used uninterruptedly until the 360s, when it was replaced by a new system that made use of allotment machines and did not take the demes’ bouleutic quotas into account. Before we finally come to the reasons we should believe that allotment machines were introduced in this context only in the 360s, we will need finally to address the claim that the small number of tokens that have been found rules out the kind of scenario I have in mind, with these tokens in use for several decades. Simply put, that few tokens have been found does not necessarily mean that there were few tokens produced. It does not even necessarily mean that only a few tokens have survived to our day, and that there are no more tokens beneath the streets of modern Athens, waiting to be uncovered by excavators in the future.

Whitehead, as we have seen, is sceptical that there are more tokens of our type to be found partly because of the small number that have been found so far ‘in an area so extensively and intensively excavated as the environs of the Agora.’ But if our tokens were indeed involved in allotments in the Theseion, this is where we would surely expect surviving tokens of the same type to be concentrated.

The Theseion itself has not even been located with any level of certainty, let alone excavated. Most recent treatments place it either north of the Acropolis, either just to the north or somewhere within a triangle formed by the Roman Agora, the Library of Hadrian, and the site of St. Demetrius Katephoris church (now demolished).\(^{118}\) The primary site at which our tokens were used, then, now likely finds itself beneath densely-built-up areas of the modern city (such as Anafiotika) which have not been exhaustively excavated. That should temper any expectations that more tokens of our type would have been discovered by now if they were indeed (as I suggest) in use for more than a year or two.\(^{119}\)

We now finally turn to the evidence that the procedure based around our tokens was retired in the 360s, replaced with a new procedure that involved selecting officials from whole tribes using allotment machines. Whitehead connected this change with Kroll’s ‘Class III’ pi\(\nu\)k\(\alpha\)ia (allotment plates or tickets), introduced at some point between 370 and c. 362 to allow allotment machines (kl\(\varepsilon\)rot\(\omicron\)\(\omicron\)\(\iota\)ria) to be employed in the selection of magistracies (as they had been employed from soon after 388 in the allocation of jurors to jury-courts).\(^{120}\) And a speech by Demosthenes from around 348 includes a reference to bronze identification tickets in allotting councilors, archons, and other magistrates.\(^{121}\)

Whitehead does draw our attention to a few items of evidence that suggest that allotments continued in the Theseion into the 320s. These (as Whitehead himself eventually decides) really present us with no difficulty since by this point all the sortitive offices were likely allotted in the Theseion using allotment machines.\(^{122}\) One of these items of evidence, though – a pair of deme decrees from Eleusis from 332/1 – does refer to ‘the archairesiai in the month of Metageitnion, when the demesmen meet in the Assembly in the Theseion.’\(^{123}\) Does this imply that magistracies were still being distributed among the demes in this period? No – since the word ‘demesmen’ here indicates only that those men from the demes were present, not that the allotment they were present at took bouleutic quotas into account.

118 See e.g. Lippolis (2006, fig. 10) and Kroustalis (2018, 111), where the Theseion is placed just south of modern Lisiou Street.

119 That the Theseion was almost certainly hundreds of metres (and perhaps as much as 1 km, if it was near the site of St. Demetrius Katephoris) removed from the classical Agora also means we should certainly not be surprised, as Whitehead was, that more of our tokens have not come to light there.

120 Whitehead 1986, 288; Kroll 1972, 91-94.

121 Demosthenes, Against Boeotus 10. Note the speaker’s emphasis here on the importance of pi\(\nu\)k\(\alpha\)ia in identifying men appointed to certain offices – something our tokens also did, though the names and demotics on the pi\(\nu\)k\(\alpha\)ia were doubtless seen as an improvement on that front.

122 As Whitehead (1986, 289) says, neither Aeschines, Against Ctesiphon 13 nor the tribal decree of Aiantis which he mentions (Woodhead 1997, 130–31 no. 86) make any mention of allocation by deme.

123 SEG 28.103. II. 27-28 with Whitehead (1986, 289–90), where he also points out that, even if this does refer to an allotment that distributed offices among demes, this could have been the allotment of the councilors or guards (which Athēnaiōn Politeia 62.1 tells us were always allotted by deme).
Sometime in the 360s, then, our procedure – which used jigsaw tokens to distribute offices proportionally among the demes – was replaced by one that employed allotment machines to draw officials randomly from whole tribes (and from the ten sections within them). Why was this change made?

**Bribery, Inequality, and Constitutional Change**

*Athènaiôn Politeia* 62.1 tells us that the change was made ἐπειδὴ δ’ ἐπώλουν οἱ δῆμοι, a phrase often translated ‘because the demes began to sell their offices.’ But though the imperfect ἐπώλουν may well be inchoative, it could also be iterative, giving us ‘since the demes kept on selling their offices.’ That would make more sense, because one of the reasons our tokens seem to have been brought in is because demes were already selling posts they had been allotted. Ultimately, though, even the procedure involving our tokens was not successful in putting a stop to the selling of offices.

So, who exactly was selling what to whom? *Athēnaiôn Politeia* 62.1 says that it was the demes doing the selling, so if that is true, we know who the sellers were. What they were selling also seems clear: posts they had been allotted. Who were the buyers? We can probably discount the possibility that the problem was demes selling the posts they had been allotted to individuals within their own demes – that is, that rich men in Acharnai, say, were paying to take up offices that the deme had been awarded, thus preventing them from being randomly allotted among volunteers from the deme. We cannot rule out this ever having taken place, but it is unlikely that this is the problem *Athēnaiôn Politeia* 62.1 had in mind, and that our tokens were meant to mitigate. Our tokens when reunited made clear which *demes* were entitled to which offices – but how would that have been helpful in stopping demes selling the offices they had been awarded to specific individuals within their communities?

It seems clear, then, that demes were selling offices to other demes, and/or, perhaps, to wealthy individuals from other demes. Why were the buyers buying? Probably not for ‘pride in being well-represented on magisterial boards’ (as Staveley suggests), because men who took up offices that they had no right to hold would hardly be keen to broadcast their résumé. In buying particular offices, they could also gain more influence over a specific part of the administrative state. For instance, they could gain more control over what went on in the Agora by paying to place their men on the board of the *agoranomoi* (market overseers); and they could gain more control over the process by which land belonging to state-debtors was confiscated and re-sold, a process overseen by the *pōlētai*.

---

124 This is the translation given by Rhodes (see, n. 8 above) and Rackham (1935 *ad loc*); cf. e.g. also Bernabé (2005, *ad loc*): ‘desde que los demos comenzaron a comprar las elecciones.’

125 Cf. above p. 7; Lang 1959, 85.

126 Bernabé’s ‘comprar’ (see, n. 51 above) seems to be a slip.

127 The posts were probably sold individually, since demes selling their entire quotas of posts to other demes would probably have been too obvious (though very small demes could perhaps have sold the one or two offices they had been awarded without raising too much suspicion).

128 It may be significant here that use of allotment machines with *pinakia* with individuals’ names written on them would have made it harder for individual men to buy offices they were not entitled to. I note also that the only allegations of buying offices that I know of in the sources involve individuals buying them: Aeschines’ accusation that Timarchus obtained every one of his offices ‘not by the exercise of the lot or by direct election but by purchase in contravention of the laws,’ ὄφδε ε ῥ ηθ ε ἔΧ, and Aeschines’ assertion that Demosthenes obtained a seat on the Council by bribery (Aeschines, *Against Timarchus* 106); and Aeschines’ assertion that Demosthenes accused of bribery by Timarchus (Aeschines, *Against Ctesiphon* 3).

129 Staveley 1972, 50.

130 As Humphreys (2018, II 744–45) notes, it seems that friends of debtors who had their land confiscated would seek to buy it back as cheaply as possible, and in cases of this nature the *pōlētai* do not always appear to have
Why were some demes willing to cede some of their political influence by giving up posts they had been awarded? Obviously, since they were selling them rather than giving them away, it was because there was some amount of money that they saw as more valuable to them at that specific point in time than control over certain offices. The idea that some demes may have felt more in need of money than others brings us to the topic of economic inequality among the demes.

This, fortunately, is an area which there has been a good deal of research in the past few decades. All the same, the picture is a complex one. Roman Klapaukh and I found that the number of known liturgists (that is, men who were among the richest 1% of Athenians) was more or less as you would expect it to be after controlling for deme-population; that is, the larger demes had proportionally more super-rich citizens, and the smaller demes proportionally fewer.

That, however, obviously does not mean that the demes were all roughly equal in terms of the total wealth of their members or in terms of their communal finances. Research on the demes in the past few decades has made abundantly clear that the demes engaged in a wide variety of different economic activities and strategies as communities or corporations, not excluding various modes of owning, leasing, and selling land and property. That variety in itself strongly suggests that the demes would have experienced a variety of different trajectories and destinies in terms of their common holdings and finances.

For an example of the sort of variety I have in mind, consider tax receipts from non-demesmen. Taxation seems to have been one of the main ways that demes raised revenue, and men from outside the deme (both citizens from other demes and resident foreigners) were an important part of the equation when it came to revenues from taxes. Certain demes had significantly more metics than others; Whitehead found that around 40% of the 366 metics whose deme of residence we know lived in the just two demes (Melite and Piraeus). Some demes would simply have found it significantly easier to raise tax revenue from metics, and this in itself makes the proposition that some demes held more communal wealth than others very plausible.

Claire Taylor, in her examination of changes in Athens’ political sociology from the fifth to the fourth century, finds that wealthy, politically active citizens were significantly more likely to come from demes that were only a couple of hours walk from the city in the fifth century than in the fourth. In the fifth century, in other words, a specifically urban, wealth-elite also had an outsize presence in politics, something which was not the case in the century that followed.

I bring Taylor’s findings up here because it strikes me as not impossible that the procedures used for allotting minor magistracies contributed to the change in Athens’ political sociology that she describes. After all, Taylor’s sample of 2,183 is composed of politically active citizens includes magistrates as well as proposers

held out for the highest possible price. It may have been quite useful, in other words, to have allies on the board of ἀρχηγὸς ἀρχής.

131 See again Kierstead and Klapaukh 2018.

132 Of course, some demes may have simply been more politically active than others, and hence keener to trade money for offices, and that may also have played a role. Kierstead and Klapaukh (2018, 388–92) do find that certain demes (esp. Kydathenaion and Lower Paiania) are over-represented among known festival liturgists. But there does not seem to be much evidence than certain demes were strikingly more politically active than the norm in general.

133 Staveley (1972, 50) can see reasons why demes would want to buy offices, but not why they would want to sell them. He appears to overlook simple lucre.


135 See e.g. Whitehead 1986, 150–158. The main tax here was the ἐκχρητικόν, levied on men from outside the deme who held land and on metics who had been granted the right to own land.


137 Taylor 2007, 72–90, esp. 75–76.
of decrees, orators, and generals – and one of her sources for the magistrates are the magisterial pinakia studied by Kroll that we discussed above.138

As we have seen, it seems likely that our tokens were brought in because the demes were already selling the offices they had been allotted. Our tokens may have mitigated the problem to some extent, but (again, as we have seen) they too were eventually deemed a failure and replaced in the 360s with a system involving klērotēria, after which point the demes were no longer taken into account in the allocation of offices. These magistracies were, instead, allotted ‘from the whole tribe’ (to use the phrasing of Ath. Pol. 62.1).

By removing the demes from the equation entirely, the Athenians made it impossible for poorer demes to sell offices that had been allocated to them – either to other demes, or to wealthy individuals. This removed a form of cheating or corruption; but in making this change I would suggest that the Athenians were, as often, motivated by a concern for political equality. That is, they wanted to make sure that all citizens had an equal chance of holding one of the offices they were allotting, and by the 360s involving the demes in the allotment procedure seemed to be more of a hindrance than a help.

From the late archaic period on, Greek city-states made use of groups of men – associations, civic subdivisions, and so on – in order (among other things) to disperse power and authority among the various stakeholders of the polis. Sometimes, as at Gortyn, groups (in this case the phylai, ‘tribes’) coincided roughly with great families, so that rotating the chief office of kosmos among the phylai prevented individual families from dominating the city’s affairs.139 At other times, as with the ten new phylai introduced by Kleisthenes around 508/7, groups were used partly as a way of creating random sub-sets of the citizenry from which offices could then be allotted and through which duties could be rotated (like, in the fifth-century, the duty of presiding over Assembly meetings).140

When Kleisthenes introduced a new system of demes as part of these same reforms, the demes must have seemed like a good example of associations that could be co-opted into the state to facilitate power-sharing among citizens. Hence, they were made the basis of allotments to the Council and to other sortitive magistracies. But though Kleisthenes may have drawn his map of the demes in a way that weakened existing power-structures in rural Attika, by the end of the fifth century at least local differences between the demes had reasserted themselves.141

And it is likely (as I suggested above) that the economic inequalities that this brought with it led to the problem of demes selling offices. The reforms we have been looking at – the introduction of our jigsaw tokens, and then of allotment machines – might even be viewed as very early and late instantiations of the same equalizing spirit that lay behind the great series of reforms that were introduced in the later decades of the fifth and early decade of the fourth century, a series of reforms so significant that they have recently been characterized as making up a new Athenian constitution.142 Though some of these reforms (like the introduction of a new body of ‘law-makers’ or nomothetai) were concerned with making the city’s decision-making more consistent, others clearly expanded the category of citizens who were politically active. One example of a reform of this nature is the introduction of pay for attendance at Assembly meetings sometime in the 390s.

Both of the reforms we have looked at in this paper can similarly be seen as part of an attempt to expand the set of the politically active Athenians by making sure all citizens had an equal chance to hold one of the minor magistracies. When our tokens were introduced – perhaps as early as the middle of the fifth century – they were part of an attempt at reducing the risk that demes would sell their offices to wealthy demes or individuals. Ironically enough, when our tokens were replaced in the 360s, this was also part of an attempt to

---

138 Taylor 2007, 73.

139 Here I follow the reconstruction of Grote 2016, 112–33.


141 If we accept the reading of Knoepfler (2016, 147–211); IG II¹ 1.447 shows that the Athenians were still using the demes as a basis for the allocation of sacrificial meat in the Lykourgan period. It may be, then, that it was only (or especially) in the political sphere that the Athenians felt a need for reform to defend strict egalitarianism; when it came to religious rituals – the sharing of meat at a sacrifice, for example – there was no reason not to continue to use the demes as a basis of distribution.

142 Carugati 2019.
deal with this form of corruption. The jigsaw tokens from the Athenian Agora were, then, a product of one of
democratic Athenians’ defining endeavours: to solve the puzzle of political equality. They were also, in the end,
one of the casualties of that same enterprise.
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Abstract

It is widely accepted that Classical Athens is to be credited with the introduction of tokens (gr. Symbola) in public administration. Accumulative evidence shows that tokens were used in the Council, the Jury Courts, and the Assembly. While the bronze lettered tokens have been convincingly assigned to the Jury Courts and the clay lettered tokens have been plausibly connected to the workings of the Assembly, there is a dearth of evidence when it comes to the Council. 144 The aim of the present paper is to gather all relevant literary and material sources to demonstrate that the Council was an issuer of tokens on a much broader scale than we may have originally thought, with the Council probably issuing – or at least supervising the issue of – all public tokens in Classical Athens. The premises lay within the functions and the jurisdiction of the Council. The earliest testimony of the Council as issuer of tokens, the Kleinias’ Decree, dated probably to 425/4 BCE (IG I3 34), has passed almost unnoticed in this regard. Likewise, the lead tokens found in and around the Old Bouleuterion and the Tholos have up till now not been regarded as a coherent lot.


There exist two different decrees inscribed on stone which bear testimony of the connections between the Council and tokens. The first of the two is the famous and much discussed Kleinias Decree, of which a marble copy was set up on the Acropolis. 145 With this decree special measures were announced to ensure that the tribute by the allies of the Delian League was paid and conveyed to Athens. Symbola are associated two verbs: First, the infinitive ‘shall be made’ (ποιεσθαι, line 11) with the ‘Council’ as subject. Second, the verb ‘let the city seal [the writing tablet] with the token’ (σεμεναμένε, lines 15-16), meaning that the written records were sealed by the tokens.

\(\ldots\) the Council and the officials

in the cities and the overseers

shall manage that

the tribute is collected each

\[143\] The paper arises from the Project ‘Tokens and their Cultural Biography in Athens from the Classical Age to the End of Antiquity’, a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Action, which has received funding under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 794080-2. The author wishes to thank Associate Professor Clare Rowan, PI of the ERC Project ‘Token Communities in the Ancient Mediterranean’ for her continuous support and Professor J.H. Kroll for comments on earlier drafts of this paper. A special debt of gratitude goes to Professor John McK. Camp II, director of the Excavation of the American School of Classical Studies at the Agora, Athens as well as to Sylvie Dumont, Registrar of the American School Excavations at the Athenian Agora.

\[144\] Jury Courts: Boegehold 1960; idem. 1995; Kroll in this volume; Assembly: Makrypodi 2019; Kroll in this volume; Makrypodi in this volume.

\[145\] IG I3 34; Attic Inscriptions Online: [https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/AIUK42/5](https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/AIUK42/5) (last accessed 18/11/2021) with references. Concerning the date of the Kleinias Decree: SEG 60, 78. Parts of the stone are kept at the Epigraphic Museum in Athens and parts of the stone are kept at the British Museum in London.
year and conveyed to Athens.

Tokens shall be made for the cities, so that it shall not be possible for those conveying the tribute to do wrong. Let the city write on a writing tablet the tribute which it is sending, and seal it with the token and send it to Athens; and those conveying it shall hand over the writing tablet in the Council to be read when they hand over the tribute. (...)

5

(...) τῆ]μ β

ολὲν καὶ τὰς ἄγχ[οντας ἑν] τὰς

1 πόλεις καὶ τὰς [ἐπισκό]πος κ

πιμέλσθαι ἴπτ[ος ἓν χρ]ισ[λᾶ

γεται ὡ]φόρος κ[εκτὰ τὸ ἔ]τος ἕ

10

ἐκαστὸν καὶ ἀπᾶ[γεται] Ἀθένα

ζε·γαῦμβαλὰ δὲ π[οιέσαι] φθαῖ π

φὸς τὰς πόλεις, ἴπτ[ος ἓ]μ μὲ ἰχσ

εὶ ἀδυνὰ[ν τὰς ἀπάνοια]ὶ τὸς φ

ὁρὸν· γράψασα δὲ ἕ]κ] πόλεις ἑς

15

γραμματεῖον τὸ[ν φόρον, ἴπτ]ὸν ἓν ἀποπέμπει, σεμο

ναμένε τὰ κυμβ[όλοι] ἀποπεμπάτω Ἀθέναζε· τὸς δὲ ἄ

Σεμένανε derives from σημαίνω, -ομαι, which means seal, provide with a sign. The term σῆμα (sēma) is of the same origin and signifies the sign, the token, the omen, the watchword. The above makes sēma almost a synonym to symbolon. Therefore, it is possible that sealing was a function intrinsic to symbola (tokens). It is stipulated that ‘symbola will be made for the allied cities’ and with these symbola, the cities will have to seal the written record of the amount paid which will accompany the tribute to Athens. This written record will be opened on delivery, read publicly, and compared with the tribute received. Although the text does not say so, it is only reasonable to think that the symbola on the written record (tablet) will have to be checked for their authenticity by means of comparison with symbola or other records kept in the possession of the Council. The reading of the tablet before the Council must have been accompanied by the verification of the seal.

These symbola were made for authentication. The purpose was to keep the tablet from being tampered with by persons entrusted with bringing the tribute by ship to Athens and to identify the senders of the tribute. They served also as a guarantee that the tribute was paid in full and conveyed to Athens as assessed and as it had been agreed. They guaranteed that the pact/agreement between the two parties – Athens and the ally – was respected, just like in the case of commercial contracts between cities and foreigners, which were also known under the same term but should not be confused with the symbola. Different sets of symbola should have been issued for each allied city.

For the Archaic and Classical Periods it has already been assumed that tokens could be anything: any kind of object could serve as symbola. In the case of the tokens which authenticated the allies’ tribute to Athens, the symbola functioned as seals, and could therefore – quite probably – have looked like seals. Because of this function which probably extended to their materiality, the symbola of the Kleinias Decree enabled multiple uses.

The second part of the Kleinias Decree demonstrates that particular importance was laid on the exact assessment of the payment and revenue management in general. The text goes on to show that the procedure was considered serious and regulated in detail. Legal processes were envisaged for anyone who was suspected of abusing the procedure. The Council was omnipotent in controlling the procedure and enforcing the measures for safeguarding it, so that it is only reasonable to believe that the ‘sealing tokens’ too were issued by the Council.

In the Neolithic Period in the Near East, tokens also played an important role in protecting resources. Although they were not seals and they had plain forms of cones, spheres, discs, ovoids, and cylinders – a total of twelve different shapes have been acknowledged – the clay tokens of the Neolithic Near East sealed clay envelopes, which in all likelihood represented debts, before being placed inside the envelopes. Denise Schmandt-Besserat suggests that the impressions on the sealed envelope allowed people to see quickly what was within. The Near Eastern tokens remained unchanged for several millennia between 9,000 and 3,500 BCE. They protected the content of the sealed envelopes and at the same time conveyed an array of information with different shapes and different sizes representing a variety of cereals and corresponding to different measures.

148 Hill and Meritt 1944, 11.
149 Gauthier 1972; Finglass in this volume.
150 Finglass in this volume: This is evidenced in particular because of the metaphorical use of the term symbolon as well as the literary testimonia which speak of dice and knuckle bones.
151 IG I 34, ll. 19-76. Several lines are missing and the last approx. twenty lines are fragmentarily preserved.
152 Wilding and Rowan 2017; Schmandt-Besserat 2019, 11-17.
The similarities of the Near Eastern tokens to the Athenian ones as described in the Kleinias Decree in terms of functions and materiality are striking and can potentially shed more light on the details of the procedure in Classical Athens. In both cases, tokens were used as seals in order to protect revenue or resources – cereals in the Near East, tribute in Athens. Furthermore, the analogy drawn with the Near Eastern tokens of the Neolithic Period reveals that Athenian ‘sealing tokens’ were probably used for the purposes of accounting. The text of the Kleinias Decrees has been acknowledged as the earliest extant testimony for the financial responsibilities exercised by the Council.\(^{153}\) Given the Council’s prominent role in collecting revenues and controlling public expenditure, and the extensive financial duties exercised in every aspect of the public affairs, it would not be too far-fetched to think of the ‘sealing tokens’ as a public instrument closely related to the workings of the Council. For how long the practice continued is not known. The picture is further complicated by the lack of findings in the archaeological record related to the ‘sealing tokens’.

A generation later in the honorific decree for Strato, the King of Sidon symbola are employed again, this time for foreign affairs.\(^{154}\) Lines 19 to 25 are of particular interest to the discussion of tokens.

And

let the Council also have tokens made

20

for the king of the Sidonians, so that

the People of Athens may know if the

king of the Sidonians sends anything when making

a request of the city, and the king of

the Sidonians may know whenever the people

25

of Athens sends anybody to him

As in the Kleinias Decree, the same verb is employed here, and the subject is the Council (‘ποιησάσθω δὲ καὶ σύμβολα ἡ βολὴ’, lines 18-19). Split symbola are at issue here with the Council keeping one half and the king of the Sidonians the other.\(^{155}\) These served to immediately identify the courtier, and they ensured the validity of the messages exchanged. Tokens appear once more in connection with the Council. The tokens in question could in fact have served also as seals.

The only split tokens we possess from Classical Athens are a set of four tokens dated to the third quarter of the fifth century BCE. These tokens certainly formed part of a much larger set used in the allotment procedure of the Offices in the Theseion. They were small tablets of fired clay, inscribed on both faces and cut along an irregular jig-saw line. They were inscribed on one side with the abbreviated name of each of the ten tribes, then they were cut in two along the middle of this inscribed name, they were turned with the blank side facing up. The upper half was inscribed with the demotic name and the bottom half with the magistracies, which were to be allotted. Tokens were marked proportionally with the names of the demes corresponding to the demes’ bouleutic quota, which

---

\(^{153}\) Rhodes 1972, 88–90 in connection to the tribute paid by the allies, and 88–134 for controlling revenue and expenditure in the army and the navy as well as religious life.  

\(^{154}\) IG II\(^{1}\) 141. Attic Inscriptions online: [https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/AIUK11/1](https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/AIUK11/1) (last accessed 18/11/2021) with references. The decree is dated to 394-386 BC (AIO). The stone was found on the Acropolis and is now kept at the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford.  

\(^{155}\) More on split symbola: Finglass in this volume.
meant that the size (population size) of the deme defined the number of councillors (*bouleutai*).

The outcome of the allotment procedure was guaranteed by the irregular jigsaw cutting, which enabled unique matching. Unique should have been the matching also for the symbola exchanged between Athens and the King of Sidon: one set should have been kept by the Athenians and the other by the King of Sidon and the two sets could be compared for verification.

It is almost certain that similar split clay tokens were employed for the allotment of all the magisterial boards and not only the *Poletai*, the board of ten magistrates, which are abbreviated on two of the preserved tokens as *POL*. Since the allotment to all magisterial boards was a procedure supervised by the Council, it is only reasonable to believe that allotment by split tokens was a procedure employed by the Council for all the other magisterial boards too. Besides the *poletai*, there were the treasurers of Athena, the *astynomoi*, the *apodektai*, the *agoranomoi*, *metronomoi*, as well as the *hieropoioi epi ta ekthymata*, the *hieropoioi kat’ eniauton* and the *athlothetai*, to mention only but a few. The *Athēnaiōn Politeia* refers to magistracies of the later fifth century BCE, by which time the apportionment of some magistracies among the demes had been abandoned in favour of apportionment by tribes. As such, it is doubtful that allotment by demes and cut symbola had lasted that late.

Four halves of split tokens have been preserved, the three just mentioned and another example known from the nineteenth century excavations at the *Dipylon*, an exceptionally low record in total. This is significant because it testifies that particular care was taken to dispose of the allotment utensils in a secure way so that the procedure could not be manipulated. In the Agora, the three tokens were thrown in what has been characterised as a rubbish pit, while the fourth token was thrown into a well, a common place to dispose of small objects.

---

**Material evidence: The Athenian Council House and its tokens**

The Council met regularly at a building specially designated for that purpose, the Original or Old Bouleuterion (Council House), which stood in the SW corner of the Agora and was erected around 460 BCE. The SW corner of the Agora was of particular political and administrative importance in the Classical Age. The Original or Old Bouleuterion was in use until the late fifth century, when the Metrōon (City Archive) was established in its premises, and the New Bouleuterion was built to the immediate west of the first one. The Prytany House stood next to the Old Bouleuterion and to the south of it and was known as the *Skias* or Tholos, because of its round shape.

A few meters to the east of the Tholos and the Old Bouleuterion, and aligned in a north-south direction, stood the Monument of the Ten Eponymous Heroes, where written public announcements were made. Tokens were excavated scattered in the area, delineated by the architectural remains of the above-described public buildings.

More tokens were excavated in the sand at the bottom of the Agora’s Great Drain. The course of the drain delineated the east facades of the Apollon Patrōnos Temple and the Metrōon (i.e. the Old Bouleuterion). It also delineated the eastern and southern sides of the Tholos, before turning to the southwest, where it was crossed by a bridge. It then passed along the south-eastern side of a rectangular building, the ‘Poros Building’, which has been interpreted as the State Prison.
Among the architectural remains of these buildings and the wider area of the south-west corner of the Classical Agora a particularly heavy concentration of lead tokens has been excavated, for many of which it is only reasonable to believe that they were in some way associated with the functions of the Council of Five Hundred.

The token types from the Council have a peculiar iconography which can be identified as state iconography, they bear distinctive legends (Δ-H and Π-E) and in total they are very different than all other tokens found in the rest of the Agora Square. The only ‘triobol token’ of the Athenian Agora comes from the area of the Council House

These tokens have several typological features in common. They are lead, coin-shaped and – with the exception of [fig. 8] – they can be dated to the fourth century BCE (at the earliest). Furthermore, they all bear designs which can be characterized as official state designs: the owl, the ‘triobol-type, and the Panathenaic amphora. The two lead lettered tokens (figs. 7 and 8) likewise relate to state functions.

Let us set aside for a moment the hypothesis put forward by Margaret Crosby that the lead lettered tokens can be considered as the Hellenistic successors of the fourth century BCE bronze lettered tokens, and that they assigned the jurors of the Hellenistic Period to their seats in the court room by analogy of their bronze forerunners.162 Alan L. Boegehold had reached the conclusion for the use of the bronze lettered tokens in the courts based not only on the finds at the Athenian Agora, but also on the literary testimony of the Atthidograph Philochoros, who preserved the information that the members of the Council began sitting by letter in 410/9 BCE.163 This will not the first instance that an equipment (objects) category can be attributed to the Jury Courts as well as to the Council. The other category is the bronze balls, some of them uninscribed and others inscribed with letters, which were used in the allotment machines (klērotēria).164 Of the nine bronze balls excavated in the Athenian Agora by the time Boegehold’s book was published (1995), six were found in the immediate vicinity of the Tholos and just two in the Square Peristyle, acknowledged as a fourth-century court, which stood on the place of the later Stoa of Attalos.165

The passage of the fourth century BCE Atthidograph Philochoros, referred to above, attests that ‘the Council was seated for the first time by letter in the year of the Eponymous Archon Glaukippos 410/9 BCE and that to the author’s day councilors continued to swear that they would sit in the section to which each one was allotted by

162 Crosby 1964, 86. Crosby comments at the beginning of catalogue Section I.
163 Boegehold et al. 1995, 71 and 155–56 source no. 73.
165 Boegehold et al. 1995, 66 cat. nos. BB2–BB7 found in the Tholos. Note also the find spot of terracotta ball ibid. cat. no. CB1. Ibid. 66 cat. no. BB8 in the Ballot Deposit (a hoard of objects, all related to the jurors’ courts) and ibid. 66 cat. no. BB9, very near the NW corner of the Square Peristyle (building of the early fourth century BCE, which housed the jurors’ courts). Kroll (in this volume) repudiates the use of lettered tokens for the seating of the members of the Council.
The text reads that the Councilors began ‘also’ to sit by letter, implying probably that the same procedure was applied elsewhere. Because the passage is just a fragment of a larger text it is not possible to say if the seating of the jurors (which is implied by the ‘also’) refers to arrangement older than the year of the Archon Glaukippos and that the jurors sat by letter already before the Councilors, or if it refers to arrangements of the fourth century BCE Jury Courts.

It is generally understood that it was the oligarchic coup of 411 BCE and the restoration of democracy soon afterwards that prompted the Athenians to take measures to protect their democratic procedures. The allotment of the councilors to seating areas by letters would have discouraged the creation of factions and the seating together of like-minded members, who could conspire and shout down the speaker and therefore manipulate the outcome of the debate.\(^{167}\)

The architectural remains suggest that in the New Bouleuterion the Councilors sat on wooden benches. Only in the late fourth or the early third century was a stone theatre-like structure installed with twelve rows, which could accommodate more than five hundred, which presumably also included a number of on-lookers.\(^{168}\) Wooden benches are also attested for the Assembly\(^{169}\) and the recently discovered lot of clay lettered tokens showed that the participants in the Assembly sat by letter.\(^{170}\) Therefore, the wooden benches were probably the kind of equipment ‘compatible’ with seating by letters.

[INSERT FIG9 HERE]

Of the two lettered tokens the one with the caduceus (fig. 7) should probably date to the second century BCE when many letter cutters executed serifs and broken-bar Alphas. In my opinion, this Hellenistic lead lettered token must be examined together with another lead lettered token this time countermarked with a caduceus. The token bears a dull impression of Athena head left on side A, which fills the entire metal round. It was excavated on the north slope of the Areopagus (fig. 9).\(^{171}\) Hellenistic lead lettered tokens bear often added symbols in the field, or they are countermarked by the same symbols. The symbols are consistent: caduceus,\(^{172}\) kernos,\(^{173}\) bunch of grapes,\(^{174}\) ear of wheat,\(^{175}\) and an owl seating on a panathenaic amphora’s belly.\(^{176}\) The custom of adding a symbol should have begun already with the bronze juror’s tokens.\(^{177}\) The meaning and the function of these ‘added symbols’ cannot be defined with any certainty. They could denote ‘time stamps’ for different sessions. But given the fact that the Council met very often – almost every day – the ‘time stamps’ seem highly improbable. It would be interesting to think that the caduceus was the typical design for the lettered tokens of the Council, given the

---

\(^{166}\) FGrHist 328F140; Boegehold et al 1995, 65 and 155–56 source no. 73: όφησι γάρ Φελώχορος ἐπὶ Γλαύκιππου «καὶ ἡ βουλή κατὰ γράμμα τότε πρώτον ἐκαθέζετο καὶ ἔτι νῦν ὀμνύσιν ἀπ’ ἐκείνου καθεδείσθαι ἐν τοῖς γράμματι ἥν ἄν λαμβάνειν».


\(^{169}\) Aristophanes, Ekklesiazousai, II. 21, 86–87; Hansen 1976, 131.

\(^{170}\) Makrypodi 2019; Kroll in this volume; Makrypodi in this volume.

\(^{171}\) Crosby 1964, 88 L17 (IL1463). The date results from the New Style head on the other face of the token. By coincidence it bears also the letter Alpha.

\(^{172}\) Svoronos 1900, 324 (no. 37 pl. I,22, pl. I,31) and 325 (no. 69 pl. I,49).

\(^{173}\) Crosby 1964, 87 L5 pl. 19 and 88 L18 pl. 19 (= fig. 8 in this paper) with countermark in the form of kernos.

\(^{174}\) Svoronos 1900, 325 (no. 70 pl. I,50).

\(^{175}\) Svoronos 1900, 325 (no. 66 pl. I,45).

\(^{176}\) Svoronos 1900, 323 (no. 19 pl. I,10).

\(^{177}\) Svoronos 1898, 65/20 (nos. 109–10 pl. ΣΤ’ 1-2 with Kernos); 55/19 (nos. 107–08 pl. ΣΤ’ 3-4 with owl); 56–57/20–21 (nos. 112–18 pl. ΣΤ’ 5–10 with Bacchos ring); Boegehold et al. 1995, 76 (T36 pl. 12, Agora B1160) and ibid. 76 (T37 pl. 12, Agora B1161 with kernos); ibid. 76 (T38 pl. 12 with owl).
symbolism of the design and its connections to the functions of the Council. Another possibility is that the designs refer to the magistrate or the Councilor who distributed the tokens, i.e. it was his personal identity badge. This latter possibility has a lot to recommend it. Token types of the Roman Imperial Period are inscribed ΓΡΑ ΒΟΥ (= ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΩΣ ΤΗΣ ΒΟΥΛΗΣ, meaning ‘Of the secretary of the Council’), giving particular prominence to one of the members of the ‘prytany’ contingency.  

The other token stamped with a letter bears the head of Athena on the other side, of a style very similar to the New Style coinage of the city (fig. 8). This is a secure anchor point in order to date the type to the second century BCE. There has been a continuous dialogue between coin types and token types in Athens beginning with the bronze jurors’ tokens of the fourth century BCE. William Bubelis argues that particular care was taken to distinguish the types and that in no occasion was a coin die used for tokens. This may apply for the fourth century BCE, but the New Style Athena Heads on the token of fig. 8 expresses the need to lend authority to the procedure in which these tokens were used by means of their iconographic relevance to coinage. They should be seen as the earliest conscious attempt to imitate coin types in the Hellenistic period.

Tokens for the councilors’ pay

Two other tokens in the Tholos (figs. 2 and 6) bear the all-too famous image of the Athenian owl. The type of the facing owl between two olive sprays ‘borrows’ the so-called triobol type of the fourth century BCE silver triobols. Three obols was the jurors’ pay as introduced in 425 BCE and this remained the same during the fourth century BCE. The occurrence of tokens with the ‘triobol type’ – first spotted in collections – along with the testimony preserved in the Athēnaiōn Politeia that the jurors received a token bearing the letter Gamma (Γ), a sign equivalent to the number three, has led to the assumption that the triobol tokens were the tokens that were exchanged for jury service.

The recovery of one such token in the Tholos trench and another one in the Great Drain to the south of the Tholos proves particularly puzzling. Were these voucher tokens intended for the Councillors’ pay? Attendance to the Council’s meeting was compulsory and the contingent of the five hundred councillors remained unaltered for the entire councillor’s year. Therefore, the use of pay tokens seems to have been redundant.

But if pay tokens were indeed used for safeguarding the attendance, would they have been the ones of the ‘triobol type’? This is only possible if the design on the token was not compelling or it was not so important as it was on a coin. When placed on tokens, the ‘triobol type’ probably ‘lost’ its original significance. The ‘triobol type’ would have designated money, but not the value of three obols or the exchange with three obols. Only future research can prove the validity of this assumption, because the fact remains that the councillor’s daily pay amounted to

178 More on these tokens: Gikaki forthcoming.

179 Note how much more distinct the Athena heads are on the bronze jurors’ tokens (Boegehold et al. 1995) and the contemporary Athenian coinage (Flament 2007, 121–32).

180 Engel 1884, 5 (no. 1 pl. I); Svoronos 1900, 333 (no. 172 pl. III,15).

181 Kroll in this volume.

182 Kroll 1993, 20–21 (no. 19); 25–26; 35–37 and 39 (nos. 35-37).

183 Athēnaiōn Politeia 68, 2; Loomis 1998, 15–16 and 26.

184 Kroll in this volume.
five obols, and that those serving as *prytaneis* received only an additional one obol daily (ration money, *εἰς σίτησιν ὀβολὸς*). Although these two arguments – the compulsory attendance and the daily stipend of five/six obols – seem to disassociate the triobol tokens from the Council, their find spot still needs further assessment.

**Tokens and civic administration**

Despite all the known difficulties in the interpretation of tokens and the questions left open regarding their functions and roles, it can nevertheless be established that tokens were used in the city’s administration and in the three main Athenian institutions: the Council, the Assembly, and the Jury Courts.

The Council had complex administrative duties which covered broad areas of Athenian public life: finance, the army and navy, religion. The Council worked together with several boards, which were either manned by the Councilors themselves or they were chosen by the Councilors. One way or another, the Council stood higher in the hierarchy and kept a permanent eye on them and through them exercised control over Athenian public life. Tokens may have been issued and distributed either by the Council directly or by the boards. Tokens for the Assembly are in fact closely related to the Council. For the Assembly tokens there exists substantial literary testimonia and a lot of clay lettered tokens has been recently assigned to the Assembly with persuasive arguments. The Assembly tokens were issued and distributed by one such a board: the Convenors of the People (*syllogeis tou demou*). They were a committee of thirty, three from each tribe, who were selected among the year’s Councilors and administered the distribution of Assembly tokens. Valuable testimony of that is provided by the decree of the Aigeis tribe praising the three tribal representatives who served as Convenors of the People in 341/0 BCE.

Tokens for the Assembly assigned participants to seating areas. They ensured that the citizens who arrived at the entrances of the Assembly and were checked by tribes took random seats at the auditorium, so that the building of factions was impossible. Furthermore, there are two more aspects which deserve particular mention regarding the role of tokens as state equipment in the workings of the Assembly. First, the tokens’ role was to make sure that the necessary quorum was reached. By distributing a pre-arranged number of 6,000 lettered tokens it should have been possible to count, at a glance, the number of participants who had already entered and taken seats in the auditorium. The second point which is related to the first, is that the distribution of tokens regulated the expenditure. This was of particular significance because the Assembly pay constituted one of the major items of the budget for the Athenian state: it amounted to fifty talents per year. Only the first 6,000 receivers of tokens would have received the daily stipend to the disappointment of late comers. In the opposite case, distribution of more than 6,000 tokens would cause unnecessary increases in expenditure; keeping the number under control would have saved the state avoidable expense. Therefore, tokens played an important role

---

186 Makrypodi 2019, 34; Makrypodi in this volume: Kroll in this volume.
189 Cf. the very informative analysis by Kroll in this volume.
190 Assembly pay was introduced in order to motivate attendance: *Athenaiōn Politeia* 41, 3; Gauthier 1993, 232–50; Hansen 1991, 150.
191 Hansen 1976, 133.
in the logistics of the Assembly meetings and the related bookkeeping.\footnote{Argued in detail by Gkikaki (forthcoming).} The importance of this is suggested by the critical turn that events took in 348 BCE, when financial difficulties and a shortage of money prevented the Jury Courts from meeting.\footnote{Demosthenes, Contra Boetum 1, 17. For the financial crisis of the fourth century BCE, the inflation and the impact on wages, Gallo (1987, 19–63) paints a colorful picture.}

With its executive committee – the fifty 

\textit{prytaneis} – the Council would have the necessary authority for issuing tokens. The keys of the temple treasuries, where in essence the state money was kept, along with the state/ public seal, were under the Council’s jurisdiction.\footnote{For the dating of the state/ public seal: Lewis 1955, 32–34; Douglas Olson 1996, 253–54.} These were kept in the Tholos and were the responsibility of the 

\textit{epistatēs}, who was picked by lot from among the 

\textit{prytaneis} and had, in effect, supremacy over the whole state for a whole day.\footnote{\textit{Athēnaiōn Politeia} 44.1; Rhodes 1981, 531–32.} There is evidence that there was not just one public seal, but the various boards of magistrates made use of their own seal.\footnote{Particularly revealing is the case of the token stamped with the same seal of seated Dionysos as the sealing found on two pots – probably measures and two lead weights (Crosby 1964, 95 L86 pl. 22 with references).} It is no surprise that tokens found in and around the building complex related to the Council bear official state designs, i.e. the owl framed by two olive sprays in the so-called ‘triobol type) (\textit{figs. 2 and 6a}), the cicada (\textit{fig. 6b}), the Panathenaic Amphora inscribed Δ-Η (\textit{fig. 11}), the kernos (\textit{fig. 12}) they bear the designs of the public seals. The administering of the state seal is closely related to the functioning not only of the Council but also of the State Archive, which was established in the late fifth century BCE in the building complex of the Old Bouleuterion.\footnote{Boegehold 1972, 23–30.} The state seal, the utensil for the Council’s administrative duties, inevitably connects to the sealing tokens of the Kleinias Decree and may potentially reveal more on the role and the functions of these tokens. This should remain speculative for the time being because of lack of concrete evidence. To the catalogue compiled above, we may add tokens coming from two lots of the Great Drain, in the immediate vicinity of the Tholos and for which we have good reason to believe that they constitute refuse from the nearby complex of civic buildings – the Tholos, the New Bouleuterion and the State Archive (Metōon). That the two lots in fact belong together is proved by the type Crosby L161 (\textit{fig. 11}), which was found in both the pocket H12: 19 in the floor of the Great Drain (third to second century BCE context) and the filling H12: 1 (context dated to the last quarter of the second century BCE).

The token with the amphora framed by the letters Δ-Η left and right (\textit{fig. 11}) has a lot to recommend it as a public token. The Panathenaic amphora has been long acknowledged as an Athenian state design found on a variety of
media from early times, and used on coinage as well as weights and measures.\textsuperscript{199} In my opinion, the inscription Δ-Η is self-evident. It refers to Dēmosion (ΔΗΜΟΣΙΟΝ, i.e. public), a well-attested term, and known to be combined with state designs, such as the owl. It is found on a variety of media such as ballots, roof-tiles, the dining equipment for the prytaneis, as well as weights and measures kept in the Tholos.\textsuperscript{200} According to the most recent analysis on the subject, the meaning of the inscription is that the object is destined for use by the people and it is meant to distinguish this stamp from others, which are not state stamps.\textsuperscript{201} Although the token type in question is the only case of a type inscribed Δ-Η which has been excavated in the Agora, more are known from other contexts. Svoronos records five different types which bear the abbreviation Δ-Η.\textsuperscript{202} Svoronos thinks that these refer to Demeter, but the abbreviation of personal names and gods’ names would be quite unusual. All five types bear designs which refer to grain and therefore their association to public grain distributions seems very probable.\textsuperscript{203} In that case, they stand in juxtaposition to similar types, some of them uninscribed but others with inscriptions, which have not been adequately explained and may refer to grain distributions of private initiative.\textsuperscript{204}

The kernos is likewise an official design of the Athenian state (\textbf{fig. 12}).\textsuperscript{205} It is a vase of biconical shape, often lidded. Because of its connection to Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries, which were a source of pride for the Athenians, the kernos should have been a very prestigious symbol. It is found on coins, on the bronze jurors’ tokens, and of course on lead tokens.\textsuperscript{206} The variety of its representation in the latter case is remarkable.\textsuperscript{207} But a type almost identical to the kernos token of the Tholos and probably from the same die has been excavated on the Pnyx from a context of the fourth century, which proves that the Tholos specimen could date much earlier than the context it was excavated in.\textsuperscript{208} In fact it comes from the construction fill of Pnyx III, where reconstruction began ca. 346–2 BCE, which proves that the kernos token type is contemporary, if not earlier to the earliest occurrence on Athenian coinage.\textsuperscript{209}

The token with the palmette (\textbf{fig. 13}) and the token with the rosette (\textbf{fig. 14}) bear simple, universal designs, which could stand for every possible use or could represent an institution, a commission, a civic body, or even a magistracy. They are enigmatic, despite their simplicity. As a result of these features they are both identified as typical designs of the early and middle Hellenistic Period. These designs have not been recorded accompanied by an inscription, and therefore every interpretation remains speculative to a degree. For all the significance it may have, it should be mentioned that the only lead token which has been excavated in Olynthos is a lead token with

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{199} Lang 1964, 5–8; Kroll 1993, 62 no. 76; Killen 2017, 96–97.
  \item \textsuperscript{200} Lang 1964, 14, 15 fig. 6 (dining equipment), 31, 32 fig. 35 (lead weight), 36 (official liquid measure), 37 (official dry measure); Killen 2017, 139–40 for an overview.
  \item \textsuperscript{201} Killen 2017, 139–40.
  \item \textsuperscript{202} Svoronos 1900, 339–40 nos. 259–63.
  \item \textsuperscript{203} Svoronos 1900, 339 no. 259–260 Demeter head: ear of Grain inscribed Δ-Η, no. 261 Demeter head: horn of plenty inscribed Δ-Η and no. 262 (uniface) plow inscribed Δ-Η and 340 no. 263 with ant walking on two feet and carrying an agricultural tool, in the field kernos.
  \item \textsuperscript{204} Crosby 1964 (90–92 L43-L56 pl. 20) publishes tokens for grain distribution inscribed EP and EPMI.
  \item \textsuperscript{205} Killen 2017, 181–82.
  \item \textsuperscript{206} Kroll 1993, 30 fn. 34 with kernos as an added symbol on one of the fifteen emission of the ELEUSI – coinage (ca. 350s – early or mid-330’s BCE and Kroll 1993, 47 no. 61 (third century BCE, undated) for the earliest occurrence of the kernos as a coin type. Kernos on the bronze juror’s tokens: Svoronos 1898, 56/20 no. 111 with reference (Kernos is the main type on side A) and Boegehold et al. 1995, 76 (T37 pl. 12). Kernos countermark on lead lettered token: Crosby 1964, 87 (L5 pl. 19) and kernos on lead tokens: Crosby 1964, 105–06 (L203–L205 pl. 26) with references.
  \item \textsuperscript{207} Gkikaki 2020, 107.
  \item \textsuperscript{208} Davidson and Burr Thompson 1943, 106 (no. 8 (M69) with fig. on p. 107).
  \item \textsuperscript{209} Refer to n. 63 above.
\end{itemize}
a palmette on one side and a spray with ivy leaves in incuse on the other. It is more than probable that this token should have travelled from Athens. It can only remain speculative if the token travelled in fulfillment of some official function or the circumstances are purely coincidental.

Another token from the filling H 12: 1 bears a ship’s prow (fig. 15). Likewise, tokens with a ship or ship’s prow are not accompanied by inscriptions, a fact which renders their interpretation particularly challenging. This is compounded by the fact that Classical Athens was notorious for its naval power and that the ship crews of that time were pro-democratic. In the Hellenistic period the city’s naval power had diminished but there was inherent prestige in these representations which should have been particularly appealing to the entire population. It would not be too far off to similarly consider a public function for this token type.

In this category of public token, the type with the corselet is also perfectly at home (fig. 16). All we know of about tokens depicting pieces of armour point to the direction of tokens distributed centrally and fulfilling some public purpose.

If an alternative view of the tokens with the Panathenaic amphora and the kernos should be offered, then it is obvious that they both refer to festivals, and specifically those festivals in which the Council is well-known to have played an important role. Both the Panathenaea and the Eleusinian Mysteries were state cults and were administered by the Council. The distribution of festival tokens would have meant the distribution of portions after the sacrifices, procedures which are attested epigraphically and were managed by the boards of hieropoiei.

The connections of the multiple token types presented above to the Boule cannot be properly justified without explaining that the Council was the principal administrator of the city’s finances. The Council managed the Doiēkēsis, the general fund in the financial administration of the Athenian polis. It provided the daily stipends for attendance in the Council and the Jurors’ Courts and at the same time – assisted by the Board of Apodektai (the receivers) – it received revenues from tribute collection (in the fifth century, at least) and from tax contracts and mine leasing later. In the middle of the fourth century BC an important change in the city’s financial administration took place: the Theōric Fund was created or – at least – reformed. This fund received all surplus revenue, until Demosthenes redirected surpluses to the Military Fund in 339/8 BCE. It was managed by a board, ‘hoi epi to theōrikon’, one of the many boards who worked closely with the Assembly and administered considerable sums of money. The Theōric fund is better known for the distribution of theōrika which enabled citizens to attend festivals, but literary sources credit the Theōric fund with all sorts of public works.

Scholarship has always considered the theōrika to be distributions in cash but tokens inscribed ΠΕ or ΠΕΝ just as [fig. 3] presented above, provide probably valuable evidence that the distribution involved tokens. The
abbreviation may stand for *pentadrachmia*, the term for the distributions at the Great Dionysia, yet another major and costly festival which was administered by the Council.\textsuperscript{219}

To sum up, the Council employed tokens in order to carry out a certain amount of day-to-day business. The argumentation developed in this chapter on the sealing tokens attested in the Kleinias Decree, as well as the functions of the tokens for the Assembly meetings, show that tokens deserve a mention in Athenian fiscal policy of the Classical period. Although it is not possible to determine the function of each individual token, the cataloguing of the tokens excavated in and around the Council house has nevertheless demonstrated that the logistics as well as the accounts associated with Athenian public finance (public revenue and public expenditure) were administered by official tokens handled by the Boule.

**Captions**

Fig. 1 Find spots of lead tokens in the Athenian Agora after a plan of the American school of Classical Studies, remastered by the graphic designer Matthias Demel.

Fig. 2. Uniface lead token, 15mm. Agora IL624. Tholos Trench D with material from the sixth and fifth centuries and occasionally as early as the third century. Layer III (Section Z #1251). Owl facing between two olive sprays. Crosby reports that the letters AΘΕ were barely visible on this specimen, but this was not confirmed by the author. Published: Crosby 1964, 100 (L144 pl. 24). https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/agoral144 (Last accessed 21/11/2021). Another specimen (Agora IL821) of this type was found in the area of the Odeon of Agrippa (section ΩΔ #88 with dumped material).

Fig. 3. Uniface lead token, 12mm. Agora IL615. Tholos (H 11), Late Roman context. Herakles dragging with his left hand a beast left, club over right shoulder, Letter Epsilon (Ε) retrograde in field left, Letter Pi (Π) should be assumed to have existed in field right. Published: Crosby 1964, 96 (L90 pl. 22). https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/agoral90 (Last accessed 21/11/2021). Cf. Svoronos 1900, 335 (no. 192 pl. III, 38) for a token of this type inscribed ΠΕ.

Fig. 4. Uniface lead token, 14mm. Agora IL1167. Northeast of Tholos (H11) Amphora, traces of letters to left (?) all in wreath (?). Published: Crosby 1964, 101 (L158 pl. 25).

Fig. 5. Lead token, 13mm. Agora IL1163. Northeast of Tholos (H11), Section Z #1753. Side A: A centaur galloping right with upraised right arm, side B: Uncertain representation. Large chip, about one third of whole missing. Published: Crosby 1964, 94 (L70 pl. 21). https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/agoral70 (Last accessed 21/11/2021).

Fig. 6. Lead token, 16mm. Agora IL1134. Section B’ #947, Great Drain to the S of the Tholos. Side A: Owl right in wreath, side B: Cicada, three incuse dots as countermarks Published: Crosby 1964, 94 (L73 pl. 21); Gkikaki 2021, 71 (no. 5). https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/agoral73 (Last accessed 21/11/2021).

Fig. 7. Uniface lead token, 23mm. Agora IL54. Section Z #100, from context of third century CE in Great Drain (G13). Letter Alpha with ‘broken’ the horizontal bar and apices, winged caduceus of the same size as the letter in the field left. Published: Crosby 1964, 87 (L7 pl. 19). https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/agoral7 (Last accessed 21/11/2021).


Fig. 9. Lead token, Agora IL1463 31mm. Side A: Helmed Athena head right (dull impression). Side B: Letter A with curved diagonal bars, countermarked with winged caduceus (kerykeion) in the field left. Published: Crosby 1964, 88 (L17 pl. 19). https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/agorail1463 (Last accessed 24/11/2021).

Fig. 10. Lead token, ΒΟΛΗ: Letter Epsilon or Sampi (image after Engel 1884, 5 no. 1 pl. I).

Fig. 11. Lead uniface token, 15mm, Agora IL647, this object depicted here (pocket H 12: 19). Amphora, inscribed: Δ – Η in field lower left and lower right respectively, all enclosed in ivy wreath. Cf. the Lead uniface token, 14mm, from a different die than Agora IL697 (filling H 12: 1). Published: Crosby 1964, 102 (L161 pl. 25). https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/agorail647 (Last accessed 25/11/2021).

Fig. 12. Lead uniface token, 11mm, Agora IL646 (pocket 12: 19). Lidded kernos on ground line with wheat through each handle. Published Crosby 1964, 106 (L204 pl. 26). https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/agorail646 (Last accessed 25/11/2021).


Fig. 15. Lead uniface token, 17mm, Agora IL1123 (H12:1). Ship prow left. Published: Crosby 1964, 107—08 (L224 pl. 27).

Fig. 16. Lead uniface token, 16mm, IL1122 (H12:1). Thorax. Published: Crosby 1964, 108 (L227c pl. 27).
Athenian tokens between the fourth century BCE and the third century CE covered several functions: the legend and/or the device link some of them to the tribes. Ten territorial tribes were founded by Cleisthenes in 508/7 and named after ten heroes chosen by lot by the Delphic Pythia (Athēnaiōn Politeia 21.2–6). As time went by, this system underwent a number of modifications. In 201/0, the Dēmetrias and Antigonis tribes, founded in 307/6, were abolished; a few months later, the Attalis tribe was added. In 224/3, the Ptolemais was created, joined in the 120’s CE by the Hadrianis.

Tribal affiliation had a role during political activities stricto sensu, but also in different spheres of everyday life. Archaeology and epigraphy provide us with evidence, especially for the fifth and fourth centuries. This chapter provides the first systematic study of tribal tokens: it aims at discussing how lead tokens with legends and/or devices connecting them to tribes (from now on: tribal tokens) were used, and at understanding their role for the functioning of the polis of Athens and its subdivisions. I will try to redefine a corpus of tokens for which a tribal attribution is certain or very likely and

I wish to thank the Numismatic Museum at Athens for allowing me to carry out autopsy of AIA1 (1, 2), O1, H1-3, take new pictures and publish them, and the Agora Excavations (and especially S. Dumont and C. Mauzy) for providing me with a good quality picture of H6. I am greatly indebted to M. Gkikaki for all her help and valuable insights and for her rare and infinite patience, J. Kierstead and J. H. Kroll for providing me with feedback and, together with S. Makrypodi and M.G. Rizzi, for allowing me to read their manuscripts before publication. None of them is responsible for remaining flaws. Dates are BCE, unless otherwise stated. The asterisks next to the catalogue numbers denote that the specimen is illustrated. Most of the types and the specimens can be identified in the Nomisma Database https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/ and https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/ which is deposited in Warwick’s institutional repository as well as in the Nomisma.org repository. All data are encoded in NUDS EAD format, as generated by the open-source software Numishare (https://github.com/ewg118/numishare).

Crosby 1964, esp. 77–78. On tribes and their functions in Classical period see e.g. Jones 1999, esp. chapters 5 and 6; Humphreys 2018, II 721–65; on the eponymous heroes see Kearns 1989, esp. 80–92; on their figurative representations (on tokens too), Kron 1976, passim.

See Jones 1987, 31–39, briefly outlining changes through centuries; for a date between 124 and 128 for the creation of tribe Hadrianis see Leone 2018, 329 with n. 36 with previous bibliography.

For a review of the epigraphic and archaeological documentation concerning tribes in the fifth and fourth centuries see Russo forthcoming.

For clay jigsaw tokens bearing tribal names see Kierstead in this volume.
afterwards discuss their uses, by bearing in mind that such objects might often be later than the centuries about which we are most well-informed.226

A short note on previous studies

In the nineteenth century, many scholars (such as A. Postolacca, A. Dumont, O. Benndorf, and A. Engel) focused their attention on lead tokens, either those stored in the Numismatic Museum in Athens (constituting the biggest collection and also housing the collection of the Archaeological Society) or in several European museums, and noticed the connection of some types with tribes.227 When publishing a selection of tokens stored in the Numismatic Museum in 1900, Svoronos identified forty-six tokens which he could consider as tribal.228 A few new types were published by M. Crosby in 1964, together with their findspots in the Athenian Agora excavation grid.229

While the connection of tokens with tribes was already established in the nineteenth century, understanding how they were employed has always been considered difficult to detect. In the introduction to his catalogue, Postolacca reports the opinion of Prokesch-Osten concerning the use of Attic tokens as coinage produced by the demes and the tribes for a local use.230 Benndorf discusses them together with other types in a chapter dedicated to the Boule, the Lawcourts, and the Assembly, hinting at a function in the latter.231 Dumont hypothesizes a cultic usage of some tokens and a public one for others.232 According to Crosby, tribal or deme tokens (i.e. “tokens naming tribes or demes”) could have been used in the Assembly, during festivals (such as the Great Dionysia), or for wheat

226 All specimens I know whose pertinence to tribes is certain or highly likely are detailed in the table.

227 Postolacca 1866, passim; Postolacca 1868, passim; Dumont 1870, 75–77; Benndorf 1875, esp. 602–03; Engel 1884, 5–6.

228 Svoronos 1900, 328–32 cat. nos. 112–58.


230 Postolacca (1868, 269-70) discusses tokens generally, but the idea is certainly based on the presence of types showing an explicit connection with civic subdivisions.

231 Benndorf 1875, 596–605.

232 Dumont (1970, 77) believes P1 to be a product of the state, meant to point out that tribe Pandionis was the prytanizing one, as he interprets the monogram on side B as a way to shorten ‘προεδρους’ (the magistrates chairing the sessions, in accusative case).
distribution. In the Assembly and in the theatre, more specifically, tribal tokens were thought to show where to sit.

Towards a corpus of tribal tokens: legends and symbols

Tribe Erechtheis

E1: Dionysus in a long chiton, standing left, with a kantharos in his right hand and a thyrsos in the left one, all in incuse / tripod with a small thyrsus on its left side; in the field right: EPEXΘ. [https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.139](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.139) (last accessed 30/12/2021)

1*. Athens, Numismatic Museum E. 2060, 17mm, Svoronos 1900, 330 no. 139 pl. II 23. [https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.II.no.23](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.II.no.23) (last accessed 30/12/2021).

2*. Athens, Numismatic Museum 3099a. 17 mm, Postolacca 1866, 351 no. 222 with pl.= Benndorf 1875, 617 no. 42 with pl. = Svoronos 1900, 330 no. 140.

3*. London, British Museum B.8463 (CGR264975) 12 mm, 1.43 g, unpublished specimen. [https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/C_B-8463](https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/C_B-8463) (last accessed 8/1/2022)

E2: EPEXΙΘΕΙΔΟΣ/–.

* Athens, at the time kept in Spyridon Comnos’ private collection, approx. 20 mm. Postolacca 1868, 314 with commentary to no. 13 = Benndorf 1875, 601 no. I.1 and 617 no. 35 with pl.

Tribe Aigeis

AIG1: helmeted Athena’s bust right; on the right: ΑΙΓΕΙΣ/–. [https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.118](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.118) (last accessed 30.12.2021)

* Athens, Numismatic Museum, 3094a, 16 mm, Svoronos 1900, 329 no. 118 pl. II 13. [https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.II.no.13](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.II.no.13) (last accessed 30/12/2021).

233 Crosby 1964, 78, 80.

234 See Crosby 1964, 78; see also Pickard-Cambridge 1968, 269–70 and Winkler 1990, 40–41 for the theatre; Stanton and Bicknell 1987, 85 for the Assembly.

235 The Collection of Roman and Athenian lead tesserae at the Department of Coins and Medals at the British Museum is under study by Clare Rowan and Mairi Gkikaki respectively.
AIG2: helmeted Athena’s head right; below, a plough; on the right: \( \text{ΑΙΓΕΙ}[\Sigma]/ \).  
*Athens, Numismatic Museum, 3946b, 14 mm, Postolacca 1868, 274 no. 100 = Svoronos 1900, 329 no. 119 pl. II 12.  
[https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.119](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.119) (last accessed 30/12/2021).

AIG3: \( \text{ΑΙΓ}/\text{ΕΥΣ}, \) clipped edges/ –.  
[https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.281](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.281) (last accessed 31/12/2021).

*Athens, Numismatic Museum, E. 3091, 12 mm, Svoronos 1900, 342 no. 281 pl. IV 38.  
[https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.IV.no.38](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.IV.no.38) (last accessed 31/12/2021).

**Tribe Pandionis**

P1: \( \text{ΠΑΝΔ}/\text{ΟΝΙΣ}/ \) monogram consisting of \( \Pi, \, \rho, \, \Delta \).  
[https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.157](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.157) (last accessed 31/12/2021)

*Athens, Numismatic Museum, 3101, 17 mm, Postolacca 1866, 354 no. 282 with pl. = Benndorf 1875, 617 no. 38 with pl. = Svoronos 1900, 332 no. 157 pl. II 37.  
[https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.II.no.37](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.II.no.37) (last accessed 8/1/2022).

**Tribe Leontis**

L1: Bearded man (Leos?) sitting on a rock, towards left, with his head turned right, wearing a himation from his hips below, carrying a vase in the right hand. Next to him and crowning him, Nike in smaller size; on the left: \( \text{ΛΕΩΣΙΣ}/\text{ΝΙΚΗ}/ \).  
[https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.103](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.103) (last accessed 31/12/2021)

1*. Athens, Numismatic Museum, 3134*, 22 mm, Svoronos 1900, 327-328 no. 103, pl. III 1.  
[https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.III.no.1](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.III.no.1) (last accessed 31/12/2021).

2. Athens, Numismatic Museum, 3135*, 20 mm, Svoronos 1900, 328 no. 104.

3. Athens, Numismatic Museum, 3136*, 20 mm, Svoronos 1900, 328 no. 105.

4. Athens, Numismatic Museum, 3137*, 19 mm, Svoronos 1900, 328 no. 106.


6. Athens, Numismatic Museum, E. 1538, 22 mm, Svoronos 1900, 328 no. 108.


L2: \( \text{ΛΕΩ}/ \) Lion right/Facing bearded head.

Athens, Numismatic Museum, approx. 13-14 mm, Postolacca 1868, 276 no. 151 = Benndorf 1875, 602 no. IV.8.
L3: Lion head right; above: ΛΕΩ (retrograde), in incuse/ a horse; above: API. https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.148a (last accessed 31/12/2021)
*Athens, Numismatic Museum, 15 mm, Svoronos 1900, 331 no. 148a pl. II 30.

L4: ΛΕΩ, clipped edges/ –. https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.149 (last accessed 8/1/2022)
*Athens, Numismatic Museum, 3100c, 15 mm, Postolacca 1868, 325 no. 73 = Benndorf 1875, 602 no. IV.7 = Svoronos 1900, 331 no. 149 pl. II 31. https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.II.no.31 (last accessed 8/1/2022).

Tribe Akamantis

AKA1: AKA, clipped edges/-
*Munich, Staatliche Münzsammlung, tray number: 19-116, 12 mm, 3.76 g, unpublished.236

Tribe Oineis

O1: Helmeted Oineus, standing frontal and naked, right arm hanging loosely, carrying a shield with his left hand; leaning on a spear; on the left: ΟΙΝΕΥΣ/ –. https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.289 (last accessed: 8/1/2022)
*Athens, Numismatic Museum, 1557, 15 mm, 2.16 g, Svoronos 1900, 343 no. 289 pl. IV 43. https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.IV.no.43 (last accessed 8/1/2022).

Tribe Kekropis

K1: KEK, clipped edges/–. https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.146 (last accessed 8/1/2022)

2. Athens, Numismatic Museum, 3100A, 14 mm, Svoronos 1900, 331 no. 147.

Tribe Hippothontis

236 The publication of the collection of the Athenian lead tokens at the Staatliche Münzsammlung, Munich is under preparation by M. Gkikaki.
H1: *Token pierced on top at the centre. Mare right suckling child with an owl in field above and a kalathos on the right/–.* [https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.143](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.143) (last accessed 8/1/2022).

*Athens, Numismatic Museum, 3099c, 24 mm, 14.12 g, Postolacca 1866, 353 no. 263 with pl. = Svoronos 1900, 331 no. 143 pl. II 24. [https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.II.no.24](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.II.no.24) (last accessed 8/1/2022).

H2: *Mare right suckling child/ piglet-on- staff.* [https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.144](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.144) (last accessed 8/1/2022).

*Athens, Numismatic Museum, 7566, 14.5 mm, 1.61 g, Svoronos 1900, 331 no. 144 pl. II 25. [https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.II.no.25](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.II.no.25) (last accessed 8/1/2022).

H3: *Mare right suckling child/ stork (?) left, turning his head toward right, the whole in wreath.* [https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.145](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.145) (last accessed 8/1/2022).

*Athens, Numismatic Museum, 2977, 15 mm, 1.33 g, Svoronos 1900, 331 no. 145 pl. II 26. [https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.II.no.26](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.II.no.26) (last accessed 8/1/2022).

H4: *ΙΠΠ, clipped edges/–.* [https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.142](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.142) (last accessed 8/1/2022).

1*. Athens, Numismatic Museum, 3100a, 15 mm, Postolacca 1868, 303 (Aggiunte) no. 13 = Benndorf 1875, 602 no. VIII.10; Svoronos 1900, 331 no. 142 pl. II 27. [https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.II.no.27](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.II.no.27) (last accessed 8/1/2022).


H5: *Mare right suckling child (?)/–.* [https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/agoral133](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/agoral133) (last accessed 8/1/2022).

*Athens, Agora Museum IL 1415, 18 mm (stamp 11 mm), Crosby 1964, 99 L 133 pl. 24. [https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/agorail1415](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/agorail1415) (last accessed 8/1/2022).

H6: *Mare right suckling child, with an owl in field above and another symbol lower right/–.*

*Athens, Agora Museum IL 352, 15 mm, Crosby 1964, 99 L 134 pl. 24.

**Tribe Aiantis**

AIA1: *Ajax with helm, shield in his left hand and spear on the right shoulder, walking left; to the right: ΑΙΑΣ/–.* [https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.277](https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.277) (last accessed 8/1/2022).
1*. Athens, Numismatic Museum, E. 743, 11 mm, 2.69 g, Svoronos 1900, 342 no. 277 pl. IV 36.  
https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.IV.no.36 (last accessed 8/1/2022).

2*. Athens, Numismatic Museum, 7588 (faded inscription), 12 mm, 2.17 g, Postolacca 1868, 283 no. 289; Svoronos 1900, 342 no. 278 pl. IV 37.  
https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.IV.no.37 (last accessed 8/1/2022).

AIA2: The same type as AIA1, but without inscription/–.

1*. Athens, Numismatic Museum, 2444, 14.5 mm, 2.30 g, Svoronos 1900, 342 no. 279.

2. Athens, Numismatic Museum, E 890, 14 mm, Svoronos 1900, 342 no. 280.

AIA3: *Hydria* between two cylindrical vessels, the one on the left sitting upright, the one on the right decorated on the surface and turned upside down, *A–I–A–N in the four quarters of the field*/–.  
https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.112 (last accessed 8/1/2022).

1*. Athens, Numismatic Museum, 3091a, 14 mm, Engel 1884, 6 no. 12 pl. I = Svoronos 1900, 328 no. 112 pl. II 9.  
https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.II.no.9 (last accessed 8/1/2022).

2*. Athens, Numismatic Museum, NM 3092 (right part of the device is struck off flan), 13 mm, Postolacca 1866, 349 no. 172 with pl. = Svoronos 1900, 329 no. 113.

3. Athens, Numismatic Museum, 3093, 14 mm, Postolacca 1866, 349 no. 173 = Svoronos 1900, 329 no. 114.

4*. Athens, Numismatic Museum, E. 667, 14 mm, Engel 1884, 6 no. 13, pl. I = Svoronos 1900, 329 no. 115.


6*. Athens, Agora Museum M 66, 13 mm, Davidson and Burr Thompson 1943, 106 no. 6 pl. 48.  
From the Pnyx.

7. New York, American Numismatic Museum; see Crosby 1964, 79 no. 12. It has not been possible to verify that this piece is kept at the ANS.


9*. Athens, at the time kept in a private collection, Benndorf 1875, 617 no. 40 pl.

10*. Athens, Alpha Bank Numismatic Collection, 518, ex Meletopoulos Collection, 14 mm, corroded and broken.  
https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/alphabank518 (last accessed 8/1/2022).

AIA4: *A–I* left and right of Helios’ neck, facing bust of Helios/ Facing bust of Helios.  
https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.117 (last accessed 8/1/2022).

*Athens, Numismatic Museum, E. 3111, 14 mm, Svoronos 1900, 329 no. 117 pl. II 11.  
https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.II.no.11 (last accessed 8/1/2022).

237 Svoronos (1900) notes by mistake that it is identical to Postolacca 1866, 349 no. 175.
AIA5: Cithara in a laurel wreath, around: AIANTI-OON/–. https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/enge11884.11 (last accessed 8/1/2022).

*Athens, Numismatic Museum, 20 mm, Engel 1884, 6 no. 11 pl. I. https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/enge11884.pl.I.no.11 (last accessed 8/1/2022).

Tribe Antiochis

ANT1: ANTIOXΣ above facing owl, with lifted wings/–. https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.126 (last accessed 11/1/2022).

2. Athens, Numismatic Museum, 3097, 16 mm, Postolacca 1866, 342 no. 49 = Svoronos 1900, 329 no. 127.
3. Athens, Numismatic Museum, 3098a (broken), 15 mm, Postolacca 1866, 342 no. 50 = Svoronos 1900, 330 no. 128.
4. Athens, Numismatic Museum, 3096 (illegible inscription), 17 mm, Postolacca 1866, 342 no. 48 = Svoronos 1900, 330 no. 129.

Tribe Ptolemais

TYPE PT1: ΠΤΟ in a laurel crown/–.

*Athens, Numismatic Museum, E. 622, 14 mm, Engel 1884, 6 no. 22 pl. I; Svoronos 1900, 332 no. 158 pl. II 38.

By taking Svoronos as a starting point, a new corpus can be redefined by adding new specimens (e.g. newly found or newly interpreted as tribal), and removing those whose previous attribution cannot be supported following new iconographic or numismatic interpretations. The link between a token and a tribe can be established thanks to the legend, an explicit device, or both. The tribal name (or that of the eponymous, as in AIG3, O1 and AIA1) is sometimes fully reported (AIG1, P1, ANT1, and E2). The connection with tribes is relatively clear also in: E1, bearing the legend ΕΡΕΧΘ; in AIG2, bearing the letters ΑΙΓΕΙ; in PT1, with letters ΠΤΟ within a laurel crown; and in AK1, H4, K1, and L2-4, with the
first three letters of the respective tribe’s names (Akamantis, Hippothontis, Kekrops, and Leontis). In L2 and L3 the legend ΛΕΩ is paired with a device, a lion head or a lion, constituting a pun on the name of the tribe.239

The eponymous heroes, sometimes accompanied by a legend, are a particularly explicit device: AIA1-2 show Ajax, represented as a warrior, with his very distinctive shield; a very similar token type represents Oineus (O1).240 In L1, thanks to the legend ΛΕΩΣ ΝΙΚΗ, Leos and Nike can be recognized in the bearded seated figure bearing in his left hand a one handled-vase and in the small figure crowning him on the right.241 Svoronos interpreted the bearded figure as the personification of the Demos, nonetheless the use of the word ‘Λεώς’ to allude to this political personification seems uncustomary.242

H1-3, 5-6’s sides A, uninscribed, represent a child suckled by a mare, clearly Hippothoon.243 The eponymous heroes’ profiles are particularly heterogeneous: some – for instance, Kekrops and Erechtheus – were important kings; others were local heroes, like Oineus, or even non-Athenian ones, such as Ajax. On tribal decrees and on the east side of the Parthenon frieze, they are represented as ‘good citizens’, covered in himation, appearing as equals as tribes were supposed to be.244 Such a

238 For the abbreviation ΛΕΩ as the abbreviation of the tribe Leontis, cf. the Athenian Agora clay tokens MC 820 and MC 821, dated to the fifth century (therefore featuring ‘ΛΕΟ’, in the pre-Euclidean alphabet) and used for lottery of magistrates, see Kierstead in this volume.

239 The same pun on the tribe’s name can be found in an anthippasia relief from the Agora (I 7167). The interpretation of Svoronos (1900, 331 no. 150 pl. II 32: owl on lion/ -) as a tribal token does not seem convincing, also because the lion is a common device on tokens known from a whole series of jurors’ tokens (Svoronos 1923–26) as well as from Athenian tokens of the Roman period (Crosby 1964, 122 L326 pl. 30).

240 Hippothoon’s representation was explicit enough not to need a legend, in contrast to the warrior figures on AIA1-2 and O1, which are similar to the one on tokens inscribed with ΠΡΥ: see Svoronos 1900, 338 nos. 241-3 pl. IV 12 and on the token type, see Crosby (1964, 109 L 243 pl. 28), of Roman date (probably third century CE) and probably representing Ares.

241 Gikiki 2020, 128 commentary under no. 30. According to Svoronos (1900, 327–28 no. 103), he sits on a rock. If so, it is not possible to verify whether the rock is a reference to his cult place, whose identification is problematic. It is often thought to coincide with the Leokorion, which is known in the sources for being the cult place of his daughters: see Di Cesare (2014(a), 1259–60) for a brief discussion of the sources and Camp (2020, 633–49) for new material of the tribe Leontis found in the north side of the Agora and feeding the debate.

242 For the personification of the Demos on tokens see Gikiki (2020, 97–98) and Gikiki forthcoming; for the use of the word λεώς, attick form of λαός, see LSF, s.v. λαός.

243 Hyginus, Fabulae 187. H1 was pierced after manufacture, to be worn as a pendent.

244 For a discussion concerning the identification of the eponymous heroes on the Parthenon frieze see Neils (2001, 158–61); for pictures of the slabs depicting them see Jenkins (1994, 77, 80–81). Two reliefs, possibly belonging to tribal decrees, might display a more individual representation of two eponymous heroes: Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Antikensammlung Sk 808, where a figure next to a horse is possibly Hippothoon: see Kron (1976, 186–87, 237–38, 280–81 (4) = H17); Lawton (1995, 145 no. 148) or Athens, National Museum 2949+2960,
flattened representation would not have been very suitable for a small object, whose iconography had to be distinctive. Therefore, at least some of the tokens recall such heroes' individual profiles, and are thus particularly important iconographical sources: Oineus, for example, is very rarely represented\textsuperscript{245} while, if the identification is right, L1 would be the only known representation of Leos (except on monuments collectively and indistinguishably representing all the eponymous heroes, such as the Parthenon Frieze).\textsuperscript{246}

On other types with two-letters legends, even when paired with official devices like the owl,\textsuperscript{247} it is not possible to draw conclusions with any certainty.\textsuperscript{248} Particularly problematic is a token type (Postolacca 1868, 271 no. 39: ΛE/ female head) which has often been considered as tribal. Dumont and Benndorf tentatively interpreted the head as the personification of the tribe and that of the Council (\textit{he Boule}) respectively, while Svoronos proposed Artemis.\textsuperscript{249} Once again, the legend is too short to be conclusive either way and, given the uncertainties in the (badly preserved) female head on side B, I would hesitate to include this type among the certain or probable tribal ones.\textsuperscript{250} I am also doubtful about Svoronos

where Kekrops is portrayed with his serpentine tail: see Kron (1976, 102, 237 n. 1155, 262 K 32); Lawton (1995, 140–41 no. 138).

\textsuperscript{245} See Kron (1976, 189) for the attestations.

\textsuperscript{246} For representations of Leos see Kron (1976, 280).

\textsuperscript{247} Deme tokens could certainly feature the owl as a device: e.g. Svoronos 1900, 332 nos. 153–55 pl. II 35, \url{https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.153}, last accessed 22/1/2022.

\textsuperscript{248} This is the case of Svoronos 1900, 329 no. 120 (no device, just inscribed AN/-); Svoronos 1900, 330 nos. 130–32 (AN owl left, in oval incuse/beetle-or cicada, \url{https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.130} last accessed 22/1/2022) for which see also Gkikaki forthcoming; Svoronos 1900, 329 no. 116 (A-I owl right with a palm branch on its right/-); Svoronos 1900, 332 no. 156 (O-I one-handled vase/-). Such abbreviations could also shorten names of demes or magistrates and, if AN shortens a tribal name, it would be ambiguous, particularly in cases when tokens with such a legend were produced after the creation of the Antigonis tribe, i.e. 307/6. Not surprisingly, given this ambiguity, Crosby (1964, 93, 101) does not suggest a tribal identification for L66 or L156 a-b, possibly or certainly marked with AI or AN. Also, Svoronos 1900, 330 no. 133 (owl right, A – N in the field right and left, T above /three torches) is ambiguous. For what concerns Svoronos (1900, 330 no. 141) (ε̂ standing frontal Apollon \textit{Lykeios}/ –), the same letters (although not lunate and with a different layout), attested with a different device in a series of tokens (whose diameter is approximately the same as our specimen), are thought to abbreviate a personal name, possibly a magistrate’s: see Crosby 1964, 90-92 L43-L56.

\textsuperscript{249} Dumont 1870, 76 no. 13; Benndorf 1875, 602 no. 9; Svoronos 1900, 331 no. 151-2 pl. II 33–34. The head of the personified Boule is known on a few other token types: Svoronos 1900, 333 no. 173–76; Crosby 1964, 93 L67 (for the identification see Gkikaki 2020, 98–99).

\textsuperscript{250} Considerations on the legend can be extended to the uniface token published by Gkikaki (2020, 128 no. 30), which has ΛΕ of lunar style, in wreath. See also the ΛΕ legend in Svoronos (1900, 331 no. 152 pl. II 34) which is also of lunar style.
1900, 331 no. 148 pl. II 29, with a monogram consisting of Κ, Ρ, Ε of lunar style, in incuse, thought to shorten ‘Kekropis’, while it could abbreviate names starting with KRE (or KER).\(^{251}\)

A few more types have proved to be not convincingly tribal. Svoronos 1900, 329 nos. 121–25 were all attributed to the Antigonis tribe, but the device on no. 124’s side A (an elephant walking right) seems to reflect that of the coins of another Hellenistic dynasty: the Seleucids, and not the Antigonids.\(^{252}\) Likewise, nos. 121–23 were associated to the Antigonis tribe because of the Α and the Athena ‘Alkidamos’, but such device is attested on coins of Antigonos Gonatas,\(^{253}\) rather than the One-Eyed (in honour of whom the tribe Antigonis was founded), allowing a link to be established with Macedonia in general, instead of the tribe or its eponymous specifically.

No. 125, a uniface token, depicts an elephant carrying a tower on his back, with the letters A on the top part of the field and an E between its feet: as towers on elephants are certainly attested from Pyrrhus onwards\(^{254}\), the attribution is not convincing. Svoronos 1900, 330 nos. 136–38 were assigned to the Demetrias: no. 137, with a helmet of pilos-konos type, a palm branch, and the legend Δ–Η, is more likely to be a public token, where the abbreviations is to be read ‘ΔΗΜΟΣΙΟΝ’ (dēmosion, meaning ‘of the state’).\(^{255}\) Although Svoronos suggested it be read as ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΑΣ, the ligature on Svoronos 1900, 330 no. 136 pl. II 22 is not enough to recommend it as a tribal token; instead, it could stand for the name of a magistrate. A very tricky specimen is Svoronos 1900, 330 no. 134, whose side A represents the head of a man, interpreted as Attalos, thanks to the legend AT; nonetheless, the portrait is more likely to be of the late Republican period.\(^{256}\) Not even Svoronos 1900, 330 no. 135 can be attributed to the Attalis tribe, as specimens of the same type from Agora contexts predate the creation

---

\(^{251}\) Monograms are common in the Hellenistic period: see Postolacca 1868 pl. K; Crosby 1964, 88–89 L23–36 pl.19 for tokens; see Callataý (2012) for coins, especially in royal mints. In our corpus, a monogram is also attested on P1’s side B: one might wonder if it was a sort of ‘time-stamp’ (see p. \[\]).


\(^{253}\) Kroll 1993, 53.

\(^{254}\) Scullard 1974, 240–41.

\(^{255}\) Schäfer 2019, 53 with n. 80; Gkikaki 2021, 64–65 with special reference to Crosby 1964, 102 L161. The same applies to Svoronos 1900, 330 no. 138 with the same type and just the letter Δ.

\(^{256}\) Postolacca (1868, 276 no. 157) identified it as Julius Caesar; one must admit that the legend is puzzling.
of the tribe. For Svoronos 1900, 332 nos. 153-155, he proposed two possibilities, either the tribe Oineis or to the deme Oinoe: he was certainly right in considering the latter more likely, given the legend OI-NO.

Datation and findspots

Dating such objects is particularly difficult, as quite often either they lack excavation contexts or they come from much later contexts. The latter is the case of H5 and H6, found in a sixth century CE context in the Southwest Area of the Agora (deposit D 16: 7), and in a Byzantine-era context northwest of the Square (G3) respectively, therefore several centuries later than their production. On the other hand, AIA3(6) comes from the filling of Pnyx III, where reconstruction began ca. 346–42, which provides the terminus ante quem for type AIA3.

The Hellenistic date might apply to all the tokens in the catalogue. When uniface and relatively small (with a diameter often around 12–14 mm), tribal tokens can typically be safely dated to the Hellenistic period and perhaps even earlier in the fourth century. A few types provide us with hints for better specifying their date. For PT1, the creation of the tribe Ptolemais in 224/3 constitutes the terminus post quem. In H2, the piglet-on-staff closely recalls the iconography of the obverse of certain Athenian coin types, dated between the 350s and early or middle 330s, which would provide us with a more solid chronological reference for this token too. For a few types (H1, AIA5, E2, and L1), with a consistently bigger diameter (equal to or greater than 19–20 mm), we might perhaps exclude a fourth century/early Hellenistic date and think about a second–first century one, perhaps even slipping into the

257 Crosby 1964, 89 L 27 b-c from the deposit A18:8, https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/agorail832 last accessed 22/1/2022; see also Kroll 1993, 302.

258 See also Crosby 1964, 79 n. 12, 100 L147, 100 L157; Gkikaki 2021, 58 n. 18.

259 For the find contexts consult the references under cat. no. H5 and H6 in this text.

260 Crosby 1964, 83. On the Pnyx III reconstruction, see recent chronological revision of Lawall (2005, 50–53).

261 Crosby 1964, 76. Crosby (1964, 79 with n. 12) assigned several types to the Hellenistic period, namely AIG1–3; O1, ANT1, P1, E1; Crosby (1964, 85) also classified H5 and H6 in her section III, containing Hellenistic or earlier tokens.


263 For the relationship between coins and tokens see Bubelis 2011, 177–182 and Crisà, Gkikaki, and Rowan 2019, 4–6.
Roman period. In the case of E2, such consideration would be supported both by the lunate letters (quite common in the Hellenistic period, specifically in the second century, as well as in the Roman) and the spelling EΠΕΧΘΕΙΔΟΣ, increasingly attested especially after 330. H1’s device is basically the same found in H2-3, 5–6 (almost all the types of tribe Hippothontis), suggesting therefore that it might have been used for a quite lengthy timespan.

**Contexts of use**

Tribal tokens were certainly used in more than one context, and different series might have served for the same purpose. The choice of lead might have been due to the fact that such objects were recycled; lead was particularly suitable for that purpose because it was cheap, easily available, and has a low melting point. Specifying the tribes’ names would have been necessary during events where many or all tribes took part (a consideration which also applies to demes, of which a few specimens are known), but it would have been suitable also for occasions involving only one group. Albeit AIA3(6), as we will see, might have not been used where it was found, and H5 and H6 come from much later contexts, some activities concerning tribal tokens might have centered in the Agora and its surroundings. This idea of events requiring the use of tokens by all tribes is strengthened by the similarities in manufacture (diameters, same clipped flans, fabric) shared by tokens of different tribes (H4, AK1, K1, and L4), also characterized by three-letter abbreviations as well as the apices on the letter: they could belong to the same series. Also, AIG3 shares the same technical features, but the legend (the eponymous name) is not limited to the first three letters, instead it has the name written in full. This type also makes us aware of the possibility that the above-mentioned series might shorten eponymous’ names. Some types reproduce state devices, like Athena in AIG1–2 and the owl with lifted wings in ANTI.

---

264 Crosby 1964, 76 b-c assigns tokens of larger sizes either to the Roman or to the Late Hellenistic period.


266 Threatte 1980, 374–76. The same considerations about the spelling apply to ΑΙΓΕΙΣ in AIG1-2, whose diameters would make a datation in the Hellenistic period probable. Also Crosby (1964, 79 with n. 12) believes that these types are Hellenistic.

267 For deme tokens, see e.g. Svoronos 1900, 328 nos. 110–11, 332 nos. 153–55; see also the discussion in Crosby 1964, 79 with n. 12 and 89 no. L38. Albeit not being evident by looking at the legend or the device, also each different type of the series in Crosby 1964, 90–92 L43–L56 might have been used by a deme.

268 See e.g. Svoronos (1900, 327 no. 99, https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.99, last accessed 22/1/2022) for a similar representation of the owl on side B (a public token, as the legend ΔΗΜΟ on side A denotes); see Svoronos (1900, 332 no. 153-5) and Crosby (1964, 100 L147) for the owl on deme tokens. On Athena’s head as a state device: Killen (2017, 180–81) and as for the owl with lifted wings: ibid., 175. For various state devices, including Athena head and the owl on Athenian tokens: Gkikaki 2020, 103–09.
Wreaths could have a state meaning as well. In tribal tokens, they either enclose legends (L2) or devices (as in AIA5 or in the badly preserved side B of H3). Public symbols could also be included in the field, in smaller dimensions, as the owl in H1 and H6 and the kalathos in H1. The bearded head in L2 is particularly interesting: from its description (as it is not pictured in any of its publications), it would seem to recall the eponymous hero (bearded in L1) or, perhaps, the Demos (which was similarly represented). Some devices could have merely served to distinguish different series and prevent fraud. In case of periodically recurring events, they indicated the specific occasion in which they were meant to be used: they were therefore, in a certain sense, ‘time stamps’. This should explain the designs on side B, such as the horse Arion (L2), or the reduplication of Helios on both sides (AIA4). Such an explanation could be extended to the symbols in smaller size, as perhaps the plough in AIG2, which nonetheless somehow relates to the main device, as the tool was introduced by Athena.

In the Assembly, from IG II² 4, 76, ll. 78-80, a tribal decree carved on a prytanic dedication of the year 341/0, it is clear that tokens (introduced in the Assembly after the Peloponnesian war, together with the Assembly pay, ekklesiastikos misthos) were distributed by the syllogeis tou demou, a board of thirty, three from each tribe. It is probable that the syllogeis of each tribe checked their own phyletai’s (tribal members) credentials. When in the late 390s Aristophanes’ Assemblywomen was first

---

269 Gkikaki (2021, 62–63) also on deme names within wreaths. Some letters within a wreath on an Agora token (IL 1168) have been restored by Crosby (1964, 89 L 38, https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/agorail1168 last accessed 22/1/2022) as ΕΛ/ΑΟΥ, a shortened form of a deme name. Such deme specimens are quite similar to some tribal ones, see e.g. PT1.

270 According to Svoronos (1900, 331 no. 145 pl. II 26), the symbol within the wreath in H3 was a stork, which appears not clearly legible.

271 For the kalathos as an official symbol, see the stamp on weights in Lang (1964, 28 LW 27 pl. 6, 30 LW 48 pl. 8).

272 Gkikaki 2020, 128 with commentary under no. 30.

273 See supra II

274 A similar function is that of countermarks (which are never attested on tribal tokens). On countermarks, see Crosby (1964, 83); Bubelis (2010, 190).

275 Bubelis 2010, 186–87; Gkikaki 2021, 59 with n. 27.

276 One might also wonder whether the horse could be a pun on the name of a magistrate, starting with API.

277 For Helios on tokens, see also Crosby (1964, 111 L 261, 119 L 313) and Gkikaki (2020, 129 no. 34).

278 For the identification of the people mentioned in IG II² 4, 76, ll. 78-80 with the syllogeis (known from other sources) see Busolt and Swoboda (1926, 994 n. 2); on the syllogeis in general, see Rizzi (2021). For the Assembly pay and the tokens related to that: Kroll in this volume.

279 See also Kroll in this volume; Gkikaki forthcoming; differently, according to Hansen (1985, 224), they worked as a 30-members team.
presented, everyone was apparently free to choose where to sit.\textsuperscript{280} It seems that, at a certain point in the fourth century, the \textit{syllogeis} handed clay tokens to their \textit{phyletai} in order to distribute them in different sections of the \textit{auditorium}.\textsuperscript{281} Even before this discovery, hints towards a tribal seating for the people in the \textit{auditorium} seemed to be particularly weak.\textsuperscript{282}

Nonetheless, there has been a short period in which a tribe (or at least part of it)\textsuperscript{283} had to sit close together,\textsuperscript{284} being chosen by lot for the charge of the \textit{bema}, to preside over it (\textit{προεδρεύσει}), as a law reported by Aeschines states.\textsuperscript{285} Whatever sitting praxis was followed in the rest of the auditorium, whatever tokens were in use at that time, whether they were made of lead or clay, then the presence of a tribal name/device would not be surprising, if there were tokens regulating the right of a specific tribe to sit in front and distributed by the \textit{syllogeis} of that single tribe.

Tribal tokens would be unnecessary both for councilors (\textit{bouleutai}), who sat by letter (\textit{kata gramma}) from 410/9 onwards,\textsuperscript{286} and in the lawcourts, where tribes were divided into sections to have an equal number of \textit{phyletai} for each trial.\textsuperscript{287} Tokens were produced when many specimens were needed,

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{280} Aristophanes, \textit{Ecclesiazousae}, ll. 290-7.
\textsuperscript{281} See Makrypodi 2019; Makrypodi in this volume; Kroll in this volume.
\textsuperscript{282} People were thought to sit by tribes or even by trittyes: see e.g. Stanton and Bicknell 1987. The assumption was mainly based on a passage of Xenophon (\textit{Hellenica} 1.7.9), reporting that during the Arginoueus trial in 406 the Assembly voted using two \textit{hydria} for each tribe. As we do not know where they were placed, this passage (referring to Pnyx I and before the introduction of \textit{misthos}) cannot prove tribal sitting: see Hansen 1988, 53-4. It was also based on some 5\textsuperscript{th} century \textit{trittys} markers (one of which, \textit{IG I}\textsuperscript{3} 1120, was found on the Pnyx), which served other functions (see e.g. Humphreys 2018, II 767 with n. 133). Moretti (2019, 135) thinks that people could have sat by tribes during some specific procedures, such as the election of the \textit{strategoi}; nonetheless, this seems unnecessary by looking at the recent reconstructions of the procedure (see Hansen 2004, 59-61), which varied over time.
\textsuperscript{283} Moretti 2019, 136.
\textsuperscript{284} Hansen 1988, 57.
\textsuperscript{285} Aeschines, \textit{In Timarchum} 33. Based on Aeschines, \textit{In Ctesiphonetem} 4, and Demosthenes, \textit{In Aristogitonem} I, 90 (although the latter source might be a forgery: see Harris 2018, 193–94), such law was soon judged not to be very efficacious: Hansen 2014, 392 with 38; cf. also Kroll in this volume.
\textsuperscript{286} Philochorus, \textit{FGrHist} 328 F 140. Similarly, if tokens at π\textsuperscript{H} represent the personification of the \textit{Boule} and letters ΛΕ are short for Leontis, their possible function within the organ is difficult to understand. While the use of pay tokens for councilors (\textit{bouleutai}) is possible, there is no reason why a tribe should be mentioned. Staveley (1972, 93 with n. 162) supposes that the Council voted in a very similar way to that described by Xenophon (\textit{Hellenica} 1. 7. 9) for the Assembly, based on Aeschines, \textit{In Timarchum} 35, where a law mentions a secret vote to be carried out either by the Council or the Assembly. Nonetheless, this is not enough to be certain of the exact procedure. Moreover, the authenticity of the passage is debated: see e.g. Fischer 2001, 164.
\textsuperscript{287} According to Boegehold et al. (1995, 71) the phrasing of Philochorus’ passage (\textit{FGrHist} 328 F 140) could suggest that \textit{jurors} already sat by letter as early as 410/9. On dikastic tokens, see Kroll in this volume.
\end{footnotesize}
therefore their use as lots in simple allotment procedures (such as the one for choosing the prytanizing tribe) cannot be taken into account, as simpler objects, perhaps even sherds with handwritten tribal names in an urn, would have been suitable. Referring again to the Assembly, it is important to note it did not just gather on the Pnyx. It was almost certainly similarly organized in other venues, as far as compatible with the architectural setting. From the Lycurgan period onwards, the theatre of Dionysus was used for assemblies more and more frequently.288

As noted above, some scholars have suggested that tribal tokens were used as tickets, or as seat identifiers, during the Great Dionysia festival.289 Nonetheless, besides the fact that no such tokens are reported to have come from the area, the use of tokens as theatre tickets is far from certain.290 Also, the possibility that people sat according to the tribal division is not particularly solid.291 Among the people awarded with prohedria were some boards of magistrates, selected by tribe,292 and some tribally-organized categories had reserved places (like ephes and bouleutai),293 but there is no way to know whether they were further divided into tribes. Tribal affiliation in such context was not likely to have been of great significance.

Nonetheless, types representing gods (such as E1 with Dionysus/ thrysos and tripod) and perhaps also divine attributes (such as the cithara in AIA4, recalling Apollo), allow us to consider the possibility that tribal tokens were used on the occasion of festivals. Affiliation to tribes should have been important during athletic and musical competitions and feasts.294

The practice of eating together with other tribe members was certainly not limited to the festivals which we are most well-informed about, such as the Panathenaia and the Great Dionysia,

290 See e.g. Roselli (2013, 82–83). Svoronos (1900, chapter Θ’) indexed AIA1-2 and AIG3 in the category ονόματα δραμάτων, given the existence of homonymous plays (even if the Oineus of the Euripidean play was the king of Kalydon). Tokens referring to a play would be uncustumary: Gkikaki (2021, 61), notes that people did not go to the theatre to watch a single play. See also Roselli (2013, 83 with n. 82). On the other hand, according to Gkikaki (2021, 61–62), tokens were used to prove exemption from payment and that therefore they should be identified with the theōrika.
291 See Russo forthcoming for a discussion.
293 See e.g. Hesychius s.v. βουλευτικόν; Pickard-Cambridge 1968, 268–70.
294 Lucianus, Timon 49, mentions the distribution of the theōrikon in connection with a phyle: he has been considered mistaken by Tomassi (2011, 477) since, at least during the Great Panathenaia such distribution was based on the affiliation to demes (as per Demosthenes, In Leocharem 37). If it was not paid in cash, according to Gkikaki (2021, 60–61), tokens with deme names could have had such a use.
during which (in the Classical period) it is known that *hestiatores*, leitourists appointed by tribes, sponsored tribal banquets.\footnote{295\ See e.g. Wilson (2000, 24 with. n. 60). According to some scholars such as Schmitt Pantel (1992, 126–30), the meat assigned to the demes (see *IG II²* 1, 447, ll. 47–53) was consumed during such tribal feastings; others, as Wilson (2008, 116) believe that feastings sponsored by the *hestiatores* were perhaps held on the day of dramatic competitions (this hypothesis, perhaps, being more coherent with the checking of the participants’ tribal affiliations).} It also took place during other ‘scheduled’ occasions.\footnote{296 Some more attention is due to *AIA3*. The vase represented is a *hydria* viewed in profile (with one horizontal lateral handle perhaps barely discernable),\footnote{297 Athenaeus (V.185d) refers, quite generically, to tribal feastings, established in an ancient time but still ongoing in Athens at the time of his source (Erodioc of Babylon, second century): see Marchiori (2001, 454).} It is attested in certain exceptional circumstances as well, such as in the case of the *epinikia* celebrated with the victims bought from the spoils of the cities plundered by Kharēs in 356, when feasts were carried out *kata phylas*.\footnote{298 As it is known, the *leitouric* organization of the classical period attested for the above-mentioned festivals is a fourth century phenomenon, while the Hellenistic period is characterized by *euergetism*: see Schmitt Pantel (1997). For a discussion concerning the use of tokens during banquets in this latter phase see Gkikaki (2020, 118–20).} While participation in feasts might have been quite spontaneous, without knowing the peculiarities of each specific event, its spatial setting and organization, the way it was funded and organized, we cannot totally exclude that, sometimes, tokens were needed to check the affiliation of those who were entitled to take part.\footnote{299 Kroll 1993, 27–28 and supra 11.} In any case, when all tribes were simultaneously carrying out the same activities, though individually organized, each group might have also used its own type of token.

The possibility of the use of tribal tokens during festivals is strengthened by the presence of the piglet-on-staff (the mystic staff of the initiates, made of bound myrtle boughs) on *H2*. Such a device was used on some Athenian coin types, thought to be ‘festival coinage’, with a role in the Eleusinian Mysteries (and not in the *Eleusinia*, given the iconography).\footnote{299 Kroll 1993, 27–28 and supra 11 cf. also Bremmer 2014, 17. Though it might be a coincidence, the presence of a piglet-on-staff on a token of the only tribe based in Eleusis might perhaps have some further significance.}

Some more attention is due to *AIA3*. The vase represented is a *hydria* viewed in profile (with one horizontal lateral handle perhaps barely discernable),\footnote{300 A *hydria* had already been identified by Rostovzeff (1903, 311 no. 11) in *AIA3(3)*.} and depicted between two smaller cylindrical vessels, of which only the right one has diagonal and horizontal lines crossing its body; it resembles a receptacle, not made of clay but of some other material (e.g. wicker).\footnote{301 Perhaps not surprisingly, Davidson and Burr Thompson (1943, 106 no. 6) call it a ‘cista’.} It is known that *hydriai* were...
used in non-domestic circumstances, such as rituals, political processes, and also awarded as prizes in various competitions. The only other hydria known to be represented on tokens, depicted with a slightly different shape and being perhaps frontally pictured, has two sprays projecting from the mouth, interpreted as ears of wheat, for which it was likely connected with wheat distributions.

No doubt, if the device has a semantic relationship with the context of use of this series of token, it has to be somehow ‘iconic’ for the action, and not a marginally used tool. Unfortunately, if the two side objects are indeed related to the hydria, they are not very helpful in orienting its interpretation. A specimen of this type, AIA3(6), comes from the filling of Pnyx III, which included material coming from nearby houses as well as sanctuaries. Therefore, perhaps we are not obliged to look for an Assembly-related occasion for AIA3 (6) (and for type AIA3 too).

Also grain distribution is thought to have been carried out tribally. The main evidence for this is IG II\(^3\) 1, 899, dated to 274/3 BC, where, for each tribe, there seems to have been a sitonēs (grain purchaser, who was also in charge of its distribution). The source for the use of tokens in this context is *I. Eleusis* 182, ll.12–14 (267/6), recording the honouring of the grammateus of the treasurer of the grain fund for his efficiency “περὶ τὴν τοῦ σίτου δόσιν καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν των διδομένων επί τον σίτον”. The inscription is a decree of the soldiers stationed at Eleusis, who certainly got their food from the surroundings.

302 E.g. for the hydriae as voting equipments, see Lopez-Rabatel 2019(a), 36; for sortition, see Lopez-Rabatel 2019(b), esp. 44–45, for other procedures, see e.g. the selections of the judges at the Dionysia: Wilson (2000, 99).

303 By looking at tribal occasions, in IG II\(^2\) 2311, 77 the hydria is the individual prize (i.e. for the runner arriving to the end) for the Panathenaic tribal torch race and perhaps also the prize in the competition of the prytaniai, awarded to the tribe which best served the interests of the state during the year, as suggested by Lawton (1995, 128 no. 97) based on an early fourth century dedication for the victory of tribe Kekropis (Acropolis Museum 3367+2542+Epigraphic Museum 8024). The vase here is represented together with a Nike crowning a partially preserved figure, either representing one of the prytaneis, as Lawton (1995, 127, no. 97) suggests, or Kekrops, on which see Raubitschek (1949, 191). The evidence for the competition dates to the 4\(^{th}\) century; see Meritt and Trall (1974, 2) for details.

304 Crosby 1964, 92 L 56 a-d.

305 Lawall 2009, 52–53.

306 IG II\(^3\) 1, 899= IG II\(^2\) 792+the fragment Agora I 1904. See e.g. Crosby (1964, 80 n. 18).

307 See Crosby (1964, 78). For a discussion on the use ἐκκλησιαστικῶν for different kinds of tokens see Kroll in this volume; conversely, see Fantasia (1998, 222 with n. 72, 223), arguing that the term does not refer to the symbolon but to the money; he also argues that the distribution could have simply been carried out by checking people’s credentials before handing them rations (e.g. by ticking their names on lists).

308 Oliver 2007, 150.
Tribal affiliation had a strong importance in military contexts. However, according to Oliver, by the early Hellenistic period the assignation of soldiers to garrison demes (as at Eleusis) was probably not made by following the traditional call-up methods. In any case, using tribal tokens for grain distribution seems to have been unnecessary and excessively complicated in controlled contexts such as garrisons.

Concerning distributions to the whole people, we should consider that they would have been difficult to carry out in a single day, especially as they depended on the supply; there are not enough details to reconstruct the specific of the procedure. In a tribal decree in honour of Phanodemos (ca. 330–327) the well-known Attidographer, in l. 3 one reads: ([ - - ] ἡ τακοσίους διὸς). While a likely possibility for restoring the text would be τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ τακοσίου (the Council of the Five Hundred), the reference to a quantity of medimnoi (μεδίμνου τακοσίου) has also been suggested. By retaining this latter restoration, we would have a reference to a donation of grain to the tribe and the People (or only to the tribe) made in a period of shortage. A donation of grain to a single tribe would perhaps be compatible with the use of tribal tokens, but one must acknowledge that the inscription is very lacunous.

Tribal boards of officials (as the sitonai) are particularly numerous, spanning from those related to the army to sacred ones: it is clear, nonetheless, that one should try to resist from the equation ‘tribal magistrates = tribal tokens’ when thinking about a payment or some other kind of distribution, and consider every single case individually.

After mostly discussing broader collective occasions, we might focus on specifically tribal ones, e.g. activities which were peculiar to the individual groups. We have evidence of a series (the three letters in incuse: H4, AK1, K1, and L4) which might have been composed by tokens of all the units, and while

309 Oliver 2007, 178–79.
310 The cavalry also had grain supply (see IG II² 1264). As in the Hellenistic period they were generally 200 horsemen (except for a few occasions, when the number was brought to 300 or even 500, about which see Bugh 1993, 186–91), using twelve different types of tokens would have been unneeded.
312 Bardani and Matthaiou 2010–13 (= SEG 63.98).
313 Bardani and Matthaiou 2010–13 (= SEG 63.98), see also Lambert (AIO 870: https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/SEG/6398, last accessed 18/01/2022).
314 See Jones 1987, 39–57.
we might suppose that some other similar series existed, some types could have been self-standing, i.e. made for individual tribes and for their internal use. Of course, for tokens to be used within the tribe any device could have been suitable – it only had to be clearly recognizable – but the use of specific imagery could have also been a way to recall a collective heritage as well as collective deeds. For example, whatever the function \textit{L.1} had, it refers to a victory, perhaps to one which already occurred.\footnote{There are no hints at a specific victory and Nike has no attributes, allowing us to take into account the possibility that the victory is not necessarily an athletic or musical one, but also the award of a prize to the tribe or the\textit{ prytaneis} (see \textit{b.17}) which would be suitable for a type usable many times and in many different contexts.}

In the internal life of the tribes, assemblies were the most important events (and probably not too frequent an occurrence), where different matters were discussed; they were often held in conjunction with festive events and rituals, such as – quite possibly – the sacrifice to the eponymous hero.\footnote{See Jones (1999, 161–69) for their activities; see Russo (2020, 247 with nn. 15, 17), for the association of assemblies with other events.} Tribal activities centered in tribal seats (i.e. the eponymous heroes’ shrines), which were scattered around different parts of Attica. Their location is not always known with certainty and, even when it is, their spatial articulation and therefore the exact way in which tribal activities were carried out, is not always easy to reconstruct.\footnote{See Russo forthcoming for a discussion on tribal seats.} They were shrines, originally designed to host cults and therefore not always adapted to host activities involving many participants: for this reason, spaces in the immediate vicinity might have been used by the tribes as well.\footnote{Russo 2020, 248.}

There is no evidence for the existence of a\textit{ misthos},\footnote{Russo (2020, 249) for the case of the tribes based on the Acropolis.} and therefore pay tokens would not be supported. However, we might think that there were occasions needing some control, especially when the inclusion of non-members might have caused problems of some type (e.g. in the case of votes). People attending tribal assemblies might have numbered a few hundred in some situations.\footnote{See Russo 2020, 248.} The needs of tokens to check affiliation might have been particularly needed in cases when the tribal shrine was located in places where a conspicuous number of non-\textit{phyletai} had reason to come. For example, on the slopes of the\textit{ Kolonos Agoraios}, the \textit{Eurysakeion}, the headquarter of the \textit{Aiantis} tribe, was also a reference point for other groups.\footnote{For the other association using the \textit{Eurysakeion} see Jones 1999, 160 specifically on the \textit{Ptolemais} tribe; similarly, see Humphreys 2018, II 649 on the genos of the\textit{ Salaminioi}. Current excavations are feeding the debate on the exact location of the seat of \textit{Leontis} tribe, see \textit{b.17} if it was indeed located on the north side of the Agora, if not then perhaps on the east side.} Tribal \textit{epimeletai} were chosen each year: they were in charge of
summoning the assembly and – we might suppose – also to check that those who attended were indeed all members.\textsuperscript{322}

\textbf{Conclusion}

The category of tribal tokens, referring to those tokens for which a connection with tribes can be established thanks to the legend, the iconography or both, comprises a relatively varied quantity of types. Tribal tokens were mostly used in the Hellenistic period, both for collective activities (i.e. for activities involving the whole polis, according to its subdivisions) and for activities carried out by each group individually. Their role in collective activities was previously often suggested by the presence of tribal boards of officials, which are nonetheless not a sufficient proof, as the case of \textit{syllogeis} exemplifies. Their use to indicate where people had to sit either in the theatre of Dionysus or in the Pnyx can be excluded (unless, very tentatively, in the case of the short period of the presiding tribe), and also sources concerning grain distribution do not seem to require them. Some polis’ symbols and the presence of a series (probably originally featuring a type for each tribe) certainly support the role of tokens in collective events. The wide variety of festivals and feasts carried out in Athens possibly allow both the use of individual types and of ten types-series, depending on the organization of the event. In any case, while former hypotheses (excluding that of Baron Prokesch-Osten) were mostly focused on the collective dimensions of the activities requiring tribal tokens, their usage in individual groups’ activities needs to be emphasized. Unfortunately, most symbols remain elusive, and hopefully new evidence will shed further light on this fascinating category of objects.

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{322} Humphreys 2018, II 745 with n. 67.
Athenian clay tokens: new types, new series 323

Stamatoula Makrypodi
Hellenic Ministry of Culture – Epigraphic Museum

During the international conference Tokens: Culture, Connections, Communities, held at the University of Warwick from 8-10 June 2017, new Athenian clay tokens from the Numismatic Museum of Athens were presented. The new data was published in 2019. 324 Only a few Athenian clay tokens were known prior to then. Some of them were published by I.N. Svoronos in 1905. 325 Twelve clay tokens from the Numismatic Museum of Athens Collections were published by K. M. Konstantopoulos in Archaeologikon Deltion (1930-31). 326 M. Crosby published twenty-six clay tokens found in the Athenian Agora. 327 A few clay tokens were published among the small objects from the Pnyx. 328 Clay tokens stamped with the names of Athenian military commanders were published by J.H. Kroll and F.W. Mitchel in 1980. 329 The research yielded by the author in 2017 focused on two major groups of clay tokens handed into the museum, the first between 1928 and 1932, and the second in 2005. The registration of the first group in the museum coincided with the publication of K.M. Konstantopoulos’ research, however, only twelve tokens were published in the Archaeologikon Deltion at that time.

The comparison between the clay tokens of those two groups, the shared pictorial types, the similarity of the clay, and the style of their representations led to the conclusion that these tokens are part of the same ensemble. As a result, the publication of 2019 yielded 56 clay tokens that more than tripled the total specimens that were known up to that point. The common characteristics of the tokens and the information of the publication of the Archaeologikon Deltion concerning their origin from the Hill of the Museion helped to attribute the entirety of the tokens to the same area. The place of origin, near the Hill of the Pnyx, in addition to the

323 I wish to thank Dr. Mairi Gkikaki for her kind invitation to speak at the Tokens: The Athenian Legacy to the Modern World workshop, 16-17th December 2019 and for her helpful remarks and support. Thanks are also owed to J.H. Kroll for sharing his work in the framework of this volume.

327 Crosby 1964, 124–30, pl. 31–32.
328 Davidson and Burr Thompson 1943, 104–08.
letters of the Greek alphabet that several tokens bear on one side indicating their use by a large body of citizens, led to the conclusion that they are tokens for the Assembly (ἐκκλησιαστικά σύμβολα)\(^{330}\). As the purpose of the publication of 2019 was the attribution of the origin for the presented clay tokens, the analysis was limited to this issue. The purpose of the 2019 publication was limited to the attribution of an origin for the presented clay tokens.\(^{331}\) Following the preliminary research and the paper published in 2019, the present paper presents all the clay lettered tokens that were accessioned by the Numismatic Museum in the period between 1928 and 1932 and in 2005, to complete the series and to present a comprehensive study. The study of the dies and the shape and form of the letters of the tokens is expected to provide information concerning their production and dating. The study of the physical characteristics of the tokens and the remarks resulting from the study of this group will contribute to the understanding of their role in the context of the participation of the Athenian citizens in the Athenian Assembly. Clay tokens published by Svoronos in 1905\(^{332}\) and those found during the excavations of the Athenian Agora\(^{333}\) will be presented as parallels.

**Clay lettered tokens**

The clay lettered tokens included in the publication of 2019 can be categorized into seven series depending on the pictorial type on one side (wreath, human head bearing little wings, Herm, dove, horse, rose, and tripod)\(^{334}\). In addition to them, we will present 23 new clay tokens bearing a pictorial type on one side and a letter of the Greek alphabet on the other (Table). The eight new types of tokens stated in bold have not been included in the publication of 2019.

**TABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Side A</th>
<th>Side B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janiform head</td>
<td>B, Beta (cat. nos. 1-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wreath</td>
<td><strong>Alpha in double lines</strong> (cat. no 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B, Beta in double lines (cat. nos. 7-10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{330}\) Makrypodi 2019, 34 and 34 with n. 28.

\(^{331}\) C.f. the title of the paper: Tokens inside and outside excavation contexts. Seeking the origin. Examples of clay tokens from the collections of the Athens Numismatic Museum.

\(^{332}\) Svoronos 1905.

\(^{333}\) Crosby 1964, 124–30, pl. 31-32.

\(^{334}\) Makrypodi 2019, 38 table 1.
### Tokens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Token Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hippalektryon (?)</strong></td>
<td>Γ, Gamma retrograde or Π, Pi (cat. nos. 11-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demeter Standing</strong></td>
<td>I, Iota (cat. nos. 22-24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human head bearing little wings</td>
<td>Σ, Sigma or M, Mu (cat. no. 31), Φ, Phi (cat. nos. 32-35), X, Chi (cat. nos. 36-38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herm</td>
<td>Y, Upsilon (cat. nos. 45-48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphinx</td>
<td>Ω, Omega in double lines (cat. no. 52), Σ, Sigma or M, Mu in double lines (cat. no. 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dove</td>
<td>(Ι), Zeta in double lines (cat. no. 16), K, Kappa in double lines (cat. no. 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O, Omicron in double lines (cat. no. 18), Y, Upsilon in double lines (cat. nos. 19-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Π, Pi in double lines (cat. nos. 26-27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>P, Rho retrograde in double lines (cat. no. 29-30), Ξ, Xi in double lines (cat. no. 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-legged animal</td>
<td>Ξ, Xi in double lines (cat. no. 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman’s head</td>
<td>Ψ, Psi (cat. nos. 54-58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kneeling figure 1</td>
<td>Ω, Omega (cat. no. 59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kneeling figure 2</td>
<td>Ω, Omega in double lines (cat. no. 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripod</td>
<td>Π, Sampi in double lines (cat. no. 61-64)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The addition of the tokens raises the number of the varieties to fifteen. All the above tokens have many similarities with each other in terms of clay and iconographic representations. They can also be attributed to the same ensemble as those published in 2019. Finally, there is a token with an unspecified representation (possibly a human figure raising or adorning a trophy) and the letter Xi (Ξ) on the other side (cat. no. 65). Its clay is light brown and bears dark grey sediments. It seems to have remained in a layer of ash. The same observations apply for token cat. no. 6 with wreath and letter Alpha (Α).
The iconography of the tokens: imagery, dies, duplicates, and parallels

The assemblage of the clay tokens under examination is lacunose. This is evident by the absence of some letters of the Greek alphabet, as well as the different number of preserved examples of each series. Additionally, the tokens have not been cleared of sediments, and this is the reason why the distinction of details is quite difficult. Having all these difficulties in mind, we endeavor firstly to make some remarks concerning the iconography of the tokens, as well as some parallels of the images found on other clay, lead, and bronze tokens, or other artifacts. Secondly, we will refer to the characteristics of the unidentified depicted figures that may lead to their identification and, possibly, to the use of different dies.

The die used for the Janiform head of **cat. nos. 1-4** seems to have produced one more clay token included in the Svoronos’ publication (**cat. no. 5**). A clay token from the Athenian Agora bears a Janiform head, however, it seems not to have been produced with the same die as the Janiform head on our tokens. Additionally, the token from the Agora bears a *kantharos* on the other side and not a letter of the Greek alphabet, as opposed to the tokens **cat. nos. 1-5**. The hybrid creature of **cat. nos. 13-15** can possibly be interpreted as an *Hippalektryon* (half-horse and half-rooster). The trunk of the figure is depicted frontally with open wings on both sides. We can see the horse's head on the right and the tail of the rooster on the left. This representation seems to be without parallel on other clay, lead, or bronze tokens. An additional feature that differentiates these tokens is the monogram of their side b. This consists of the two letters of Eta (H, \(\text{Η}n\) in the monogram form) with the crossbar of eta supplying a horizontal *hasta* (stroke) for Tau (T) and a short vertical stroke attached to the horizontal, an addition necessary to distinguish the letter Eta (H) from Zeta (Z).

Wreaths as those of **cat. nos. 6-12** are depicted on lead tokens of the Athenian Agora, and also on a number of small bronze tokens. A dove (**cat. no.19**) combined with the letter Upsilon

---

335 Svoronos 1905, 338 (cat. no 75, pl. IX, 1).
336 Crosby 1964, 127 (C 7A). Janiform masks on lead tokens have been found in the Athenian Agora and have been published by Crosby (1964, 90–91 L 44 pl. 20; 94 L79 pl. 22;106 L208 pl. 27).
337 The same monogram is used for Eta on certain other tokens and dikastic ballots/ *psephoi*: Boegehold (1960, 395–98; Svoronos 1923–26, pl. 101.7).
(Y) in double lines in Svoronos’ publication may have been produced with the same die as **cat. nos. 16, 18, 20, and 21**. However, the partial impression of the die on those tokens does not allow any safe comparisons. The tripods depicted on tokens **cat. nos. 61-64** seem not to have any exact parallel. A tripod on a clay token in the collections of the Numismatic Museum of Athens published by Svoronos does not seem to bear any similarities with those mentioned before.\(^{339}\) There are representations of tripods on small bronze tokens,\(^{340}\) on lead tokens, as well as the image of Herakles stealing the Delphic tripod on a clay token.\(^{341}\) The lead token type with tripod accompanied by the inscription [EPEXΘ] (reading *Erechtheis*) and paired with Dionysos in full figure on the other side belongs to the special category of tribal tokens.\(^{342}\)

Besides the above-mentioned cases, some observations concerning particular varieties of tokens may be noticed. The series with the representation of a Herm (right), a *kerykeion* (left field), and the sprays of a leafy bush (right field), provides the majority of examples. By comparing the best-preserved images (**cat. nos. 39a, 48a, and 51a**) we can observe differences concerning the rendering of the branches and the distance between them. Additionally, the front side of the Herm of **cat. no 48a** is rendered with a strong curvature, while the front face of **cat. no 39a** is formed with a straight line. It seems that two or even three different dies have been used for side a. Herms can be identified on small bronze and lead tokens.\(^{343}\)

The human head of **cat. nos. 31–38** can hardly be identified. The description “human head bearing little wings” derives from Kontstantopoulos in the publication of 1930-31.\(^ {344}\) What has not been understood is that the representation expands on two levels; on the upper level there is a human head, whereas on the lower one there is a four-legged animal, which looks like a

---

Wreaths on small bronze tokens: Postolakas 1880, 10 no. 33 pl. A’ 33 (the other side is Zeta, \(\text{I}\)); 14 no. 62 pl. B’ 62 (the other side is A with a globule)

\(^{339}\) Svoronos 1905, 332 (cat. no. 47 Pl. X, 19). The diameter of that token (12 mm) is smaller than the tokens mentioned in this paper.

\(^{340}\) Potolakas 1884, 19–20 with no catalogue number and no image (paired with head of Athena on the other side).

\(^{341}\) Crosby 1964, 91 L. 53 a-c pl. 20 and ibid. 127 C6 pl. 32.

\(^{342}\) Russo in this volume, pp. cat nos. …

\(^{343}\) Postolakas 1884, 13–14 (cat. nos. 75 and 82 pl. 2), 15–16 (cat. nos. 88 and 94 pl. 2), 17–18 (cat. no 96 pl. 2); Kroll 2015, 109 (cat. no 1 pl. 1); Crosby 1964, 104–05 L.193–L.198 pl. 26.

\(^{344}\) Konstantopoulos 1930–31, 32 (fig. 3).
Maltese dog, as on cat. no. 25. It seems that the same die has been used for all the examples for side a. The best-preserved representations are those of cat. nos. 31, 32, 33, 37, and 38. The differences observed between cat. nos. 34, 35, and 36 and the previous ones is more likely to be the result of damage of the die or of the token itself or a poor imprint of the die rather than a different die having been used. However, the use of a different die cannot be excluded: The imprint of the outline of the die is much closer to the back of the head in the cat. no 34 than that of the cat. no 38.

Among the newly presented tokens, cat. nos. 22–24 bear on side A the representation of the female figure standing in three-quarter view to the right, dressed in peplos and with a short mantle covering her head. She rests her right hand on a grounded sceptre and there are two ears of grain turned downwards in her left hand. This figure can be attributed to the goddess Demeter (or Kore). Side A may have been produced with the same die, although cat. no 24a is covered with sediments.

To produce the tokens bearing a woman’s head on side A and the letter Psi (Ψ) on side B (cat. nos 54, 55, and 57), the same die has been used for side A. The same die has been used for the letter Psi on side B on both tokens. That of cat no 56 is an exception, since different dies have been used in relation to the previous tokens, both for side A and for side B. The same dies as in cat. no 56 have been used for the tokens published by Svoronos in 1905 (cat. no 58). A woman’s head on a token from the Athenian Agora from a Roman context seems similar to the representation of cat. no 56. The latter bears the letter Upsilon (Y) on side B, whose style refers to that of the letter Psi on cat. nos 54, 55, and 57. Female heads on tokens have been interpreted as personifications of the Democracy or the Boule.

Different dies may be distinguished not only on the pictorial faces but also on the lettered ones. For example, the letter Phi (Φ) is formed by an upright bar with two curves attached right and

---

345 Demeter in serpent car, perhaps carrying torch and grain, is represented on a lead token type of Roman date from the Athenian Agora: Crosby 1964, 110 (L 245 pl. 28), 113 (L 270 pl. 29) 117 (L 301 pl. 30). For Demeter on clay tokens Crisà 2019, 65; Crisà 2019, 33–55.

346 On the top of the female head there is a small spherical-elliptical end that could be interpreted as a lampadion (c.f. Gzikaki (2014), 83–84). In this case the token should be attributed to another die and to another series. Nevertheless, it is very likely that it is a simple bulge of the clay.

347 Crosby 1964, 126–27 C5 pl. 31

348 Gzikaki 2020, 97–99 (with n. 30 fig. 4 on p. 99), 122 (cat. no 2 pl. 13), 125 (cat. no. 13 pl. 13) has identified female heads on lead tokens as personification of the Council (Βουλή).
left. On cat. nos. 32b and 34 b the side curves are almost straight on the upper part and they turn downwards to oblique lines, while on cat. nos. 33b and 35b the side curves are almost semicircular. The same remark may be made for the letter Psi (Ψ): on cat. nos 54b, 55b, and 57b the two small strokes of the letter are slightly curved, while in the case of cat. no 56b and 58b they are formed by straight lines. The two forms are known from Greek inscriptions as well. 349

The representation of the Sphinx on the two tokens (cat. nos 52 and 53) come from the same die. It is worth mentioning that the same die has been used to produce the Sphinxes of the series with figurative scenes on both sides, a topic which will be discussed below. Stamps with the image of a Sphinx have been used in Athens for official use, for example on lead tokens and possibly on the bronze jurors’ allotment plates (dikastic pinakia). 350

The distinction of the dies. Differentiations and similarities

Even though our ensemble is a small sample of the tokens that had been produced for the same purpose and does not allow to draw any safe conclusions, some of the observations mentioned above could be particularly evaluated.

Most of the images are produced from the same die. In several cases the same die of the side A has been used in combination with different letters. In some cases, it is observed that the same die has been used to produce letters on tokens that belong to different series, that is, they bear a different pictorial type (for example 44b and 63b). It seems that each image was produced with all 50 different letters (Alpha to Sampi, and Alpha in double lines to Sampi in double lines). The variations of the kneeling figure 1 (59a) and kneeling figure 2 (60a), the first combined with an Omega (Ω) in simple lines and the second with an Omega with double lines, may be interpreted as a method to create another series, of a total number of over 50 items, by modifying the figure’s representation. The kneeling figure is depicted with one of his hands outstretched on cat. no 60a, while on cat. no 59a he has both hands lowered.

349 Guarducci 2008, 110.
However, there are indices of use of different dies for the same pictorial or lettered type. This is the case in the instance of the Herm and of the letters Phi (Φ) and Psi (Ψ). The need to change or replace the die should be considered in terms of duration or rate of production of the tokens. J.H. Kroll argues that the production of the clay tokens was comparatively easy because of their material, suggesting that it was possible to produce them by the thousands only to be used 40 times every year.  

The first question that arises is the amount of strain that a single die could withstand. It is obvious that this level could vary depending on whether the die in question was used for coins or for tokens. Naturally, a die used to imprint an image on a soft material, such as clay, could endure more. However, an additional question arises, regarding the material from which the die itself was made.

As this is the first time that such a large assemblage of clay tokens is studied, we have not got the opportunity of comparison to reinforce our hypothesis concerning the possible replacement of the dies due to wear. There are examples documenting the gradual wear of seal-stones based on their successive imprints on clay sealings which are documented in archives; however, they are not contemporary to our tokens. Neither the duration of the production of this group of tokens, nor the exact number of the specimens of the group to which they belonged, are known.

We should also not overlook the different types of dies used to produce the pictorial types. Although the majority were produced with flat, wide, probably metal sealing surfaces, in five cases there are small, curved, oval sealing surfaces, probably derived from either a gem or metal finger ring. This is true in the case of the Janiform head (cat. nos. 1-5), of the “Hippalectryon” (cat. nos. 13-15), of the human head bearing little wings (cat. nos. 31-38) and that of the woman’s head (cat. nos. 54-58). Also, the Goddess (Demeter/Kore) was produced with an oval stamp (cat. nos. 22-24). It is not easy to say whether this diversification is due to a chronological difference, a change in the authorities issuing tokens, their being used differently, or other reasons.

---

351 Kroll in this volume, p. #.
352 The development of the damage of the dies through their imprints has been observed in large groups of clay sealings originating from archives with great durations, as for example the one of the House of the Seals on Delos: Auda and Boussac 1996, 520.
In the 2019 publication, in addition to the seven series of lettered tokens, two more were presented with pictorial types. The first one bears a representation of a young man riding a deer on one side and Artemis driving a deer chariot on the other (cat. no. 67), whereas the second bears the head of Apollo on one side and a Sphinx on the other (cat. no. 66). The lot contains ten specimens of the type depicting Apollo / sphinx, and these all come from the same pair of dies.

In this article we present a new series with the Sphinx type on side A and the letters Omega (Ω) or Sigma (Σ)/ Mu (Μ) on side B. We can observe that the Sphinx comes from the same die, both in the Apollo/ Sphinx series and in the Sphinx/ letters series. The choice of the same die to produce a new series of tokens may not be random. We could assume that the use of a common die might be a link between the two series.

The lot of tokens under consideration does not provide any other such examples nor do the tokens published by Svoronos. However, a separate clay token from under north end of the Stoa of Attalos may reinforce our hypothesis. It bears a Janiform head with a bird between the two heads, whose tail serves as the beard of the male head. It bears a kantharos on side B, while the Janiform head clay tokens of our group bear a letter. The dimensions of this token (18 x14 mm) are almost identical in comparison with the tokens bearing Janiform heads of our group (diam. 17-18 mm). However, the conservation status of our token does not allow the comparison of the dies. Thus, the second example can reinforce the existence of a connection between the lettered and the pictorial tokens, however, the specifics of this connection are difficult to define.

**The coherence and homogeneity of the material**

In the 2019 publication we conceded the coherence of all clay tokens due to the similarities of the clay, the repetition of the iconographic types, and their common origin. It was suggested that the time when most of the material was handed in to the Numismatic Museum of Athens

---

354 Makrypodi 2019, 37 (cat. nos. 40–49 fig. 15 on p. 31 and cat. nos. 52–57 fig. 17 on p. 31).

355 Crosby 1964, 127 (C7 pl. 32). The token was found in a context probably of the second half of the fourth century BCE.

356 Makrypodi 2019, 33.
coincided with the excavation activity in Pnyx and the Athenian Agora in the 1930s.\textsuperscript{357} The material was handed in to the museum gradually, as the few examples included in the publication of Svoronos of 1905 document that they had come to light as early as the end of the 19th century.\textsuperscript{358}

Typically, lots of tokens or clay sealings are located in deposits (\textit{apothetai}), where they were collected for counting and archiving purposes. The next step in the process was to dispose of them when they had fulfilled their role or to collect them back and reuse them.\textsuperscript{359} Therefore, it is highly likely these clay tokens had been buried somewhere together. That they were gradually handed into the museum may have been a result of illegal excavation activity in the late nineteenth century. The excavation activity in Pnyx may have raised awareness among individuals who had acquired the tokens as collectors and who, knowing their origin, handed them over to the museum at some point later, between the years 1928–32. A second possible scenario is the following: The ‘deposit’ had for some reason been disturbed due to severe weather conditions (e.g. heavy rainfall) and the objects scattered were gathered gradually and then handed in immediately or at another time to the museum.

The clay of the tokens is generally uniform, and the colour ranges from orange to brownish red. In some cases, a colour difference is the result of the different firing temperature. Also, some tokens have got a porous surface and others a smoother one. This is a result of differences in the composition of the clay, the different firing temperature, the different processing of the surface before firing, or it can be the result of differences in the conditions where they were deposited for centuries and therefore differences in the preservation and the corrosion of the surface.

An additional trait that reinforces the homogeneity of the ensemble is the form of the letters of the Greek alphabet they bear on side B. Although not all the letters of the alphabet are found in the tokens of this set, we can observe the following:

\textsuperscript{357} Makrypodi 2019, 33; Kourouniotis 1910; Kourouniotes and Thompson 1932, 90–96.

\textsuperscript{358} Makrypodi 2019, 38 table 1; Svoronos 1905, 325 (cat. nos. 1–6 pl. IX, 2–7).

\textsuperscript{359} It is the case of the clay tokens of Mantinea, c.f. Svoronos 1900, 221; Robinson 2011, 37–38.
• All the letters are distinct for the purity of their lines and their simple, almost geometrical, appearance, which characterizes the letters of the Greek alphabet from the end of the fifth century BCE onwards.

• A tetraskelos Sigma (Σ) and the double consonants Xi (Ξ) and Psi (Ψ) are included.

• The form of the letter Omega (Ω) maintains a sufficient height in its curved part, a characteristic of the end of the fifth century and the beginning of the fourth century BCE.

All these indicate the introduction of the Euclidean script as a terminus post quem. The Euclidean script was introduced to Athens in 404/3 BCE, although it seems that it had gradually prevailed in practice since 411 and generally since 406 BCE.360

The existence of two different dies for the letter Psi (Ψ) (cat nos. 56, 58, and cat. nos 54, 55, 57), the former with straight lines and the latter with slightly curved ones, documents the transition to the fourth century BCE, where letters increasingly presented curved forms as the fourth century progressed.361 Moreover, the two forms of the letter Phi (Φ) date back to the fourth century BCE, however, they may be subsequent.362 It is noted that both Psi (Ψ) and Phi (Φ) are found on side B of the tokens that bear on side A imprints of small seals (gems or metal finger rings), which could have different dating.

**The interpretation of the use: tokens for the Assembly**

As mentioned above, this new series adds new iconographic types. The identification of the representations has been neither easy nor definitive. Were the token designs chosen arbitrarily by the responsible magistrate, as Crosby thought, or did they have a particular identification and purpose?363 Svoronos identified specific lead tokens with particular tribes of Attica, based on the inscriptions they bore or the characteristic representations that referred to the myths of tribal heroes.364 In the case, however, of our own tokens, which lack inscriptions, such safe identifications are precluded. Human figures and human heads on tokens had been identified

---


361 Guarducci 2008, 44.

362 Kirchner 1948, 22 (fig. 48), 23 (fig. 50 for Φ and Ψ), 20 (fig. 44).

363 Crosby 1964, 81–82 with n. 25.

364 Svoronos 1900, 328–32 cat. nos. 112–58 with plates; Crosby 1964, 79 with n. 12; Russo in this volume.
as personification of the Demos (Δῆμος), the Boule (Βουλή), or even Democracy (Δημοκρατία) by M. Gkikaki.\textsuperscript{365}

It is therefore very likely that our tokens were not intended for specific individuals, but possibly for groups of people. These groups could be the tribes. The entry of the citizens in the Assembly was done through the entrances of the Pnyx in tribes. The first 6,000 incoming citizens received a token, possibly indicating where they would sit and most likely this was given back at the end of the meeting. This would have ensured they would be paid the daily remuneration for their participation in the Assembly, as was established after the restoration of democratic government in 403 BCE. The 6,000 citizens were necessary to ensure a quorum in the meeting of the Demos.\textsuperscript{366} The rest of the citizens could participate sitting or standing in the back of the auditorium. J.H. Kroll considers that the unlettered tokens could be given to those who entered the Assembly after the number of 6,000 citizens had been completed. He also believes that the unlettered tokens may represent a return to free seating.\textsuperscript{367}

The addition of the new series presented in this article increases the number of series to 15, as stated below:

1. Janiform head.
2. Wreath
3. Hippalektryon
4. Dove
5. Demeter
6. Four-legged animal
7. Rose
8. Horse
9. Human head with little wings
10. Herm
11. Sphinx
12. Female head
13. Kneeling figure 1
14. Kneeling figure 2
15. Tripod

\textsuperscript{365} Gkikaki 2020, 97–99.
\textsuperscript{366} Hansen 1999, 130, 147, 149–50.
\textsuperscript{367} Kroll in this volume, pp. #.
As already mentioned, five of those series (1, 3, 5, 9, and 12) have different characteristics form the rest of the series, both in terms of the type of die used for their production and in terms of the dating of the letters they bear on side B.\textsuperscript{368} If these five series are subtracted, the remaining number corresponds to the ten Athenian tribes. However, if the two series that depict kneeling figures (13 and 14) are to be considered as the same, then a different hypothesis for the use of these tokens emerges. Hansen has previously argued that the Pnyx auditorium was likely divided into nine sections, which would allow the votes cast to be counted by the nineprohedroi (πρόεδροι) after 403/2 BCE. If this set is considered as a series of nine, then perhaps they were associated with the functioning of the Assembly.\textsuperscript{369}

**Conclusions**

As mentioned above, the most probable interpretation concerning the presented clay tokens is their use in the framework of the citizen participation in the Assembly. Therefore, they could be identified as the *symbola* (σύμβολα) mentioned by Aristophanes.\textsuperscript{370} The information on finding them on the northwest slope of the Hill of the Muses, southeast of the Pnyx, advocates their origin from the area of Pnyx. Our group of tokens has two major interpretive shortcomings: the absence of the excavation context; and the fact that it is lacunose and does not include examples of all the letters of the Greek alphabet. Nevertheless, it allows us to draw some tentative conclusions.

The letters on one of their two sides probably indicated the specific place in which the citizens were seated on the Pnyx. The daily allowance of the citizens for their participation in the Assembly was introduced after the restoration of the democratic government in 403 BCE, and the dating of all the tokens in this period is confirmed by the form of the letters. The variety of types refers to the systematic and large-scale production and argues that they were intended for a large body of citizens. Some figures, as well as the symbols depicted on the other side of the tokens, may refer to the mythology and history of the city, the tribes, or even to personifications of its civic institutions. If, despite the fragmentary nature of the group, we claim that we

\textsuperscript{368} Clay tokens bearing a representation only on one side coming from Pnyx are dated by J. H. Kroll (this volume, p. #) to the phase Pnyx II.

\textsuperscript{369} Hansen 1977, 137. Hansen 1999, 140.

\textsuperscript{370} Aristophanes, *Ekklesiazousai* ii. 289–97 (391 BCE).
distinguish nine or ten different series of clay tokens, then these numbers are identical with the parts in which Pnyx was divided or the number of Athenian tribes respectively.

However, there are some questions that remain difficult to answer: The lettered tokens were most likely used for the entry and indicated the seating places of the first 6,000 incoming citizens at the Pnyx possibly for the payment of their daily allowance after the end of the meeting, and perhaps as ballots when necessary. If the lettered tokens had this role, then what was the use of those bearing pictorial types on both sides? Even if we accept that the tokens with pictorial types were given to the citizens who entered late, when the required quorum had been filled and were used for payment at a time when all participants were entitled to it, the reason for the use of a common die in both categories of tokens (lettered and unlettered) remains unclear. We remind that this is the case with the Sphinx, which exists in both categories, perhaps indicating a special link between them.

The interpretation of this link eludes us. Nevertheless, it seems that it was not accidental, but on the contrary very important. This is evidenced by the presence of Apollo, ancestor of the Ionians, on the other side of the token. We must not forget that the temple of Apollo Patrōos was located in the Athenian Agora in an important location among public buildings. It is worth noting the numerical superiority of the preserved tokens belonging to the Apollo/Sphinx series in comparison to the number of examples belonging to other series. An additional issue is the separation of our group of tokens imposed by the two types of dies used for the pictorial types, metallic for most of the tokens, but gems or metal rings for five of the series presented. Therefore, we must distinguish more than one issue and possibly a small chronological difference dictated by the different kind of dies and perhaps later letters.

Everything mentioned above shows that the interpretation of all our tokens is quite complicated. Unfortunately, the only evidence we have is the physical characteristics of the tokens, as their excavation context has been lost. This is a unique group of clay tokens related to the Pnyx, the entry of citizens to it, their payment, and possibly their vote. The iconography

---

371 Kroll in this volume.
372 Makrypodi 2019, 38 table 1.
of the tokens seems to have strong symbolism. Their production may not be limited to a single year of meetings of the Assembly, but to a wider period of time.

**Catalogue**

Side A: Janiform head.
Side B: Beta (B).

1. NM (Π1), fig. 1. Ø 18mm 1h.
2. NM (Π4), fig. 2. Ø 18mm 5h.
3. NM (Π33), fig. 3. diam.
4. NM (Π41), fig. 4. diam.
5. Svoronos 1905, 338 cat. no 75 pl. IX, 1.

Side A: Wreath.
Side B: Alpha (Α) in double lines.

6. NM 1929/30 (Π61) Ø18mm 3h.

Side A: Wreath.
Side B: Beta (Β) in double lines.

7. NM 1929/31 (Π62) (fig. 6) 17mm 9h
8. NM 215/2005 Ø 17mm 2h.
9. NM 226/2005 Ø 19mm 7h.
10. NM 242/2005 Ø 17mm 7h.

Side A: Wreath.
Side B: Gamma (Γ) retrograde or Pi (Π).

11. NM 251/2005 Ø 17 mm.
12. NM 1929/32 (Π63) (fig. 10) Ø 17mm 9h.

Side A: *Hippalektryon* (?)
Side B: Eta in the monogram form (Eta).

13. NM 220/2005 (fig. 12) Ø 15mm 7h.
14. NM 1929/16 (Π47) ( ) (12 mm).
15. NM 1929/17 (Π48) ( ) (12 mm).

Side A: Dove right.
Side B: Zeta (Zeta) in double lines.

16. NM 1929/34 (Π65) ( ) Ø 17mm 1h.
Side A: Dove right
Side B: Kappa (K) in double lines.

17. NM 281/2005 ( ) Ø 18mm 2h.

Side A: Dove right.
Side B: Omicron (O) in double lines.

18. NM H3/1931 (Π15) ( ) Ø 17 mm 6h or 12h. Konstantopoulos 1930-31, 36 cat. no 3 fig 9, the third seen above; Makrypodi 2019, 36 cat. no 28 fig. 11.

Side A: Dove right
Side B: Upsilon (Υ) in double lines.

19. NM 8146 Ø 18 mm. Svoronos 1905, 325, cat. no 3, pl. IX; Makrypodi 2019, 36 cat. no 29.
20. NM 1929 (Lerakis)/ H5 (Π 7) Ø 15 mm, 2h. Makrypodi 2019, 36 cat.no 30 fig 20.

Side A: Standing woman
Side B: Iota (I).

22. NM 1929/18 (Π49) ( ) Ø 14mm 1h.
23. NM 1929/19 (Π50) ( ) Ø 14 mm 12h.
24. NM 1929/20 (Π51) ( ) Ø 14 mm 2h.

Side A: Four-legged animal (a Maltese dog?)
Side B: Xi (Ξ).

25. NM H5/1931 (Π17) ( ) Ø 19 mm 11 h.

Side A: Rose
Side B: Pi (Π) retrograde in double lines.

26. NM 1929/39 (Π70) Ø 17 mm 7h. Makrypodi 2019, 37 cat. no 50 fig. 16.
27. NM 222/2005 Ø 17 mm 9h. Makrypodi 2019, 37 cat. no 51.

Side A: Horse facing right with a bird on its back.
Side B: Xi (Ξ).

28. NM 268/2005 ( ) Ø 15mm 12h Makrypodi 2019, 37 cat. no 39 fig. 25.

Side A: Horse facing right with a bird on its back.
Side B: Rho (Ρ) retrograde in double lines.

29. NM H2/1931 (Π14) Ø 17 mm 7h. Konstantopoulos 1930-31, 36 cat. no 1 fig. 9, the first seen from above. Makrypodi 2019, 37 cat. no 37 fig 13)
30. NM 1929/33 (Π 64) Ø 18 mm 2h. Makrypodi 2019, 37 cat. no 38 fig. 24.
for P cf. Crosby 1964, 126 Pl. 31 C4 pl. 31.
Side A: Human head right bearing little wings.
Side B: Sigma (Σ) or Mu (Μ).

31. NM 1930/KH (Lerakis 1929 B’) (Π11) Ø 15mm, 1h or 4h. Konstantopoulos 1930-31, 32 cat. no δ fig. 3, the fourth seen from above. Makrypodi 2019, 36 cat. no 20 fig. 9.

Side A: Human head right bearing little wings.
Side B: Phi (Φ).

32. NM 1929/22 (Π53) Ø 14 mm 11h. Makrypodi 2019, 36 cat. no 21.
33. NM 1929/21 (Π52) ) Ø 14 mm 12h. Makrypodi 2019, 36 cat. no 22.
34. NM H7/1931 (Π19) 13x15 mm 9h. Makrypodi 2019, 36 cat. no 23 fig. 10.
35. NM 1929 (Lerakis)/H5 (Π8) 12x15 mm, 3h. Makrypodi 2019, 36 cat. no 24.

Side A: Human head right bearing little wings.
Side B: Chi (Χ).

36. NM 1929/23 (Π54) Ø 14 mm 10h. Makrypodi 2019, 36 cat. no 25 fig. 22.
37. NM 1929/24 (Π55) Ø 14 mm 2h. Makrypodi 2019, 36 cat. no 26.
38. NM 243/2005 Ø 15 mm 12h. Makrypodi 2019, 36 cat. no 27.

Side A: Herm right, bush with three branches in the field r., kerykeion in l. field.
Side B: Sampi in double lines (¶).

39. NM 1929/36 (Π67) Ø 17mm 1h. Konstantopoulos 1930-31, 32 cat. no γ fig. 3, the third seen from above (this specimen). Makrypodi 2019, 35 cat. no 7 fig. 7.
40. NM 1929/35 (Π66) Ø 17mm 4h. Konstantopoulos 1930-1931, 36 cat. no 4, fig. 9, the fourth seen from above (this specimen). Makrypodi 2019, 35 cat. no 8.
41. NM 1929/12 (Π43) Ø 17mm 4h. Makrypodi 2019, 35 cat. no 9.
42. NM 1932/KE’/8 (Π27) Ø 19 mm 5h. Makrypodi 2019, 35 cat. no 10.
43. NM 1932/KE’/7 (Π26) Ø 17mm 4h. Makrypodi 2019, 35 cat. no 11.
44. NM H4/1931 (Π16) Ø 18 mm 12h). Makrypodi 2019, 35 cat. no 12.

Side A: Herm right, bush with three branches in the field r., kerykeion in l. field.
Side B: Upsilon (Υ).

45. NM H6/1931 (Π18) Ø 17mm 6h. Konstantopoulos 1930-31, 36 cat. no 5 fig. 9, the fifth seen from above (this specimen). Makrypodi 2019, 36 cat. no 13 fig.8.
47. NM 221/2005 (Ø 17 mm 3h). Makrypodi 2019, 36 cat. no 15.
48. NM 234/2005 (Ø 18 mm,1h) Makrypodi 2019, 36 cat. no 16.

Side A: Herm right, bush with three branches in the field r., kerykeion in l. field.

373 Cf. the discussion in Boegehold 1960, 396.
Side B: Xi in double lines (Ξ).

49. NM 1929/13 (Π44) Ø 18mm 12h. Makrypodi 2019, 36 cat. no 17.
50. NM 1929/14 (Π45) Ø 17 mm 11h. Makrypodi 2019, 36 cat. no 18.
51. NM 1929/15 (Π46) Ø 18mm 11h. Makrypodi 2019, 36 cat. no 19 fig. 23.

Side A: Sphinx facing right
Side B: Omega (Ω) in double lines

52. NM 1930/KH’ (Lerakis)/H5 (Π10) 18mm 11h. Konstantopoulos 1930-31, 32,β fig. 3 the second seen from above (this specimen).

Side a: Sphinx right
Side b: Mu (Μ) in double lines.

53. NM 1932/4 (Π23) 18mm 12h.

Side A: Woman’s head facing right.
Side B: Psi (Ψ).

54. NM 1929/25 (Π56) Ø 15mm 3h.
55. NM 1929/26 (Π 57) 16x14 mm, 10h.
56. NM 1929/37 (Lerakis) (Π68) 14x12 mm 9h.
57. NM 1929/38 (Lerakis) (Π69) 14x12 mm 10h.
58. NM 8129. Ø 17 mm axes. Svoronos 1905, 325 cat.no 5 pl.IX, 6.

Side A: Kneeling figure, possibly male, facing right.
Side B: Omega (Ω).

59. NM 1929/29 (Π60) Ø 15mm 12h.

Side A: Kneeling figure, possibly male, facing right.
Side B: Omega (Ω) in double lines.

60. NM 1930/KH’/Lerakis, H5 (Π12) 18x8 mm 8h. Konstantopoulos (1930-31, 32,e fig. 3, the fifth seen from above (this specimen).

Side A: Tripod.
Side B: Sampi (☰) in double lines.

61. H1/1931 (Π13) Ø 16mm 9h. Konstantopoulos 1930-31, 36 cat. no. 7 fig. 9, the first seen from above. Makrypodi 2019, 37 cat. no. 33 fig. 12.
62. NM 1932/KE’/6 (Π25) Ø 16 mm 4h. Makrypodi 2019, 37 cat. no. 34.
63. NM 241/2005 18x15 mm 1h. Makrypodi 2019, 37, cat. no. 35.
64. NM 286/2005 17x18 mm 2h. Makrypodi 2019, 37, cat. no. 36.
Side A: Unidentified presentation (human figure raising or adorning a trophy?)
Side B: Xi (Ξ).

65. NM 284/2005 Ø 14 mm.
Side A: Head of Apollo, facing right.
Side B: Sphinx, facing right.

66. NM 1928/H5 (Vlasto’s donation) (Π5) (Ø 15mm, 12h). Makrypodi 2019, 37, cat.no 40.

Side A: Young man riding a deer, right.
Side B: Artemis driving deer chariot, right.

LETTERED AND OTHER TOKENS IN THE LAWCOURTS AND THE ASSEMBLY OF ATHENS*

J. H. Kroll

University of Texas at Austin

Of the seven or eight mentions of conventional, coin-like tokens in Athenian literature and inscriptions, all but two refer to tokens employed in the Athenian assembly and jury courts. In the case of the lawcourt testimonia, procedures involving tokens in the fourth century are described in enough detail that Alan Boegehold was able to identify and discuss most of the tokens in question. There has been no comparable treatment of tokens connected with the assembly, however, because hardly any criteria for identifying such tokens had been recognized until quite recently. The aim of this paper is to redress this imbalance insofar as the evidence of extant tokens and plausible conjecture allow. For convenience of reference the relevant testimonia are labelled below as (a)-(f).374

I. In the Athenian Lawcourts (dikastereia)

Of all Athenian tokens the most fully understood are those that were employed in the fourth century BC for the seating of the jurors (dikastai) in the large Athenian dikasteria. Several courts, variously consisting of 200, 400, or 500 sworn jurors, were empaneled roughly 200 days a year.375 As described in the Aristotelian Athēnaion Politeia, written in the mid-320s BC, each juror, once he had been selected by lot from the pool of eligible candidates from his tribe, was given a colored staff and an acorn with a letter on it which indicated by color and letter the courtroom to which he was assigned.

(a) And when he comes into that court he receives an official token376 (symbolon) from the person selected by lot for this task.” (para. 65.2)

Later,

*Acknowledgements:  Stamatoula Makrypodi, for sharing her work on terracotta tokens, Mairi Gkikaki for editorial assistance.

374 The remaining two Athenian testimonia attest to the use of tokens in the private sector: one refers to a symbolon obtainable from shopkeepers (Pollux 9.71, quoted from the Old Comedy poet Hermippos), the other to a symbolon purchased as a ticket to see a variety show (Theophrastos, Characters VI: ‘The Shameless Man’).

375 A convenient introduction to the Athenian jury court system will be found in Hansen 1991, 178-224.

376 The translation, ‘official token’, is that of Boegehold (1960, 393 and 1995, 207-208 source no. 249) and Rhodes (1984). The Greek is not so straightforward: the juror receives a σύμβολον δημοσίᾳ, ‘a token officially’, with the second word expressed as an adverb, not the adjective (δημόσιον) that one would expect. Understandably, Rhodes 1981, ad loc. finds this puzzling. But it may be worth noting that most of the word is missing from the Athēnaiōn Poiteia papyrus and is supplied by a quotation of the sentence in the scholia on Aristophanes, Ploutos, 277. Trusting the scholia, successive editions of the Teubner text of the Athēnaiōn Politeia print δη[μοσία], with most of the word in brackets.
When each juror casts his vote, he gives up his staff and receives a bronze symbolon with a triobol design\(^{377}\), for when he hands it in he receives three obols. This is to ensure that all will vote, for no one can receive a symbolon without voting. (para. 68.2).

Later still (para. 69.2) we read that the jurors received their pay outside of the courts in the tribal entrance area where they were initially allotted.

The \textit{AthPol} mentions the receipt of two tokens, the first that the juror was given upon entering his assigned court (and that he surrendered with his colored staff just before voting) and the second, with type of a triobol coin (or the number three), to be exchanged for his stipend. While the purpose of the second token is clear enough, the purpose of the first one was not correctly understood until the 1950s when a number of bronze tokens stamped with letters was excavated in the Athenian Agora within and near to foundations that proved to belong to the Athenian lawcourts. One such token was found in an enclosed deposit with several bronze ballots used in courtroom voting.\(^{378}\) Previously, such lettered tokens were assumed to have served as tickets for theatrical performances and assembly meetings in the Theater of Dionysos, their letters representing seating areas within the auditorium.\(^{379}\) Once Boegehold recognized that they were used in the lawcourts, the likelihood that their letters served for seating the jurors made excellent sense. As he explained, requiring the jurors to sit on benches in allotted, lettered sections reduced confusion in the seating of hundreds of men and in 410/09 had already become mandatory for the 500 members of the Athenian Council (\textit{Boule}), primarily to protect against the disruptive behavior of like-minded participants, who, if free to sit together in factions, could harass and drown out speakers they disliked.\(^{380}\)

Approximately eighteen series of these tokens are known, all of bronze.\(^{381}\) The tokens of each series are stamped with one of the 24 letters of the Ionic/Attic alphabet.

\(^{377}\) Translation of Rhodes 1984, which is probably correct. The text states that it is a bronze symbolon with a \(\Gamma\), i.e., a \textit{gamma} representing the number three, but it could just as well represent a three-obol coin.

\(^{378}\) For the find spots of the Agora tokens and a plan of the Agora with the find spots indicated, see Boegehold et al. 1995, 68 and Figure. 4.

\(^{379}\) Svoronos 1898, 37–120. Svoronos’ theory that the letters on the tokens corresponded to letters on marble slabs that he identified as theater seats had already been refuted by O. Broneer (1936), who recognized that the marble slabs were drainage covers of the theater’s gutter and the letters were used for positioning.

\(^{380}\) Boegehold 1960, 400–01; idem. 1995, 155–56, no. 73, citing Philochoros (late fourth/early third century BC), \textit{FGrHist} 328, frag. 140, with commentary: “Philochoros says that in the archonship Glaukippos (410/9) the boule was for the first time seated by letter (\(\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\alpha\mu\mu\alpha\)) and even now they swear an oath to sit in the letter to which they are allotted.” Below, p. 60.

\(^{381}\) Boegehold’s discussion and catalogue of the specimens from the Agora (Boegehold et al. 1995, 68–76, pls. 9–12) needs to be read along with the three folio-sized plates of Svoronos (1923–26 pls. 100–02), which illustrate plaster casts of 134 lettered tokens by series. In his original catalogue of almost all of these tokens, Svoronos (1898) lists all unillustrated duplicates with measurements along with the best specimens that he chose to illustrate.
(A – Ω) to which was added the early Ionic letter sampi (ϡ) to give 25 lettered sections. The tokens of each series are stamped on their obverse with a helmeted head of Athena (Fig. 1) or some other symbol: in one series a lion’s head, in another a design of four owls and the letters ΘΕ-ΣΜΟ-ΘΕ-ΤΩΝ, “of the Thesmothetai”, the Athenian magistrates who presided over the jury trials (Fig. 2). Four series of bronze tokens are stamped with the same letter on both sides. The letter-forms and archaeological contexts in the Agora excavations show that the extant tokens date to the fourth century. The earliest reference to the handing out of (seating) tokens to jurors when they arrive at the lettered court to which they had been allotted (the courts also were also assigned letters) is

(c) Aristophanes’, Ploutos (388 BC), lines 277–78:

Now that you have been allotted to your letter to judge in the grave, go. Charon is handing out the symbolon.

The courts continued to function in the first half of the third century. As Boegehold observed, plain tokens of lead with a letter on one or both sides, of which there are many examples in various sizes and styles probably replaced the bronze ones of the fourth century.

The second juror token mentioned in the AthPol happens to be the most completely described token in all of ancient literature. Both its type (that of triobol or the letter/number three) and its material (bronze) are specified. Ironically, not a single specimen has come to light. But then, unlike seating tokens, such voucher tokens were less prone to be lost. Not only did they have a monetary value but at the end of every court day each one had to be returned to the state for payment.

All tokens with an Athenian triobol device that have survived are of lead. Two, are stamped on one side with types that are nearly identical to those on late fourth-century triobol coins and could very well be later versions of the bronze token. The triobol devices on two other lead tokens (Fig. 3a and b) reproduce the coin type less accurately; both tokens also have a section letter stamped on their reverse. With the curved sides and dot serifs of its delta, the second token is clearly Hellenistic. The other, with an alpha of conventional shape has an adjunct symbol of the Eleusinian vessel known as a kernos. Since both lead tokens are likely to be third-century successors of the jury tokens in bronze, they suggest that the two earlier types of

---

383 Boegehold et al. 1995, 41–42.
384 Svoronos 1900, 326 no. 83 pl. II 4, https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.83 and https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.II.no.4 (last accessed 23/1/2022); Crosby 1964, 100 L 144 pl. 24 https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/agoral144 and https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/agorail624 (last accessed 23/1/2022)
385 The alphas and delta on the lead armour tokens from an Agora well (Kroll 1977, pl. 40; Schäfer 2019, figs. 2–6) have similar dot serifs and curved sides. Associated finds date these tokens to the middle or third quarter of the third century.
tokens, one for seating, the other for payment, may have been combined into a single juror’s token after c. 300 BC.

II. In the Athenian Assembly (Ekklesia)

The employment of tokens in the large Athenian assemblies is attested in two passages and may be referenced in a third.

(d) Aristophanes, Ekklesiazousai (The Assemblywomen), lines 290–97. 391 BC.

CHORUS OF WOMEN DISGUISED AS MEN

Let’s go to the Assembly, men! Because the thesmothetes has issued a warning that if anyone doesn’t come good and early, when it’s still dark . . . he won’t give him his three obols . . . And when we’ve got our symbola, then we must make sure we sit close together, so that we can vote to approve all of the measures our women friends may need—only, what am I saying? I should have said our male friends.

(tr. A. H. Sommerstein, adapted)

(e) IG II1 3 4, 76 (tr. AIO). 341/0 BC. Decree of the tribe of Aigeis praising a committee of three tribal representatives who served as Convenors of the People (syllogeis tou demou = controllers of entry into the Assembly [Hansen 1991, p.142]).

. . . since they well and justly managed the convening of the People and the distribution of the symbola. . .

(f) Another epigraphical passage relevant to assembly payments and tokens occurs in a decree passed in 267/6 BC by a detachment of Athenian soldiers stationed at Eleusis during the Chremonidean War (I. Eleusis 182 = IG II2 1272 [tr. AIO]). The decree honors a certain Dion, who . . . as secretary to the treasurer of the grain fund in the year of the archonship of Menekles (267/6), has made every effort concerning the giving of grain and of the ekklesiastika given for the grain (περὶ τὴν τοῦ σίτου δόσιν καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τῶν διδομένων ἐπὶ τὸν σῖτο[ν]).

Several commentators, including Svoronos and Crosby have followed M. Rostovtzeff in identifying these ekklesiastika as voucher tokens.386 In disagreement, U. Fantasia points out that since the only other extant occurrences of the term ekklesiastikon (Schol. Aristophanes, Knights 51; and I. Iasos 20, lines 2 and 6) pertain to the actual stipend for

386 Rostovtzeff 1905 28 with n. 2; Svoronos 1905, 344; Crosby 1964, 78.
assembly attendance, the term in the inscription should be understood to refer not to tokens but to the indemnities or expenses incurred in the distribution of grain to the soldiers: ἐκκλησιαστικὰ (χρήματα) rather than ἐκκλησιαστικὰ (σύμβολα). But whether it refers to tokens or expenditures, the passage shows that ekkesiastic pay had become the state payment par excellence and a synonym for other public compensations. In as much as tokens were routinely employed in all such mass disbursements, the present passage, however translated, implies the existence of tokens for assembly pay as late as the 260s.

Soon after the restoration of democratic government in 403 BC the Athenians introduced pay for assembly attendance to ensure that a full quorum of 6,000 voters would be present for voting on certain items of state business. Initially fixed at one obol, the amount had to be raised to two, and by 391 BC, as we learn from the above passage in Aristophanes’ Ekklesiazousai, it had been increased to three. By the 320s the rate had doubled to a drachma (six obols) for ordinary sessions, and a drachma and a half for major (kyria) sessions. Since these assemblies with their required minimum of 6,000 participants met about forty times a year, the tokens distributed at these meetings must have been the most familiar of all tokens issued by the Athenian state. Commentators on the Ekklesiazousai passage have reasonably assumed that the symbolon mentioned by the chorus must have been a voucher token, handed out to the first 6,000 attendees to arrive and exchanged for their fee upon exiting when the assembly was adjourned.

Mogens Hansen wondered whether that some small lead tokens in the Athens Numismatic Museum could be such tokens. They are stamped on one side with a male head wearing a laurel crown and identified by the accompanying legend ΔΗΜ-ΟΣ as the personification of the Athenian Demos (Fig. 4). Attribution to the Assembly is attractive, but being small, of lead, and finely detailed, they are clearly Hellenistic in date and cannot be associated with the assembly in the fourth century.

Recently, in her study of the terracotta tokens in the Numismatic Museum of Athens, Stamatoula Makrypodi identified a substantial and far more intriguing class of tokens whose relevance to the fourth-century Assembly can hardly be doubted. As explained in her preliminary 2019 account and now in her contribution to the present volume (above, 000),

388 Athēnaiōn Politeia 62.2
389 Hansen 1987, 169 with n. 557, citing the tokens listed by Svoronos 1900, 327 (nos. 92–97 pl. II 40), https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.92 and https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.II.no.40 (last accessed 23/1/2022). They are 12 mm. in diameter and are stamped on the reverse with a gorgoneion, a symbol of Athena and of the Athenian People, to judge from its appearance on archaic Athenian coins and as a stamp denoting citizenry on allotment plates of fourth-century Athens, cf. Kroll 1972, 53–56.
390 A token with the same obverse (Svoronos 1900, 327 no. 98 pl. II 41, https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.98 and https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.II.no.41 last accessed 23/1/2022) has the reverse type of the three Graces, relating it to the democratic cult of Demos and the Graces, established after Athens liberation from Macedonian control in 229 BC, cf. Habicht 1997, 118.
nearly all of the 65 tokens of this type were found in 1929-1931 on the northwest slope of the Mouseion Hill, the slope that descends towards the road that led from the Athenian Agora up to the Assembly place on the adjacent hill of the Pnyx. When brought to the Numismatic Museum, most of the tokens were said to have been picked up as surface finds. Because many of them are duplicates and all are similar in character, it is likely they came from a single deposit, having been lost or buried together in antiquity even if they somehow had become exposed and scattered before discovery.

Most of them divide into fifteen lettered series, each token of which displays a common pictorial type on one side of the tokens and an alphabetic letter on the other. In these respects, the series are similar to the series of lettered bronze tokens used in the Athenian courts. In addition to the 25 letters that occur in each series of the dikastic tokens (24 letters of the Attic alphabet plus the borrowed letter sampi [ってしまいます]), the letters on the terracotta tokens continued for another 25 of the same letters represented in double lines for a total of 50 lettered designations altogether. As with the dikastic tokens, in the absence any plausible alternative, the letters should represent seating sections, although in the case of the terracotta tokens, seating for a much larger number of persons, a circumstance that, even more than their recovery in proximity to the Pnyx, supports their identification with the Athenian assembly.

Unlike the series of bronze dikastic tokens, most of which have a helmeted head of Athena as their pictorial type, the pictorial images that define each of the terracotta series are highly diverse, extending from simple, conventional symbols like a tripod or wreath (ref to Stamatoula Makrypodi fig.) to such obscure, idiosyncratic representations as a stork or other long-billed bird with long legs standing on the rump of a horse (ref to Stamatoula Makrypodi fig.) or a male-female janiform head wearing a cap in the form of a lion’s face (Stamatoula Makrypodi fig.). Since the pictorial designs of five of the fifteen lettered series were stamped from oval-shaped dies that were smaller than the diameter of the clay disk, causing the image to be surrounded by a sunken, incuse field: Janiform head (Makrypodi in this volume nos. 1-5), Hippalektryon? (ibid. nos. 13-15), Demeter standing (nos. 22-24), Human head r. (mask?) etc. (ibid. nos. 31-38), woman’s head r. (ibid. nos. 54-58). Ten series stamped from wider dies that produced a flat field: Wreath (ibid. nos. 6-12), Dove (ibid. nos. 16-21), Dog? (ibid. no. 25), Rose (ibid. nos. 26-27), Horse with bird on back (ibid. nos. 28-30), Herm with bush and caduceus (ibid. nos. 39-51), Sphinx (ibid. nos.52-53), Kneeling figure (ibid. nos. 59-60), Tripod (ibid. nos. 61-64), Unidentified (ibid. no. 65).

In his 1989 discussion of the use of wicker fences (gerra) to control the crowds of assembly-goers that arrived at the Pnyx, Hansen imagined that area below the staircase or staircases that led up to the auditorium was fenced off so that the thirty Convenors of the People could check the 6,000 citizens and hand out the tokens (see testimonium (e) above) as the citizens passed through.393 Hansen envisioned only one entrance from the fenced area to the stairs, but since there were three Convenors per tribe (originally probably one per each tribe’s

392 Makrypodi in this volume, p. 00. Five series were stamped with oval shaped dies smaller than the diameter of the clay disk, causing the image to be surrounded by a sunken, incuse field: Janiform head (Makrypodi in this volume nos. 1-5), Hippalektryon? (ibid. nos. 13-15), Demeter standing (nos. 22-24), Human head r. (mask?) etc. (ibid. nos. 31-38), woman’s head r. (ibid. nos. 54-58). Ten series stamped from wider dies that produced a flat field: Wreath (ibid. nos. 6-12), Dove (ibid. nos. 16-21), Dog? (ibid. no. 25), Rose (ibid. nos. 26-27), Horse with bird on back (ibid. nos. 28-30), Herm with bush and caduceus (ibid. nos. 39-51), Sphinx (ibid. nos.52-53), Kneeling figure (ibid. nos. 59-60), Tripod (ibid. nos. 61-64), Unidentified (ibid. no. 65).

393 Hansen 1989, 135.
tittys or regional third\textsuperscript{394}, it stands to reason that for the effectiveness of the Convenors, who had to guarantee that admission was limited to \textit{bonafide} citizens of their tribe, and for the convenience of the attendees themselves, each tribe ought to have had its own entrance. Accordingly, as each attendee was admitted through the entrance of his tribe he drew or was handed a token that assigned him to one of fifty designated seating areas in the auditorium. As with the Athenian juries, assembly-goers arrived at the entrances of their tribe but ended up seated in sections that were independent of tribal organization\textsuperscript{395}

Like the lettered tokens for the seating of jurors, the lettered Assembly tokens presupposed seating for a predetermined number of participants. In the case of the Assembly, the only number we know of was its legal quorum of 6,000, which, if used for the number of tokens, would mean that they were received by the first 600 men to present themselves at each tribe’s entrance. There being 50 sections, the allotted seating section would have accommodated 120 citizens each. When the assembly was adjourned and the tokens had to be turned in, they would have served a second function as vouchers for the receipt of the attendee’s stipend.

In addition to these lettered tokens, the collected terracotta tokens picked up on the slope of the Hill of the Muses in 1929-31, contained two varieties of similarly sized tokens that, lacking letters, have pictorial images on both faces. Ten of them show a head of Apollo and on the other side a Sphinx.\textsuperscript{396} Six depict a Youth riding a deer on one face and Artemis driving a deer chariot on the other.\textsuperscript{397} The sphinx on the Apollo/Sphinx tokens happens to have been stamped with the same sphinx die as used for a lettered series.\textsuperscript{398} This sharing of dies between lettered and unlettered terracotta tokens has a parallel of sorts in the pictorial type of Janiform head wearing a lion-head cap mentioned above as a series type on lettered tokens; the same curious head (although not from the same die) appears on a bifacial terracotta token from the Agora that shows a kernos on the reverse.\textsuperscript{399}

The existence of these double-image tokens alongside the lettered tokens is problematic, as is the absolute chronology of these and all of the other terracotta Assembly tokens in general. One thing we can say with some certainty, however, is that fourth-century Assembly tokens are recognizable from their material: fired clay, an inexpensive substance well-suited for tokens that had to be made literally by the thousands and yet were used on only forty occasions each year with types that continually needed to be changed to avoid falsification. By way of contrast, jurors’ tokens, which were handed out and collected far more

\begin{footnotes}
\item[394] As known from the demotics of the named Convenors honored in the 341/0 inscription (above, \textit{testimonium e}), representation by \textit{tittys} had been abandoned by that time. The Convenors are first attested in a law of 375/4 pertaining to Athenian coinage (Rhodes and Osborne 2003, 114–15 no. 25, line 15).
\item[395] In a number of discussions Hansen (1987, 39–41; idem 1989, 161–62; idem 1991, 137–38) has consistently maintained that seating in the Assembly remained unrestricted for the whole of the fourth century. The opinion that he felt obliged to challenge was that the attendees sat in tribal groups. Allotted seated in lettered sections, however, would have been neither tribal nor unrestricted.
\item[396] Makrypodi 2019, 37 (nos. 40–49 fig. 15 on p. 31).
\item[397] Ibid. 37 (nos. 52–57 fig. 17 on p. 31).
\item[398] Makrypodi, this volume, p. 00.
\item[399] Crosby 1964, 127 (C 7 “context probably of second half of the 4th century” pl. 32).
\end{footnotes}
often—approximately every other day—in smaller numbers and in more confined, easily controlled spaces, were just as sensibly stamped on disks of bronze that allowed for continuous reuse.

In addition to the core finding of over five dozen specimens from the Hill of the Muses, a number of related terracotta tokens have been recovered in the excavations of the Assembly place on the Pnyx and within and near to the Agora square. Six of these excavated tokens are double-sided, bearing a pictorial image on one side and a letter in single or doubled lines on the other. These are: one from the Pnyx with Eros figure moving r. holding staffs/K, glazed, and five from the Agora, published by Crosby as C1 to C5 of her catalogue. The 25 mm diameter of C 4 is conspicuously larger than that of the other extant lettered terracotta tokens (15-18 mm), indicating that it belongs to a separate, probably earlier, phase of manufacture and use. C 4 is of additional interest because it was excavated about halfway between the Agora square and the assembly place on the Pnyx. Another token from another lettered terracotta series in the collection of the Numismatic Museum of Athens is illustrated by Svoronos.

Since these lettered tokens served to assign each participant to a seating section at the beginning of the meetings, their introduction should postdate the Ekklesiazousai (391 BC), in which the early arriving women, after receiving their symbolon for pay, were free to sit together and vote as a bloc. Such partisan grouping with its potential for disruption was precisely the kind of problem that seating “by letters” was intended to eliminate. Because the earlier assembly tokens served merely as vouchers for pay they would have been lacked letters, like the two unglazed terracotta tokens that were excavated from the fill of the Pnyx III auditorium. Both were stamped on one side only. One shows the head of a bearded man, the other a Pegasus. Since both were found in the construction fill of Pnyx III, with its greatly enlarged auditorium, begun in or shortly after 347, these earlier tokens clearly date to the time of Pnyx II (c 400-347). Accordingly, as this massive filling contained no tokens with letters, it is tempting to associate the introduction of lettered tokens with the completion of the enlarged third auditorium.

Although the contextual evidence for this association is admittedly slight, it could lend support to Hansen’s conjecture that the limitation of pay to the required 6,000 may have been relaxed when the size of the Assembly place was increased. Even if seating by assigned sections was limited to the 6,000, standing room outside of the seating sections at the back and sides of the auditorium could have accommodated additional attendees for whom a different kind of token would be appropriate, tokens that lacked seating letters, like the problematic bifacial Apollo/Sphinx and Artemis/Youth and deer mentioned above. Or, did these bifacial

---

400 Davidson and Thompson 1943, 108 no.18 (T138) fig. 48,18 on p. 107.
401 Crosby 1964, 126 nos. C 1 (standing figure/A, glazed), C 2 (Crab/K, glazed), C 3 (“Uncertain solid, large design, possibly a thorax, frog or winged insect”/K in double lines, unglazed), C 4 (Rooster/retrograde P in double lines, unglazed), C 5 (Female head/Y, unglazed) pl. 31.
402 Svoronos 1905, 325 (no.1 pl. IX, 2: Pig/?Θ).
403 Davidson and Thompson 1943, 108 nos. 14 (T134) and 15 (T135) fig. 48,14 and 15 on p. 107. Makrypodi (2019, 35 nos. 4–6 figs. 4–6 on p. 29) illustrates the bearded head token from the Pnyx with two other specimens of unknown provenience from the same die. Like the tokens from the Mouseion lot, all of these were unglazed.
404 Lawall 2005, 50–53.
405 Hansen 1987, 47.
unlettered tokens represent a return to free seating after the complex experiment with assigned seating failed to justify its continuance? There is much here that must remain a matter of guesswork.

As the many Hellenistic decrees passed by the Assembly attest, the Ekklesia continued to meet as late as the first century BC. For most of the third century the Pnyx remained the site of the body’s regular meetings and was not replaced by the Theater of Dionysos until the second century.\textsuperscript{406} Even though reference (f) to ekklesiasti\(\kappa\)a in 267/6 pertained to grain rations, it implies at a minimum that for pay for Assembly attendance continued well into the third century, doubtless through the established means of exchange with tokens. By that time the assembly tokens were no longer made of terracotta, however, but like dikastic tokens originally of bronze, were continued on in lead. With the probable exception of the lead tokens depicting the labelled head of Demos (\textbf{Fig. 4a and b}), the remaining Hellenistic unlettered lead tokens of Hellenistic date that may have been used in Assembly payments cannot be identified as such. Like most of their unlettered terracotta antecedents, their figural iconography was dictated by a need for constant variety and change and hence was devoid of visible clues that might allow us to recognize their association with a specific Athenian institution.\textsuperscript{407}

\textbf{Addendum. In the Athenian Council (\textit{Boule})}

As seating by lettered sections was evidently devised in 410/9 for the seating of the 500 \textit{bouleutai} (above, n. 7), we should ask whether lettered tokens were employed in the organization of this sizable legislative body as well. The artifactual evidence is limited: a single lead token in the Athens Numismatic Museum, first published in an 1884 drawing (\textbf{Fig. 5a}) and later by Svoronos with a photograph of a plaster cast (\textbf{Fig. 5b}).\textsuperscript{408} The spelling BO-\(\Lambda\)H on the upper face would ordinarily date the token to the first half of the fourth century, after Athens’ adoption of the Ionic alphabet in 403 but before the retention of omicron for the omicron-\(\upsilon\) diphthong became extremely rare.\textsuperscript{409} But this is a lead token and the use of lead may be an indicator of a later period, in which case the condensed spelling might have

\textsuperscript{406} MacDonald 1943, 57–59.

\textsuperscript{407} For this reason, my earlier, tentative suggestion of connecting the very small Athenian tokens of bronze (wrongly called \textit{kollyboi} by Svoronos) with the Assembly (Kroll 2015, 115) can remain no more than a mere possibility. The uniform size of these 6–8 mm diameter tokens implies public use, as opposed to instruments that were privately made and distributed. The scale of the extant lettered and unlettered types and type combinations is huge. Svoronos 1912, (130–60) lists 645 combinations, many involving categories that are problematic in themselves, such as some 82 monograms or pairs of different letters as types and a number of tokens with a different letter on each side. Consequently, like the Hellenistic tokens of lead, many of which were also stamped with monograms, the small bronze tokens probably served multiple purposes and institutions, including possible use in mass distributions or lotteries at festivals (Kroll 2015, 115, citing the many religious symbols, phalluses, and all sorts of drinking and wine storage vessels depicted on these small tokens). This does not exclude the possibility that many or all may have served as tokens for assembly pay, only that there is no particular visual or other hint that would support that interpretation.

\textsuperscript{408} Engel 1884, 5 (no. 1 pl. I); Svoronos 1900, 333 (no. 172 pl. III 15); \url{https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.172} and \url{https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-specimens/id/svoronos1900.pl.III.no.15} (last accessed 30/1/2022).

\textsuperscript{409} Threatte 1980, I.238–56.
been dictated by the small size of the token. The seating letter on the other side was stamped partially off the edge of the token and was either an epsilon or a sampi, as Svoronos noted.\textsuperscript{410} In either case, there is no reason to doubt that this token was one in a series of lettered tokens for randomly distributing \textit{bouleutai}, like jurors, among lettered sections.

The question here becomes how often was this distribution performed? Unlike the voluntary and ever-changing membership from meeting to meeting in the courts and the Assembly, membership in the boule was stable. All 500 or (after 307/6) 600 \textit{bouleutai} served together for the full year, meeting almost every day, and may have sat in their same lettered sections, if not for the entire year, then at least during each prytany, one-tenth of the year. Such longer-term assigned seating may be implied in the use of the singular in the oath each \textit{bouleutes} swore at the beginning of his annual tenure when he pledged “to sit in the letter to which he was allotted” (ἐν τῷ γράμματι τῷ ἄν λάχωσι). If so, the drawing of lettered tokens would have been infrequent, the series of needed tokens few, and the survival of a single token from a century or more of token use for seating understandable.

The members of the boule received a daily stipend. But for such a fixed body that met regularly, there was probably no need for tokens in the disbursement of pay.\textsuperscript{411}

\section*{CAPTIONS.}

Figure 1. Bronze Dikastic Token Series, nearly complete. Assembled from specimens from the National Numismatic Collections of Athens, London and Berlin as well as the excavations of the Athenian Agora and the Alpha Bank Numismatic Collection. Boegehold 1960 and Svoronos 1923-26 pl. 101 have stood as model for this plate. Bronze jurors' tokens of the series \textit{A}, according to Boegehold’s classification (1995, 72-73). The plate was created by Mairi Gkikaki and the Graphic Designer Matthias Demel and was inspired by the plate 87b in Boegehold (1960). Tokens lettered \textit{A} to \textit{Δ}: © Berlin, Münzkabinett (inv. nos. 0061240617031, 0061240617032, 0061240617033, 0061240617034, 0061240617035), E: The Alpha Bank Numismatic Collection.

\textsuperscript{410} Since Émile Gilliéron, the draftsman of Engel’s drawing, apparently assumed that the letter was an \textit{epsilon} rotated 90 degrees to the right, he extended the vertical on the right to the bottom of the token. Svoronos’ photo, on the other hand, seems to show that this vertical was actually shorter. Since Svoronos himself was familiar with character \textit{sampi} from his previous study of lettered bronze tokens, he identified the incomplete letter as either an \textit{epsilon} or a correctly oriented \textit{sampi}. I have not seen the token, but my impression is that the photograph favors \textit{sampi}, in which case this token could only have served for seating.

In his 1900 publication of inscribed lead tokens Svoronos (1900, 333 nos. 175–79 pl. III 16–20) included eight tokens with \textit{BOYAH} or \textit{BOY} in very small lettering. None have a section-letter. All appear to be Hellenistic, as do a majority of the fifty one-sided tokens with the letters \textit{ΠΕΝ} and 36 different types that Svoronos attributed also to the Boule of 500 (ibid. 334–36 nos. 181–228) on the assumption that \textit{ΠΕΝ} was an abbreviation of \textit{pentakosiōn (500, πεντακοσίων)}. But it is unlikely that all fifty of these tokens date before 307/6 BC when the number of \textit{bouleutai} was raised to 600; \textit{ΠΕΝ} should be an abbreviation of some other word. Gkikaki (2021, 61) discusses the \textit{ΠΕΝ} tokens and proposes that the legend should be interpreted as abbreviation of \textit{pentedorachmia}.

\textsuperscript{411} More on tokens and the Athenian Council in Gkikaki in this volume.
Figure 2. Partial Bronze Dikastic Token Series. Type of four owls arranged crosswise, inscribed ΘΕ-ΣΜΟ-ΘΕ-ΤΩΝ. Reproduced from Svoronos 1923-26, pl. 100, 42–46.

Figure 3a. Lead token, face a: Owl right, framed by two olive sprays, face b: letter Delta (slightly struck off flan) 12h. Fig. 3b. Lead token, face a: owl facing, framed by two olive sprays, pierced at 12 o’clock, face b: letter Alpha with kernos between the two diagonal bars. Reproduced from C. Darember and E. Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines, tome Deuxième, première partie* (Paris 1892) 193 figs. 2413 and 2414 [s.v. Dikastai 186-200]. These two images were reproduced in J.E. Sandys, *Aristotle’s Constitution of Athens. A revised text with an introduction, critical and explanatory notes, testimonia and indices* (London and New York 1893) frontispiece.

Figure 4a and b. Lead tokens with Demos head as bearded and laureate facing right. Reproduced from Svoronos 1900, pl. II 40 and 41.

Figure 5a and 5b. Lead token, 12mm. Side a: ΒΟ|ΛΗ, side b: sampi [☿]. Reproduced from Engel 1884, 5 (no. 1 pl. I) and from Svoronos 1900, 333 (no. 172 pl. III 15).
TOKENS FROM THE DEME OF KOILE
Olga Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou
Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City

Abstract
During field research in Athens’ Western Hills (encompassing the hill of the Muses, or Philopappou, the Pnyx, and the Hill of the Nymphs) undertaken in 2000, a group of sixteen lead tokens came to light at a short distance from the well-known Koile road, close to the Koile Agora and near the West Gate of the Themistoclean Wall (fig. 1). Fourteen of these tokens were found inside a small oval rock cut basin (Catalogue part A) and two in a natural cavity just outside the basin (Catalogue part B). Along with other miscellaneous objects also inside the basin and the cavity, five silver coins of Athens (among them a Wappenmünzen obol) and thirty-two bronze coins (Athenian and non-Athenian) were also found, along with a dikast’s bronze token, all of which were presented by Eva Apostolou and the author in 2020. Chronologically, these coins range from the second half of the sixth century BCE to the first half of the first century BCE. Based on the coins (which provide a useful terminus ante quem), the destruction layer, and the pottery also collected from within the basin, the tokens can be dated to the second century BCE. At that time, the second phase of the Compartment Wall, the Diateichisma, also known as the White Poros Wall, was constructed. As a result, the extramural section of the deme of Koile was abandoned and finally became a disreputable area (fig. 2). Taking into consideration the excavation data, topography, and the history of the Koile and Pnyx area in the late Hellenistic period, we will attempt to provide a daring interpretation in this article. It is argued that this lot of coins and tokens may have been some sex worker’s savings from services offered at a low price in such a deserted and disreputable area. This suggestion may give us a response to the serious question: is it possible that Archaic coins were in circulation simultaneously with Classical and Hellenistic currency? Research on the findings from the Koile area could clarify the role played by the tokens as petty currency. In any case


413 Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou and Apostolou 2020, 275–89.
the small but significant findings from the Koile area provoke questions and, as such, deserve a place in the research of the tokens.

[INSERT FIG1 HERE]

[INSERT FIG2 HERE]

The excavation

The total number of tokens presented here were brought to light in the north-east part of the Koile road while we were searching for the boundaries of the Koile Agora (fig. 3). The big channel which delimited the northern and the western sides of the square at its north-eastern corner was connected to a narrow-stepped road (a flight of five rock-cut steps), which headed eastwards toward the Pnyx. (fig. 4). The oval rock-carved basin (0.69 m long, 0.41 m wide, and 0.46 m deep) with a narrow, carved channel on its SE side was brought to light at the highest point of the stepped road, at its north-eastern corner, after removing a destruction layer which covered all the surrounding area (fig. 5). The structure was possibly used for washing, or as a collection basin for water or other fluids (fig. 6). Inside the basin, at the depth of between 8 to 27 cm and in a layer comprising a mass of homogenous soil (compressed yellowish clay with small stones in it), fourteen lead tokens and a dikast’s bronze token were found. These were mixed with four silver coins (an archaic obol, two classical period obols, and a silver trihemitetartemorion from the early fourth century BCE). In addition, nineteen bronze coins were also found. Between them six coins have been definitely confirmed as Athenian, minted during the second half of the fourth century BCE. Two coins were minted on Salamis and date from the last decades of the fifth century to the early fourth century BCE. Another two coins were minted in Megara, dating from the second quarter of the third century BCE. A bronze coin of Antigonatus Gonatus has also been identified, as has a coin minted at Myrina

---

414 The excavation was carried out by the archaeologist Marilena Kontopanagou. For the Koile Agora see: Lauter 1982, 45; Lambert 1997(b), 96 n. 24; Ficucielo 2008, 100; Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou 2009, 229; Consoli 2011, 349–50.
415 Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou and Apostolou, 2020, 277, 286 (cat. nos. 1 to 4 figs. 7–10 on pp. 279–80).
416 Such as the bronze coins with Triptolemos/piglet and head of Athena/doubled-bodied owl: Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou and Apostolou, 2020, 277, 286 (cat. nos. 5–6 figs. 11–12 on pp. 280–81).
of Lemnos, dating to between 167-86 BCE, which thus dates to around a century after the aforementioned coins.  

[INSERT FIG3 HERE]  
[INSERT FIG4 HERE]  
[INSERT FIG5 HERE]  
[INSERT FIG6 HERE]  

In addition, the basin also returned a number of other miscellaneous items. These included a lead apotropaic eye (fig. 7a), and a lead object depicting a bird’s skull (fig. 7b). This has been identified as belonging to a raven, and thus it has been suggested that the object was an amulet, given that ravens were the sacred bird of Apollo. More valuable material was also recovered, notably two red jasper gemstones. The first of these (fig. 7c), is an unevenly shaped round stone, which appears to bear an intaglio representation of a nude man. This is Zeus, in the early late-Archaic/early-Classical schema of the striding god brandishing the thunderbolt in his upraised right hand. The second gemstone, also unevenly shaped, perhaps represents a woman seated right (fig. 7d). Four bronze rings were also discovered (fig. 7e), along with other material that included: a small lead piece, perhaps a lead pen; some crumpled gold foil; a copper bead; a lead ring; iron slag; an amount of lead masses and lead joints (fig. 8); and scrap iron rivets.

[INSERT FIG7 HERE]  
[INSERT FIG8 HERE]  

Similarly, additional items were found in one natural cavity to the west of the oval basin. These items included two lead tokens, and these were mixed with: one silver obol and ten bronze coins; four bronze rings; iron nails; iron slag; and lead joints. In addition to the silver obol from Athens dated 454-404 BCE, the bronze coins include an Athenian example dating from

---

419 Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou and Apostolou 2020, 282, 287 (cat. nos. 15–16 fig 15 on p. 281 and fig. 16 on p. 282).
420 See Svoronos, 1900, 334 (cat. no 181 pl. III, 26). This statue type was found on the reverses of issues dating to circa 190-183 BCE: Kroll 1993, 54, 55 (AE 2 nos. 82–84).
421 The bronze rings, small in size (10mm, 8mm, 5mm and 4mm.) are flat inside, convex outside. They may have been a child's finger rings, but more probably were used in some other way.
422 Inv. 2694-10: 0.6g 11mm (diameter 3mm).
423 Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou and Apostolou, 2020, 282–84 (figs. 18–22) and 288 (cat. nos. 25–33).
424 Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou and Apostolou 2020, 288 (cat. no. 25 fig. 18 on p. 23).
340-320 BCE, another Athenian coin minted in the early second century BCE, and a bronze coin from Salamis. Moreover, a bronze coin from Corinth, minted in the final decades of the third century BCE, was also included. The findings from both the basin and the natural cavity were examined as a group, prompted by the consideration that the destruction layer covering the area was uniform and that the composition of the two groups of findings was so similar.

The present study provides a continuation of previous analyses of the coins from this find, and provides an examination of the lead tokens in an attempt to develop our understanding of the material recovered from this interesting and often perplexing site.

The tokens

The total number of tokens found in both the basin and the cavity is sixteen. Of this number of tokens only ten have relatively discernible stamps (cat. nos 1-4, 9-13, and 15). The others are either destroyed, badly damaged, or bear illegible representations. Although few in number, the lead tokens from the Koile excavation supplement the existing record in three notable respects. For one thing, they are among the few examples whose precise place and circumstance of discovery are documented. Another aspect is the fact that at least four of these tokens (cat. nos. 3, 10, 12, 13), but possibly more, add new varieties to the corpus of lead

---

425 Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou and Apostolou 2020, 288 (cat. no. 26 fig. 19 of the variety Triptolemos on serpent car/piglet).
426 Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou and Apostolou 2020, 288 (cat. no. 27 fig. 20 on p. 283).
427 Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou and Apostolou 2020, 288 (cat. no. 30 fig. 21 on p. 283).
428 For some of them see Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou and Apostolou, 2020, 282 (fig. 17), 284 (fig. 22).
429 In the inventory of the excavation, twenty-two objects were catalogued as symbols. A closer look revealed that only sixteen belong to the tokens.
430 See similar objects defined as ‘Seal impressions’ in Davidson and Thompson 1943, 104–07 where the authors present 18 such seal impressions (13 lead and five clay) from the excavation of the Pnyx and characterise them as ‘enigmatic objects’ since no interpretation of their use is satisfactory. Also, a group of 12 clay tokens have been found in the northwest slope of the Hill of the Muses (Konstantopoulos, 1930–31, 32 (fig. 3), 36 (fig.9). Recently, Makrypodi (2019, 27–38) in a new work of cataloguing and categorizing the clay tokens of the Numismatic Museum reached the conclusion that, in the period between 1929 and 1932, not just 12, but 62 clay tokens were sold or offered to the Museum coming from the same place, the northwest slope of the Hill of the Muses (Philopappou). These clay tokens were all handed in by the same person, Ioannis Lerakis and were probably occasional finds coming from illegal surface surveys. They lack an excavation context. But Makrypodi (2019, 33) and Kroll (in this volume) believe that all of them must have come from the Western Hills and connected with the functions of the Athenian democracy. None of our token types matches any of the examples provided.
tokens. Lastly, the co-existence of tokens and money in a single context touches upon the much debated question of the roles of tokens in the city. As such, this find can perhaps help us better understand the possible functions of tokens in Classical Athens.

The tokens of Koile do not seem to follow a pattern as far as the shapes, dimensions, weight or axis of these tokens is concerned. This is a concept otherwise known to us largely from the findings from the Athenian Agora.

Generally, our tokens’ shape is that of an irregular disk with a diameter from 10-18 mm and their weight ranges from 0.7 to 3.6 g. There is a high degree of variety across the tokens in terms of the thickness of the flans, while it should likewise be noted that some have more pronounced incuses and others are rather faint. Nearly all the tokens present a design usually only on one side (uniface), while the other side in most cases is flat and smooth. They all appear to depict different subjects which must have been impressed by seals made for this particular purpose. Recognising the designs depicted on the tokens presented a great level of difficulty making each interpretation questionable. A search for similar published tokens in most cases was unsuccessful. Only in a few cases (cat. nos 4, 9, 15) were similar examples uncovered. Another element that contributed to the difficulties in interpreting the illustrations depicted on the tokens was the fact that under certain lights they did appear different.

Each of the tokens of Koile, as mentioned above, presents a different depiction and different topic. However, three of those (cat. nos. 1, 3, 12) hold a common pattern, an ear of wheat. On cat. no. 12 the wheat is combined with a tuna fish. Out of all the specimens the best preserved are cat. no. 2, which depicts a running hound, cat. no. 9 showing a gallic shield, cat. no. 11 depicting a poppy head, cat. no. 13 with a kantharos, and cat. no. 15 which depicts Pan sitting on a rock playing the flute are the best preserved. The latter, along with the token with a round shield (cat. no. 4) and the token with a gallic shield (cat. no. 9), possibly to be identified as ‘armour tokens’, are the only types which have also been identified in other publications. Finally, the token bearing the neck of an amphora on the upper part of the field (cat. no. 10) has not been identified in other publications. Our symbola seem to belong in Crosby’s first category, which identifies “relatively small disks, 12 to 14 mm in diameter, bearing representations on only one side. Most of these date from the third and second centuries BCE, a few probably from the fourth century BCE”.

431 Crosby 1964, 76, such as the types depicted on pl. 22.
The dikast’s token (cat. no. 17) belongs to one of the eighteen known series, which have already been classified by Svoronos. 432 This series is distinguished by Athena (facing right) with a large disc-shaped earring; the calotte of the goddess’ helmet is prominent with some sort of additional but indistinguishable design. The edges of the flan are bevelled. Probably only one more specimen of the same series is preserved. 433 The token bears a striking similarity to Athenian silver coinage, and in particular with the so-called ‘quadridigité’ style. 434 This similarity denotes that the series in question should be dated approximately to the second-quarter of the third century BCE. 435 This date corroborates well with the findings of the Agora, which attest that the courts continued to function using the same equipment and the same practices in the third century BCE. 436

[INSERT the TOKENS PLATE HERE]

Interpreting the tokens

By examining our tokens, we attempt to address the following matters: firstly, do the tokens belong to public or private issues; and secondly, what use where they intended for, including any possible monetary value, a debate particularly prevalent in the current discourse concerning these objects. 437 As far as the first question is concerned, in examining the symbols we notice a wide range of themes which does not allow them to be classified in a way that would satisfy the question as to what their purpose once was. Furthermore, almost none of the tokens present similarities with another in terms of shape, dimension, or weight. Even though three tokens present a common theme (cat. nos 1, 3, 12), an ear or a branch of wheat, it still remains a question as to whether they should be categorized under the theorikon or the ekklesiastikon, dikastikon, bouleutikon and sitonikon, since there is no inscription to indicate that these tokens are related to the workings of the Athenian government. 438

432 Svoronos 1898, 1/ 37 – 84/ 120 pls. Γ’ – ΣT’.
433 Svoronos 1898, 54/ 18 (no. 98 pl. E’ 15), kept in Berlin.
434 Flament 2007, 133–34.
435 Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou and Apostolou 2020 (287 cat. no. 14 fig. 26) catalogued the token and dated it to the fourth century BCE, comparing it to Boegehold et al. 1995, 73 Series C.
436 Boegehold et al. 1995, 41-42.
438 For the uses of tokens see Crosby 1964, 76–82. For previous aspects about the use of the tokens also Crosby 1964, 74-5; Svoronos (1900, 319–43, pls. I-IV) believed all the tokens he published to be for official use; also Bubelis (2010, 183, 185) claimed that most, if not all, tokens are indeed official in nature. This is not to say, however, that Athenians did not use tokens of some sort for personal or private use.
Additionally, none of these tokens seem to share symbols that are also attested on Athenian coinage from the same period.\textsuperscript{439} It is therefore obvious that coins and tokens (\textit{symbola}) should be differentiated, and a sharp distinction be made between the two categories. Evidently, the Athenians needed the validity of their coinage, and as such the tokens must have served different purposes.

As a result, the heterogeneity of their imagery and shape on the one hand, and the lack of symbols or legends that would clearly identify their producer and intended function on the other, leads us to assume that our tokens were intended for personal or private use. Furthermore, in considering that they do not have a determinable coherence or homogeneity, we can similarly assume that these tokens were produced by different users.

Regarding the use of the tokens, and taking later Roman tokens as a point of comparison, Crosby suggests that they were employed “in various distributions to be exchanged later for money or for a present; in some cases, they were a means of admission to theatres or to baths; in other cases, they were used as small change by individual minor merchants or shops”. In this way the tokens can operate in a similar manner to money, facilitating the distribution of goods and efficient account keeping, without ever taking on all the roles of money: that is, without becoming general-purpose money.\textsuperscript{440}

Nevertheless, there is an ongoing discussion between scholars. According to Bubelis “the hoard of official armor tokens, mixed with ninety-two bronze and two silver coins dated to the second quarter of the third century or slightly later possibly were used as ‘fiduciary coinage’, i.e. as money, by an Athenian”.\textsuperscript{441} Schäfer notes that “this interpretation is not convincing, not least because these lead tokens are made from a different, much inferior metal than coins”.\textsuperscript{442} The discussion is fueled by the recent discovery of tokens with numeric values in a cistern containing Sullan debris to the SE of the Acropolis.\textsuperscript{443}

\textsuperscript{439}Crosby (1964, 80, 81), notes that “in fact almost half of the subjects used on the hellenistic tokens from Athenian Agora occur on contemporary Athenian coins. Most of these parallels are to the small symbols on Athenian New Style coins, symbols which changed annually and which marked a particular term of office”; Bubelis (2010, 171) refers that, “to the Hellenistic era, when the chronically poor economic conditions and growth of certain institutions may have contributed to a plethora of tokens that did avowedly imitate contemporary Athenian coins”.

\textsuperscript{440} Crosby, 1964, 76; Crisà, Gkikaki and Rowan 2019, 5.

\textsuperscript{441} Bubelis 2010, 185 (with n. 45). For the hoard: IGCH 157; Thompson 1942, 223; Kroll 1974; Kroll 1977.

\textsuperscript{442} Schäfer 2019, 46 (with nn. 37 and 39).

\textsuperscript{443} Karra in this volume.
The chronology and the use of the structure.

Along with the above-mentioned objects, pottery was also found within the oval basin and around it, dating from the end of the third until the first-half of the second century BCE (fig. 9a-b). This pottery provides us with data to determine the terminus ante quem for the devastation of the Koile district. Therefore, based on the pottery and the latest coin found inside the basin (that from Myrina of Lemnos), one can assume that the basin had ceased to be in use about the first-half of the second century BCE. In all probability, the construction of the second phase of the Diateichisma, known as the White Poros Wall, took place at that time. Thompson and Scranton date this to 200 BCE. However according to more recent dating of the pottery by Rotroff, this construction is dated by Conwell to the decade of conflict between Athens and the Achaean League after 166 BCE. The abandonment of the area occurred gradually during the last-quarter of the third century BCE, yet with the construction of the White Poros Wall, the extramural section of the deme of Koile was rapidly abandoned. After, the development of a cemetery occurred on both sides of the road, replacing the former urban fabric.

Trying to reach conclusions about the use of the site, one faces a difficulty in recreating the landscape, in large part due to the fragmentary nature of the excavation. However, the way the basin is constructed leads us to the hypothesis that it was given to domestic or workshop use. Taking into consideration the large quantity of tiles covering the structure, we believe that it was in a semi-outdoor area, facing the narrow street that passed through and in front of the structure.

In search of the owner’s identity

444 Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou and Apostolou 2020, 282 cat. no 16 fig. 16.
445 Thompson and Scranton 1943, 358–60.
446 Conwell 1996, 97; Theocharaki 2007, 41–44.
Reviewing the excavation data and taking into consideration the characteristics of the locality, the period we are referring to, and the variety of objects found, a new intriguing interpretation emerged.\textsuperscript{448}

The basin came to light in a narrow road (\textit{laura})\textsuperscript{449} which is located slightly to the northeast of the commercial Koile road, immediately to the east of the so-called Koile Agora, and close to the western gate of the Themistoklean circuit leading to the Long Walls.\textsuperscript{450} These characteristics meet the criteria of locality set by Glazebrook for the concentration of prostitutes. She explains: “ease of access for locals and non-locals alike, however, and thus economic reasons ensured that brothels clustered in ports, near city gates and close city centres”.\textsuperscript{451} Ancient sources corroborate that brothels were typically situated in ports, near to city gates, and close to the city centres; likewise, Hesychius (s.v. Kerameikos) identifies the Kerameikos, a region of Athens near to the city wall, as a place where prostitutes gathered.\textsuperscript{452} In general terms, prostitutes (\textit{Pornai}) stood at the city gates where there was a lot of commotion, especially involving foreigners coming to the city for business reasons.\textsuperscript{453} Based

\textsuperscript{448}In the prior publication with Eva Apostolou, we have expressed the view that “heterogeneous objects were collected by some sort of scavenger in the area at a time when its glamour had been lost”. See Sheedy 2019, 24; Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou and Apostolou 2020, 285.

\textsuperscript{449}For the word “\textit{laura}” see: Lentakis 1998, 158, n. 239, «\textalpha\nu\omicron\omicron\alpha \delta\epsilon \sigma\tau\epsilon\nu\tau\iota \omicron\delta\omicron\alpha\omicron» (Eustathius, 1063.60); Costaki, 2006, 193, n. 197.

\textsuperscript{450}For the West gate see: Theocharaki 2007, 497; Lentakis, (1998, 40–42), refers to the gates as the main place where prostitutes were active. According to Hesychius, the Δήμιασι πύλαι were so named because the prostitutes stood at the gates “ἐπεί προσέστηκαν ἐν ταῖς πύλαις αἰ πόρναι” (Lentakis, 1998, 41). The Δήμιασι πύλαι (Damian gates) are located on the northwest side of the hill of the Nymphs, and a short distance from the West Gate, cf. Travlos 1960, 52; Theocharaki, 2007, 497-98.

\textsuperscript{451}About the \textit{Porneion} and prostitution in the Athenian civic space, see: Lentakis, 1998, 40-51; Glazebrook, 2011, 34-59; Glazebrook, 2016, 181. In Table 8.1, she gives the brothels’ sites.

\textsuperscript{452}For the brothels in Kerameikos see: Knigge 1988; Lentakis, 1998, 40–41, n. 48; Knigge 2005; Glazebrook 2011, 39–45; Ault 2016, 75–102 (with previous bibliography). According to Ault's theory, ‘Building Z’ in Kerameikos is the best example of prostitution, and perhaps the only one. The archaeological remains of ‘Building Z’ are located within the city walls close to the Sacred Gate. Also, a possibly sacred \textit{porneion} dating to the fourth century was found in a recent excavation around the Olympic equestrian center near Athens, in Merenda, ancient Myrrhinous, just off the main road leading to the port: Kakavoyanni and Dovinou 2003, 34–35; Glazebrook, 2011, 45–46.

\textsuperscript{453}The main choice facing travelers bound for Piraeus was either a road running within the Long Walls or one running just outside them to the north. The first of these two roads was generally called the [\textit{Ὅδος}] διὰ Κοίλης. The second route is often referred to in the ancient sources as a \textit{hamaxitos} (ἅμαξιτος), a cart-road, which departed the upper city near the Dipylon Gate in Kerameikos: Bakewell, 2020, 730–33. The wheat supplies were transported through them and then from Piraeus where they ended up in the \textit{Aiakeion}, where the distribution took place: Straud 1998, 104–08; Ficuciello, 2008, 102 with n.568.
on the literary evidence, the women working in brothels were typically slaves. They either worked in brothels or they advertised their services out in the open as streetwalkers. Moreover, many female prostitutes worked in the streets, sometimes in the guise of “musical entertainments”. Streetwalkers in ancient times were called Laurai, σποδησιλαύραι, λεωφόροι and χαμαιτύπαι. An additional term used was χαλκιδίτες, meaning one offering their services for very cheap, i.e. for one, two, three or four bronze coins. From various sources it has been concluded that the tariff for female prostitute consisted of an obol.

The references of Aeschines (345 BCE) in his speech Against Timarchos (I, 81–84) supports the view that the Pnyx area was a deserted and disreputable place in the second-half of the...
fourth century BCE. It was there where male and female *pornai* offered their services out in the midst of destroyed buildings for small change.

In addition to the location, some other criteria for the identification of a place of “ill repute” could support this interpretation. They are the following features. For instance, the location is both conveniently accessible and reasonably provisioned with courtyard and ample access to water. Further, the assorted finds, especially the jewelry, point strongly to a female presence at this site. The narrow-stepped road could give easy of access to locals and non-locals. The small oval basin seems to have been located in a courtyard by the road, providing access and direct visibility from the street into the structure. Even though we did not detect signs of a well, the density of cisterns and wells in the area, especially around the Pnyx, indicates that there was a well supplying the area with water. Moreover, the additional findings from the interior of the basin and the cavity - the two red jasper gemstones, the bronze rings, the copper bead, the lead ring, the lead raven head and the leaden eye amulets – were without doubt female-specific items related to physical appearance and adornment, but it is also possible that these were used as apotropaic or magical symbols (figs. 7a-e). In addition, the amount of lead

459 Demosthenes (Contra Nicostratum, 17) relates that western area of the Hills was very dangerous for someone was coming from Piraeus, especially through the street of Long Walls. This was because no one would hear him if someone grabbed him and kicked him, dragging him to the quarries of Varathron. For the area, see Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou (2013, 196); Plantzos (2014, 101) notes that, “The aristocratic areas of the Pnyx and the Hill of Nymphs were found after the Peloponnesian War to decline and turn into infamous and low-frequency areas. Another moment in the history of Athens where a district turns into a gray zone on the outskirts of urban life.”

460 Both male and female citizens engaged in prostitution as a socially accepted institution. Cohen (2015, 3) treats prostitution as a commercial function in which both men and women provided sex for compensation – and often under compulsion.

461 Lentakis, 1998, 267, 268 n. 23, 269: gives the translation and comments for the part of Aeschines’ speech referring to the Pnyx area (Against Timarchus, 81–84). Commenting on the damaged buildings (ibid. 269, n. 25), he believes that it may be Cimon’s Ruins (Kimôneia Ereipia), mentioned by the sources as a notorious area; Plantzos (2014, 102) also notes that, “The areas around the walls, in the shade of the towers or in the recesses of the gates, were suitable for the professional activities of the girls and boys who had given their bodies for a few obols, often on the ground or in makeshift booths.”

462 Glazebrook 2016, 180-190; Trümper, 2016, 111.

463 E. Burnouf, (1856, 83), counted fifty-eight reservoirs, most of which (26 reservoirs) are located on the Hill of the Pnyx, a landscape that has largely remained intact since antiquity.

464 As Rush (2012, 100) notes “The use of magical stones, amulets, and rings, and their powers, as such objects were among the most pervasive forms of magic in Greco-Roman antiquity. Gems and amulets, however, were also used for their lucky, protective, or apotropaic powers, and/or for their erotic potency as love charms. Additionally, (ibid. 102 with references), magic, and especially amulets, belonged to the domain of women and the lower classes. Magical gemstones and amulets, which had their antecedents in the earlier periods, grew in interest and popularity during the Hellenistic period (ibid. 104). Red stones such as jasper, haematite, and carnelian, might be used to prevent menstrual bleeding. (ibid. 108); Hatjidakis (2017, 331) refers to findings
found with them could be justified given that prostitutes also used *psimuthion* (white lead) for their complexion. Moreover, lead was a material easily recyclable and therefore commercialised. The above findings, although of little monetary value and importance, betray the presence of a woman, probably their former owner.

Finally, examining the finding under this new perspective and totaling the value of our coins, (four silver obols, a silver denomination, thirty-two bronze coins, a dicast’s bronze token, and sixteen lead tokens whose value is not known) it is clear that the monetary value of the specimens is quite low. The majority of the coins found are bronze (*chalkoi*) which leads us to the *chalciditidai pornai* (*χαλκιδίτιδαι πόρναι*). It is possible that the total value of these coins represent a fee given to a female prostitute, who worked in her own space or advertised her services out in the open as streetwalker. Perhaps the former owner of these objects was compelled to abandon these objects at short notice, and may have left them in the courtyard or the side of the narrow road, only for rain waters to have carried them away into the basin and then into the cavity. The action of waters is confirmed by the homogenous layer of soil (compressed yellowish clay with small stones in it) in which all the various objects have been found. The presence of the four small Athenian silver denominations, along with the bronze coinage and the lead *symbola* is definitely strange. Although it is difficult to prove that these silver coins were in circulation during the second century BCE, after all, there is no parallel finding, but it cannot be disputed that they belong to the same set, as they come from the exact same layer. In addition, the fact that the findings of the natural cavity had exactly the same composition (a silver obol (No. 2680. Issued: 454-404 BCE), bronze coins and *symbola*, reinforces the indications of the unity of the whole.

It is nearly impossible for the above theory to be verified, however if the total of the money indeed constitutes a fee for a prostitute, then we could justify the coexistence of silver coins with different era bronze ones and even the inclusion of tokens. If our hypothesis is at all sound, one could deduce that all of this small change of various origins could have come from different visitors, who employed the sex worker’s services. Similarly, our tokens bearing different

related to a woman, probably a prostitute, who lived in the tavern on Delos and used them for jewelry but also as amulets and magically.

465 Glazebrook 2016, 191. For the preparation of *psimuthion* from lead, see Theophrastus, Περί λίθων, 57.

466 Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou and Apostolou 2020, 277, 286 (cat. nos. 1–4 figs. 7–10 on pp. 279–80).

467 See the catalogue of the coins in Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou and Apostolou 2020, 288.
stamps could determine the different customers who used these tokens to pay for the said services. Under this logic, we could say that our tokens had exchange value in the market, playing the role of money, or that they were used in exchange of services or of particular goods, such as bread.

**Conclusion**

If the above hypothesis could stand, then our group of coins and tokens coming from the said transaction proves that these specimens were in circulation in the first-half of the second century BCE. Therefore, we have an answer to Kenneth Sheedy’s question: “does this find offer an insight into the composition of circulating petty currency in an Attic market”\(^{468}\)

Whatever the case, this collection of finds is “a perplexing” but unique sample from the Western Hills and one of the very few recent excavation finds. They help us better understand the roles and functions of tokens in Classical Athens. The co-existence of tokens and money touches upon the much-debated question of the roles of tokens in Classical Athens. Their use as fiat currency already in second century BCE Athens anticipates functions and usages in later periods in the Mediterranean and Europe.\(^{469}\)

Finally, our findings shed light in particular aspects of everyday life in Classical Athens, aspects which had fallen into scholarly neglect. The findings in the Koile area break with traditional interpretations by providing additional material for the study of the institutional history of Classical Athens. As such, it is an interesting archaeological discovery offering food for thought to scholars for further study.

**CATALOGUE**

**A) From the small basin**

1. Lead, 10mm, 1.29g, uniface, oval-shaped. Third century BCE.
Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City Inv. 2692-4.

\(^{468}\) Sheedy 2019, 24–25.

\(^{469}\) Burnett (2019, 189–200) talking about seventeenth century trade tokens, notes that they were explicitly tied into the monetary economy, designed to supplement existing monetary supply rather than replace it, and their period of production and use was tied to the production of state issues. As tokens, therefore, they were an index not of abstract ‘value’ or ‘money’ but of specific coins. In the case of the trade tokens of the seventeenth century, tokens provided a restricted but necessary supplement by acting as a replacement for low value royal coinage due to the absence of the denominations needed.
Side a: Three ears of wheat tied together (?).
Side b: flat and plain.
Cf. Postolacca 1868, 292 (cat. no. 529 pl. LII); Crosby 1964, 92 (L 54 a-b pl. 20).

2. Lead, 10mm, 1.6g, uniface, circle-shaped. Third century BCE.
Ephorate of Antiquities of the Athens City Inv. 2692-13.
Side a: Hound running right in realistic and artistic design.
Side b: Flat and plain.
Cf. Svoronos 1900, 335 cat. no. 196 pl. III 41: hound running right, inscribed ΠΕ[N], in the field below: mystic ring.
Hound running right is found on the reverses of issues of Roman Republic, e.g. silver denarius of C. Postumius TA, Roman Republic, 74 BC, accessed 18/1/2022.

3. Lead, 10mm, 1.29g, uniface, circle-shaped. Third century BCE.
Ephorate of the Athens City Inv. 2692-14.
Side a: Palm branch (?) or ear of wheat (?), all in square incuse.
Side b: Flat and plain.
Cf. Crosby 1964, 92 (L 54a-b pl. 20).

4. Lead, 20mm, 1.6g, uniface, circle-shaped, broken, large part is missing. Third century BCE.
Ephorate of Antiquities of the Athens City Inv. 2692-15.
Side a: round shield (?) with riveted rim.
Side b: unevenly concave.
Cf. Postolacca 1868, 294 (cat. nos. 584–96 with images for cat. nos. 586 and 589 on pl. LII); Svoronos 1900, 330 (cat. no. 135 pl. II 20); Crosby, 1964, 88–89 (L26–L27 Pl. 19 with monograms on shields); Schäfer, 2019, 57 (cat. II.b fig 15 on p. 47), 58 (cat.no. IV.d fig. 25 on p. 51).

5. Lead, 10mm, 0.7g, oval-shaped, illegible. Third century BCE.
Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City Inv. 2692-10.

6. Lead, 15mm, 2.49g, uniface, almost circle-shaped, illegible. Third century BCE.
Illegible incuse designs.
Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City Inv. 2692-16.

7. Lead, 13mm, 1.4g, illegible, irregular shape of disc. Third century BCE.
Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City Inv. 2692-19.

8. Lead, 10mm, 1.6g, uniface, circle shaped, illegible. Third century BCE.
Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City Inv. 2692-20.
Side a: Incuse with illegible stamp.
Side b: Flat and plain.

Inventory numbers 2692-2 and 2692-6 are damaged.

9. Lead, 20mm, 3.5g, uniface, elongated irregular shape. Third century BCE.
Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City Inv. 2694-1.
Side a: Gallic shield (?)
Side b: Flat and plain.
Cf. Schäfer 2019, 57 (cat. no. IIIc fig. 26 on p. 52) and 58 (cat. no. IVe fig. 26 on p. 52).

10. Lead, 18mm, 3.6g, uniface, irregular shape. Third century BCE.
Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City Inv. 2694-3.
Side a: In the field upper right there seems to be the neck and handles of an amphora.
Side b: Uneven surface.
Cf. Postolacca, 1884, 15–16 (no. 88 pl. 2, the upper part of an amphora on a small bronze token); Davidson and Thompson 1943, 106 (no. 7 fig.48,7 on p. 107 lead token with Chian amphora in round incuse).

11. Lead, 10mm, 2.2g, circle-shaped. Third century BCE.
Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City Inv. 2694-4.
Side a: Poppy head (?) in round incuse.
Side b: Surface slightly irregular,
For poppy head with ear of wheat on side cf. Crosby 1964, 107 (L214 pl. 27)

12. Lead, 10mm, 1.8g, uniface, circle-shaped. Third century BCE.
Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City Inv. 2694-5.
Side a: Ear of wheat (left) crossed with tuna fish (right) (?).
Side b: Uneven.
No known parallels. The tuna is best-known as a *parasema* from the Cyzicene silver and electrum coins, cf. Greenwell 1887.

13. Lead, 10mm, 1.0g, uniface, circle-shaped token. Third century BCE.
Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens city Inv. 2694-6.
Kantharos, on its surface the letter A (?).
Cf. Postolacca 1868, 301 (no. 768 pl. LII); Crosby 1964, (L 201, pl 26).

14. Lead, 10mm, 1.6g, circle shaped with a protrusion. Third century BCE.
Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City Inv. 2694-7.
Illegible.

**B) From the Cavity:**

15. Lead, 10mm, 1.6g, uniface, circle-shaped. Third century BCE.
Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City Inv. 2684-7.
Pan squatting frontal and playing the double flute.
Cf. Postolacca 1868, 279 (no. 2211 pl. LII); Engel 1884, 13 (no. 93 pl. III).

16. Lead, 10mm, 1.8g, circle-shaped. Third century BCE.
Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City Inv. 2684-12.
Illegible.

17. Bronze jurors’ token, 18mm, 4g, 3h, circle-shaped, beveled edges.
Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City Inv. 2692-22.
Side a: Helmeted Athena head right.
Side b: Letter Pi (Π) of which the horizontal bar is struck off flan.
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Captions

Fig 1. The Koile road running east to west toward the Piraeus. © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Archive of the Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City.


Fig 3. The junction of the three hills (the Hill of the Nymphs, the Hill of the Muses and the Pnyx) where the Agora of the Deme of Koile is located. © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Archive of the Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City.

Fig 4. The NE part of the Agora with the big rock-cut channel that connected to the stepped path. © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and the Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City. Photo: O. Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou.

Fig 5. The stepped road. The arrow points to the location where the oval basin was brought to light. © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and the Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City. Photo: O. Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou.

Fig 6. The oval rock-cut basin from the eastern part of the stepped road. View from the SE and from NE. © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Archive of the Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City.

Fig. 7a. The apotropaic eye (6.2 g, 21mm). © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and the Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City, Inv. 2694-2. Photo Irini Miari.

Fig. 7b. The skull of a bird (1.9g, 15mm). © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and the Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City Inv. 2694-8. Photo Irini Miari.

Fig. 7c. Red jasper gemstone with the representation of a nude man right (0.8g, 11 mm). © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and the Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City Inv. 2692-8. Photo Irini Miari).
Fig. 7d. Red jasper gemstone, probably with the figure of a seated woman. (0.73g, 8mm) © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and the Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City Inv. 2694-9. Photo: Irini Miari.

Fig. 7e. Four bronze rings. The bronze rings, small in size, (Ø 10mm, 8mm, 5mm, and 4mm) are flat inside, convex outside. They may have been the finger rings of a child, but more probably were used in some other way. © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and the Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City Inv. 2691, M 24. Photo: Irini Miari).

Fig 8. Lead joints and lead masses from the oval basin. © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and the Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City. Photo: O. Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou.

Fig 9a-b. Pottery from the destruction level around the oval basin and from the inside of the oval basin. © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and the Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens City. Photo: O. Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou.
The Lot of Lead Tokens from the Makrygiannis plot in Athens*

Irini Karra
The Acropolis Museum

Introduction

Tokens (symbola), coin-like objects of no intrinsic value, made of lead, bronze or clay were used in Athens in the late Classical and Hellenistic Period for the functions of the governmental bodies and the operation of public finance. Their area of function was particularly broad because they were employed in the allotment procedures for the selection of officials, the allotment to seating areas in the courts and other governmental bodies, while they were also distributed to citizens either as vouchers to be exchanged for state pay for service in the Athenian Assembly, the Council of the 500 and the Jury Court or as admission tickets for entrance to the theatre, the free distribution of grain for the public grain distributions and other state allowances or gifts in kind. The Aristotelian Constitution of the Athenians, Aristophanes’ works, and a handful of passages of ancient authors constitute valuable sources of information for their employment for the purpose of the good functioning of democracy.  

Since the 19th century, when with Achilles Postolakas’ and J.N. Svoronos’ pioneering publications and cataloguing of the material kept at the Numismatic Museum at Athens, the earliest studies of the subject began, our knowledge on tokens has significantly progressed. The rich material which came to light in the excavations of the Athenian Agora from the 1930s onwards, in many cases from well-documented public buildings along with Margaret Crosby’s

*I express my deep gratitude to Dimitrios Pandermalis, President of the Board of the Acropolis Museum, for giving me permission to publish the material discussed below. I would like to extend a special thank you to the director of the Makrygiannis plot excavations, S. Eleftheratou, for her continual assistance and support. A particular debt of gratitude is owed to M. Gkikaki for inviting me to participate in this volume and for her much-appreciated continual support and advice. Thanks also due to J. Kroll for his valuable remarks; to the conservators A. Gaki and E. Govatsou for conserving the tokens and to J. Leonard for translating my text; to the photographer I. Miari; to the designer A. Nikas; and to R. Jacob for advice and suggestions.

publication in 1964, have further boosted research on tokens and have helped decode the questions of chronology and context of use.

Nevertheless, there still exist many aspects which remain obscure. The great range of types and the arbitrary selection of designs make it difficult to determine their exact use. While their employment in public life is well attested, it remains still under discussion as to what extent – if at all – they were also used privately and if they were ever employed as fiat money.

Under these circumstances, the important find of nineteen lead tokens of the late Hellenistic Period in the Makrygiannis plot, to the immediate Southeast of the Acropolis, with value marks on many of them, aspires to question established views on the roles and functions of tokens in Classical and Hellenistic Athens.\footnote{471}

**The find**

The lead tokens examined in this article were discovered in 2000 during the archaeological excavation of the Makrygiannis plot, within the framework of the construction of the new Acropolis Museum.\footnote{472} Excavations carried out at the site revealed an extensive section of the residential area of ancient Athens, with continuous use from the Classical era through to Late Antiquity (fig. 1).\footnote{473} The organized urban planning of the area began in the later decades of the 5th century BCE and was laid out according to a system of city blocks defined by a dense road network. The architectural remains of houses of the Classical and Hellenistic periods were discovered along the streets.

All the tokens under discussion come from House Λ (ΟικίαΛ), from the last phase of its operation at the end of the Hellenistic period, most (nos. 1-9, 11-16, 19) from the underground Cistern III, with several more (nos. 10, 17-18) from a circular pit, probably intended for holding a large storage vessel which would have been removed after the abandonment of the house (fig. 2).

\footnote{471} General Ioannis Makrygiannis, who played an important role in the Hellenic Independence War (1821-1831), owned land and residence in the area to the SE foot of the Acropolis. In this area, known by the name ‘Makrygiannis plot’, archaeological excavations were carried out for the construction of the New Acropolis Museum at the plot’s south and west section and the Acropolis Station of the Athens Metro at the east.

\footnote{472} For the Makrygiannis plot excavations, see Eleftheratou 2006 and 2020.

\footnote{473} Eleftheratou 2020, 53–57.
House Λ was constructed in the Classical period to the west of NMA II Street – an uphill road connecting the Makrygiannis area with the Sanctuary and Theater of Dionysus and the South Slope of the Acropolis- located to the south of NMA VI Street and north of NMA V Street (fig. 2). It continued to be used in the Hellenistic period after remodelling and modification and was destroyed at the beginning of the 1st century BCE, probably during the invasions of Sulla in 86 BCE. Only its eastern part was revealed since it continues westward beyond the boundaries of the excavation. The excavation’s limited extent, as well as the architectural remains’ fragmentary preservation (a consequence of later construction interventions), do not allow us to fully restore its floor plan, nor even to determine its exact use. Of the Hellenistic phase, only a few walls were preserved, along with Cistern III, from where the majority of the lead tokens originated (fig. 2).

Cistern III is an underground, bell-shaped reservoir with walls lined in hydraulic mortar. Its contents were extremely rich in ceramic vessels, iron objects, lead utensils, and several lamps and coins, most of which date to the end of the Hellenistic era. Only a few finds can be dated as late as the end of the 1st century BCE.474

The filling-in of the cistern is attributed to the cleaning-up of debris left over from the destruction caused by the Roman soldiers of General Sulla in 86 BCE.475 The history of this ransacking is well known: in 87 BCE, the Athenians allied with Mithridates VI, the king of Pontus, in his war against Rome; after a months-long siege, Sulla’s Roman forces finally managed to breach the walls of Athens in March 86 BCE, entering the city and plundering it. According to ancient writers, the losses in terms of both human lives and material destruction

474For some of the finds from Cistern III, see Eleftheratou2006, 36(no.46 trade amphora), 41 (no. 72 lead weight), 44(no. 89 bronze coin of Athens of the series Kroll 1993, 74 no. 97, 87/6BCE), 45 (no. 90 sesterce with the jugate heads of Marc Antony and Octavia, of the series RPC, I, no. 1470, 37-36 BCE), 84 (no. 207 lamp), 96 (nos. 247-250, an amphora, two funnels and a lagynos), 99 (nos. 264, 266a beehive and an unguentarium), 109 (no. 297 lagynos), 111 (no. 309 kantharos), 112(no. 313 round-mouth juglet), 113(nos.317-318 a lekythos and a biconical jug), 114 (nos. 320-324 plates), 116 (nos. 330-331 bowls with outturned rim) and127(no. 371pyxis with lid).
475Eleftheratou2020, 57.
were enormous.\footnote{476}{\textit{For the siege and the destruction of Athens by Sulla, see Habicht 1998, 387–409. For the destruction of Athens by Sulla, as recorded in historical sources, see Plutarch, \textit{Sulla} 13–14; Appian, \textit{Mithridatic Wars} 30–39; Pausanias 1.20.5–7. Archaeological research has revealed abundant traces of destruction from the end of the Hellenistic era that can be attributed to the Romans’ violent invasion of 86 BCE; see Rotroff 1997, 34–36.}}\textsuperscript{477}\textsuperscript{478}These clean-up operations were a slow process, and in many cases the wreckage from the disastrous invasion lay virtually “undisturbed for many decades before its final disposal”. Susan Rotroff considers as “pure Sullan debris” the deposits whose material dates from before 75 BCE, while “Sullan debris” are those also containing later material.\footnote{479}{\textit{Rotroff 1997, 35–36. Rotroff (2014) discusses the Sullan debris of the Athenian Agora, while Vogeikoff (1993, 128–155; Vogeikoff-Brogan 2000) of the Acropolis South Slope.}}\footnote{480}{\textit{Rotroff 1997, 35–36; idem. 2014, 88.}}The Cistern III deposit can be described as Sullan debris – even not a “pure” one – as can be deduced from the dating of the pottery and of the twenty-five coins found inside: fifteen date to the late Hellenistic era (two of which are coins of 87/86 BCE with Athena/Fulminating Zeus, and at right a star between crescents, the symbol of Mithridates),\footnote{481}{\textit{One on Eleftheratou 2006, 44 (no. 89, bronze coin of Athens of the series Kroll 1993, 74 no. 97).}}while six belong to the second half of the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE.\footnote{480}{\textit{One on Eleftheratou 2006, 44 (no. 89, bronze coin of Athens of the series Kroll 1993, 74 no. 97).}} The remaining four are illegible.

Of the sixteen lead circle-shaped tokens recovered from the interior of Cistern III, ten (nos. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16) were found together at a depth of –7.50 m; four more (nos. 3, 4,...}
8, 12) were found just a few centimeters higher, at a depth between −7.40 and −7.50 m; while no. 7 lays a little lower, at a depth between −7.62 and −7.85 m and no. 19 at a higher depth of −6.70 m. Nevertheless, their common characteristics and depositional circumstances allow us to consider them as originally belonging to a single group.

To the same group can be attributed the lead tokens found in the circular pit in House Λ (nos. 10, 18) and in the disturbed layer that covered the pit (no. 17). We are led to this conclusion not only by the excavation data – they all come from House Λ and from layers dating to the late Hellenistic period – but mainly by the fact that token no. 10 from the circular pit is similar to, and perhaps derives from the same die as, token no. 9 from Cistern III. We can therefore infer that all these tokens are synchronous and would most likely have served the same purpose.

The tokens – all lead, uniface, with a diameter ranging from 10-14 mm – can be classified in two distinct categories. The first consists of tokens that exhibit a numerical sign in addition to their other pictorial designs, while the second includes tokens with no numerical signs.

A. TOKENS WITH NUMERIC SIGNS
The largest sub-group within this category consists of tokens nos. 1-8, depicting a hare running right and two strokes (II) displayed at the top left that can be interpreted as numerical symbols or monetary value. In the latter case, they designate two obols. All these tokens come from the interior of Cistern III. They were issued in two variants. In the first (nos.1-4), no symbol is depicted below the body of the hare, while in the second (nos. 5-8), an additional symbol appears below the hare – probably a flower or perhaps ears of wheat in a container. Otherwise, the tokens of both variants are identical and were likely produced from the same die, which was probably reused after the necessary changes.

482Measurements are taken from a fixed point, 75.8 m. above sea level (0 m = 75.8m above sea level). Cistern III was found at a depth of – 5.73 m., however its upper part was not found, as it had been destroyed by the mechanical excavator that opened the test trenches of the Third Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities (3rd EPKA) in the 1980s. For these test trenches see Eleftheratou 2020, 27 (fig. 6).

483Threatte 1980, I.111.
A possible parallel should be the hare, which has been tentatively identified on a lead token of Hellenistic date from the Athenian Agora excavations, although it is more likely to be a mouse.\textsuperscript{484} There are no known examples of hares on Athenian coins.\textsuperscript{485}

Tokens nos. 9 and 10 depict a bird to the right, holding in its beak a circular object with a dot in the center, possibly the letter Θ or perhaps a phiale. At the bottom right there is a wreath, while above the bird's head there probably appears a second letter (A or Δ) and to the left three strokes (III). As above, these can either be interpreted as numerical symbols, or monetary value (in this instance, three obols). The two specimens are similar in their representations, but it is not clear whether they come from the same die.

A number of lead tokens of the Hellenistic period with images of birds and letters above have been found in the Athenian Agora excavations. Two of these depict a swan and are inscribed with the letters AN, or possibly AΛ, above its back.\textsuperscript{486} Two more may depict herons and retain traces of a letter above.\textsuperscript{487} Another, struck on both sides, depicts an eagle, and is inscribed with the letter Ω behind its head.\textsuperscript{488} Although none of the above objects exactly parallels tokens nos. 9 and 10, they all have similar dimensions and consistently combine the image of a bird with one or two letters above. Only the tokens from the Makrygiannis plot, however, exhibit numbers.

\textsuperscript{484}Crosby 1964, 99 (L131 pl. 24). Crosby described it as a crouching animal, left, with long ears, perhaps a hare. However, the shape and posture of this animal is more reminiscent of a mouse, and similar to bronze figurines of mice, cf. Kiernan 2014, 602–03(figs. 2, 3).

\textsuperscript{485}There is no known example for Athens in either Kroll (1993) or Thompson (1961). Among the coins of other cities, the hare is found on those from Messina, Sicily; in many cases it is depicted, as on the tokens from the Makrygiannis plot, running with a lively movement to the right.

\textsuperscript{486}Crosby 1964, 101 (L156 a, b pl. 24). They come from late Hellenistic context and are very similar in size and appearance to the tokens inscribed EP; cf. Crosby 1964, 90–92 (L43–L56 pl. 20).

\textsuperscript{487}Crosby 1964, 98 (L117 a, b pl. 23).

\textsuperscript{488}Crosby1964, 94 (L71 pl. 21). It comes from late Hellenistic context. On the other side is depicted a winged animal, perhaps "a winged horse or some kind of bird".
Token no. 11 depicts a seated animal, possibly a mouse, playing the flute (aulos).\(^{489}\) In the field at bottom right, four vertical, uneven strokes (IIII), probably denote the number four or they designate four obols. The strokes are not straight as in the previous cases, and therefore they may not denote numbers but they may be some kind of or a part of a design.

A representation of a mouse holding a lyre is depicted on a comparable token from the Numismatic Museum. Standing on its hind legs, the mouse faces right while playing the musical instrument (lyre) with its front legs.\(^{490}\) The inscription ΠΕΝ led Svoronos to associate this token with the Council of the 500.\(^{491}\) Recently, the ΠΕΝ tokens have been plausibly associated with the state distributions of theorika and ΠΕΝ (PEN) has been interpreted as the abbreviation of pentedrachmia, the charge attested for the Great Dionysia in the late fourth century.\(^{492}\)

Another lead token from the Stoa of Attalos is countermarked with a rooster holding a mouse by its tail.\(^{493}\) Several lead tokens of the second and first centuries BCE from central Italy and Baetica depict on one side a mouse standing erect facing left with its paws on the lip of an oil-lamp.\(^{494}\)

Athenian symbola with numeric signs are extremely rare. The only known parallel is the lot of nine lead tokens dated to the second half of the third century BCE (or later) and unearthed in

\(^{489}\) The creature’s complete absence of a neck alludes to a rodent. Depictions of mice with musical instruments are known from small works of art. For relevant examples, see Toynbee 1973, 203–04 (fig. 100: a bronze figurine of a mouse or rat playing a trumpet); Classical Art Research Center, Gem 2909: a gem with a mouse playing the double flute on an altar between columns (https://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/XDB/ASP/recordDetails.asp?recordCount=1&start=0, accessed on 21/12/2021).

\(^{490}\) Postolacca 1868, 286 (no. 373); Svoronos 1900, 335 (no. 197 pl. III, 42): ‘Μῦς ἱστάμενος ἐπὶ τῶν ὀπισθίων ποδῶν πρὸς δεξ, καὶ διὰ τῶν ἐμπροσθίων φέρων καὶ ἀνακρούον λύραν’ (a mouse standing on its hind legs and with its front legs holding and playing a lyre).

\(^{491}\) Svoronos 1900, 335 (no. 197 pl. III, 42). See also Crosby (1964, 80), who suggests the inscription ΠΕΝ indicates such objects were “suitable as pay-tokens for meetings of the boule or possibly for members of the boule at meetings of the assembly or at the Greater Dionysia, where the bouleutai sat in a separate section, the bouleutikon”.

\(^{492}\) Gkikaki 2021, 60–62.

\(^{493}\) Mylonas 1901, 122 (no. 11 pl. 7). The description reads: “Rosette of five petals. Circular countermark, on which appears a rooster holding a mouse by the tail with its beak”.

\(^{494}\) Stannard 2009, 1047 (no. 9–11, pl. 1). On the other side appears a bearded, male theater mask facing right. For bronze figurines of mice attached to lamp lids, see Kiernan 2014, 601–26.
1972 in the Dipylon Well B1 in Kerameikos.\textsuperscript{495} They are uniface, with unassuming designs including branches, ants and insects, and numerical legends that designate monetary units: drachms and obols.

Two comparable lead tokens have also been found in the Athenian Agora, both in the Great Drain and both in late Hellenistic context.\textsuperscript{496} One of the two was recovered from the Hellenistic filling in the Great Drain, which filled up shortly after 86 BCE but contained much earlier material.\textsuperscript{497} They display the symbol for four- and one-half obols with an illegible object visible above. Crosby believes that since the weights of these two tokens (six and seven grams, respectively), do not have the value of 4½ obols, the numerical values would seem to refer to a sum of money.\textsuperscript{498}

Another lead token, this time of the Haller von Hallerstein Collection, and dating to a period between the 3rd and 1st centuries BCE, depicts a Panathenaic Amphora with two strokes on the field, which can be interpreted as numerical symbols.\textsuperscript{499} Its small size (12mm), similar to the size of the tokens of the House Λ of the Makrygiannis plot, as well as the minuscule size of the numerals compared to the size of the design, make this, in the general idea, a close parallel to the tokens with numeric signs of the House Λ.

\textbf{B. TOKENS WITH NONUMERIC SIGNS}

Tokens nos. 12–15 exhibit an insect, most likely a cicada, and do not bear any secondary symbol, letter, or number. They are identical to each other and likely derive from the same die.

Lead tokens exhibiting cicadas are known from the Athenian Agora excavations,\textsuperscript{500} while a token from Athens bearing a depiction of a cicada and the inscription ΟΑΓ is associated by

\textsuperscript{495}Braun 1970, 193 (pl. 57.1); Grace 1974, 199.
\textsuperscript{496} Crosby 1964, 89–90 (L 42 a-b, pl. 19).
\textsuperscript{497} Crosby 1964, 135 (deposit A-B 19-20:1).
\textsuperscript{498} Crosby 1964, 89–90 (L 42 a-b, pl. 19).
\textsuperscript{499} Gkikaki 2020, 132–133 (no. 58 pl. 15).
\textsuperscript{500} See Crosby 1964, 91 (L 46 pl. 20), which belongs to a group of lead tokens of the second century BCE, bearing the inscription ΕΡ or ΕΡΜΙ, considered to have been used for grain distribution. Also: Crosby 1964, 98 (L 119–122 pl. 23).
Svoronos and Engel with the market supervisors (*agoranomoi*).\(^{501}\) Crosby, however, considers this interpretation as uncertain.\(^{502}\) More recently tokens with this and similar legends have been associated to the *agorastikon*, the fee paid for participation in a religious banquet.\(^{503}\)

In Athenian bronze coinage, the cicada comprised one of the most popular designs at the end of the 2\(^{nd}\) and early 1\(^{st}\) centuries BCE.\(^{504}\) It formed the main element of design during the early 2\(^{nd}\) century BCE, remaining as such until the era of the mid-80’s to 70’s BCE,\(^{505}\) and it further continued as a secondary sign until the end of the first century BCE.\(^{506}\) On New Style silver coins, it can be seen as an issue symbol through the second century until the early first century BCE.\(^{507}\)

The cicada falls easily into the category of official devices of the Athenian state. It symbolised Athenian autochthony, as the people of Athens, unaffected by the southerly expansion of the Dorians, were particularly proud of their indigenous character, born from their native soil much like the cicada. The revival of this symbol during the Hellenistic period, within the general context of the revival of antiquated symbols in the second century BCE, can be viewed as an expression of "the outbreak of sentimental nationalism which accompanied the Roman conquest of Greece".\(^{508}\)

Token no. 16 depicts a different insect, most probably a scorpion, or perhaps an ant. The latter is known from several comparable types at the Numismatic Museum in Athens.\(^{509}\)

---

\(^{501}^\)Svoronos 1900, 333 (no. 164 pl. III, 8); Engel 1884, 7 (no. 24 pl. I). For more tokens featuring cicadas, see Postolacca 1866, 347 (nos. 118–20); Postolacca 1868, 288 (nos. 419–21 pl. LII); Engel 1884, 18 (nos. 168, 169, 177 pl. V); Gikaki 2018; Gikaki 2020, 132 (no. 56 pl. 15); Gikaki 2021 68, 71 (no. 7 with fig.) and 72 (no. 11 with fig).

\(^{502}^\)Crosby 1964, 81 with n. 23.

\(^{503}^\)Gikaki 2020, 118–20.

\(^{504}^\)Kroll 1993, 53–54.

\(^{505}^\)Kroll 1993, 65 (no. 85 pl. 8); 76 (no.100, pl. 10); 79 (nos. 108–09 pl. 10); 80 (no. 113 pl. 10) and 99 (no. 131 pl.12).

\(^{506}^\)Kroll 1993, 110 (no. 158 pl. 15).

\(^{507}^\)Thompson 1961, 50–52 (nos. 65–73 pl. 9); 170–72 (nos. 429–40 pl. 44); 386 (no. 1248 pl. 139).

\(^{508}^\)Kroll 1993, 53–54.

\(^{509}^\)Postolakas 1884, 5–6 (no. 33a: double-sided token with a head of Pan on one side and Α-Λ and an ant on the other); Postolakas 1884, 11–12 (no. 71: token with a fly on one side and an ant on the other, and no. 72: token with an ant on one side and a cicada [τέττιξ] on the other). Also, Svoronos 1900, 340 (no. 263 pl. IV, 24: inscribed Δ-Η), which according to Gikaki (2021, 64) refers to ΔΗΜΟΣΙΟΝ, meaning ‘public’.
Two tokens with a representation of a stylized bee crossed by a staff that seems to terminate in a *caduceus* (nos. 17, 18) come from the circular pit in House Λ and the layer that covered it, respectively. Above the bee appears a star; below, the letter A. Although the two tokens are identical in many details, they seem not to derive from the same die. The bee was used as an emission symbol on the Athenian New Style silver issue of the Zoilos-Euandros (110/09 BCE), while it also represented the preeminent coin type of Ephesus throughout its history.

Token no. 19 exhibits a central jar with a high neck and a raised handle, flanked left and right by an ear of wheat and a poppy head with downwardly projecting stems that intersect below. The composite design of a vase flanked by an ear of wheat and poppy head is not found on any published lead tokens. Nevertheless, we find the two latter vegetal elements combined on Athenian lead tokens. Likewise, on coinage the poppy between ears of wheat is used as an emission symbol on the Athenian New Style silver issue of the Lysandros-Oinophilos, the fourth or fifth issue after that of Mithradates-Aristion and on bronze issues of the 1st century BCE. The combined ear of wheat and poppy head are the most characteristic symbols of Demeter and Persephone, although the jar seen on token no. 19 is not one of the ritual utensils associated with their worship, such as the *plemochoe* and the *kernos*.

Based on excavation finds and numismatic evidence the tokens of the House Λ date to the late Hellenistic period. The tokens under discussion largely share a common iconographic focus, in so much as the majority depict various fauna. Tokens with numeric signs tend to depict smaller animals (hare, probably mouse) and bird, while tokens with no numeric signs depict insects.

---

510 Thompson 1961, 257-261 (nos. 709c-d, 713c-d, 714d-i, 715-721 pl. 76-77). For the dating see Flament 2007, 151 (no. 55).

511 Crosby 1964, 107 (L 213-215, pl. 27); Postolacca 1866, 346 (nos. 106-112); Engel 1884, 18 (no. 175, pl. V) and 20 (no. 200, pl. VI); Svoronos 1900, 339 (no. 259 pl. K (IV), 22); Gkikaki 2020, 132 (no. 55).

512 Thompson 1961, 374 (nos. 1179-1186 pl. 132); For the dating see Flament 2007, 150 (no. 83); Kroll 1993, 81-84. For the bronze issues see Kroll 1993, 85 (no. 118 pl.11, early 70’s BC), 100 (nos. 133-134 pl.12, mid. 80’s-70’s BC) and 107 (no. 150 pl.14, mid-20’s-19 BC). For the coin types: Kroll 1993, 100 (nos. 133-134).
(cicada, scorpion or ant, bee) exclusively. The only exception to this iconographic homogeneity constitutes symbol no. 19, which depicts a jar framed by wheat ear and poppy head.

As a whole, the tokens discussed here stand apart from the majority of tokens excavated in the Athenian Agora not only because of the numeric signs but also because of the ‘unofficial’, almost casual, style of the designs. Tokens with numeric signs are known only from the periphery of the Agora. Besides the find in the House Λ of the Makrygiannis plot, the find in Well B1 in the Dipylon also comes from outside the Agora. Just as is the case with coinage, tokens with numeric signs have been found in hoards and not isolated. It remains open to debate whether the tokens with no numeric signs belong to the same context of function. This is not improbable as it can be judged by the find in Kerameikos, where a lettered token (the well-known jurors’ tokens) was found together with the rest which obviously form a very coherent lot.

Functions of the Tokens

The study of the rich and diverse material from the Athenian Agora Excavations has demonstrated that ‘the exact use of a particular token is often impossible to determine’. When types are accompanied by inscriptions, conclusions may be reached perhaps with more certainty, but such inscriptions usually consist of only one or two letters and can lead to a wide variety of readings. Furthermore, the themes represented on tokens are not particularly telling, since they have been occasionally selected from a repertoire of subjects common in numismatic iconography or other public objects of the city, which needed to be stamped with

513With the exception of the two pieces in the Great Drain of the Athenian Agora discussed above, which can be considered as fortuitous losses: Crosby 1964, 89–90 (L42a-b pl. 19).

514Braun 1970, 193 (pl. 57.1); Grace 1974, 199.

515Crosby 1964, 76.

516Crosby 1964, 79. Even in cases where inscriptions are more explanatory, they may still be interpreted differently; for example, tokens inscribed with ΑΓ or ΑΓΟΡ, were interpreted by Crosby (1964, 80–81) as receipts for tax payments and associated them with agoranomoi, the market officials. Crosby based her assumptions obviously on Athenian tokens inscribed ‘Agoranomōn’ in full and on the analogy of similarly inscribed tokens in Roman Egypt, corroborated by abundant papyrological records. For the ‘Agoranomoi’ tokens of Roman Egypt revealing is the evidence gathered by Wilding (2020, 121–22). Gikiaki (2020, 118–20) based on Bubelis’ epigraphic survey (2013), has argued that the abbreviations ΑΓ, ΑΓΟ, ΑΓΟΡ should be better interpreted as ‘agorastika symbola’, and that the tokens in question were exchanged for entrance to a sacrificial banquet after the participants had paid for it or contributed in other ways, in the form of a prescription.
a small design (e.g. standard weights and stamped amphora handles) and in only a few cases were their designs related to their use. It is possible, however, that tokens depicting ears of wheat were associated with state-sponsored grain distributions, while tokens bearing an owl image, a type depicted on silver triobols, could be exchanged for a three-obol payment and may have been used in Jury Courts as dikastika tokens. In the case of the tokens from the Athenian Agora with a piece of armor on their obverse, their design clearly reflects their use, as they were intended for the acquisition of state-owned armor. Their discovery in the same well as a large collection of cavalry tablets further indicates that they “might very well have been employed for the arming of cavalrymen”. Excavation data has also proved of crucial importance for the identification of bronze Jury Court tokens initially identified as admission tickets both for entrance to the Assembly when summoned at the theatre of Dionysus and to the Dionysia. The unearthing of similar tokens in the Agora among the foundations of the Jury Law Courts, one of them in association with bronze ballots, proved these objects were not tickets for the entrance to the theater, but bronze tokens used in Athenian Jury Courts.

With regard to the House Λ of the Makrygiannis plot, the individual designs as well as the added symbols, offer little evidence for their interpretation. Nevertheless, their signaling with numbers, the excavation data, and the specific contexts within which the lead tokens were found offer us sufficient information to formulate some understanding of their use.

The numeric signs on the lot of nine tokens from Dipylon as well as on the two specimens excavated in the Great Drain in the Agora correspond to monetary units (drachms and obols). This finding cannot be contested, because drachms, half drachms, half obols, and quarter obols—on the Dipylon tokens— as well as half obols on the Great Drain tokens are denoted by

517 Crosby (1964, 81) comments that ‘almost half of the designs which were used on the Hellenistic tokens from the Athenian Agora occur on contemporary Athenian coins’; According to Bubelis (2010, 181) ‘tokens, coins, official seals and still other objects merely used slightly differing versions of common images that the state tended to use for a variety of official purposes’.

518 Crosby 1964, 90; Ralli 2009.

519 Crosby 1964, 81.

520 Kroll 1977, 143.

521 Kroll 1977, 146. According to Schäfer (2019, 55–56), the armor depicted on these tokens is not related necessarily to the cavalry and they could well have been destined for soldiers of the infantry or hoplites.

522 Svoronos 1898, 63–64.

523 Thompson 1954, 58–59; Boegehold et al. 1995, 68.
the appropriate signs. The similarities of these tokens with those of the House Α of the Makrygiannis plot (nos. 1-11) are clear: lead material; uniface; designs that do not belong to the realm of public repertoire; and especially the numbers struck on the same side as the fauna species. However, in the tokens of the Makrygiannis plot, the particular sign for drachms is absent and what we have is just strokes, which could equally denote obols or numbers for any unit. This suggests that the numeric denotation does not necessarily stand for a numismatic value.

There is still one possibly significant difference. For the types from Kerameikos and the Athenian Agora, the principal subject is the numbers, which are placed in the centre and take up most of the flan, while in the material from the House Α the exact opposite occurs: emphasis is given to the design, the numbers are cut small and, given the small size of the subject, they are hardly discernible. While for the types from Kerameikos and the Agora the principal information is the value marks, in the case of the types from House Α of the Makrygiannis plot numerals play only a supplementary role. It may be a difference not just in style but also in the function of these distinct lots of tokens. Nevertheless, the interval of more than a century which separates the find in Well B in the Dipylon and the find in the House Α to the SE of the Acropolis may well account for this difference in the numeric signs.

The symbola with monetary values from Kerameikos should be interpreted as receipts or exchange tokens to be exchanged with the equivalent sum, an interpretation which has been put forward by Crosby for the analogous types from the Agora. Nevertheless, their marking with irregular sums, as well as their subject matter with designs that do not pertain to the official symbola, probably suggests that they were private and not public instruments.

Some additional evidence concerning the framework of use of tokens from the House Α is offered by the context in which they were found, particularly in relation to Cistern III from where most of them were recovered.

The contents of Cistern III with regard to ceramic vessels were impressive: pithoi, amphorae, kraters, cooking equipment, serving vessels for the consumption of food and drink, lamps,

---

525Crosby 1964, 81.
526Kroll 2019.
loom weights, and beehives altogether compose an extremely rich assemblage (fig. 11). Among this abundant material there are vessels used for the measuring out and selling of liquids and possibly solids. Finally, in addition to the lead tokens, a lead weight completes the picture of an assemblage that could only with difficulty be described as purely domestic. Yet another lead weight was recovered from the circular pit.

The identification of the original function of a context – especially of a well - on the basis of the ceramics assemblages alone, is extremely uncertain. Nevertheless, the number as well as types of vessels from Cistern III suggest their provenance from a space destined for mass consumption and supply of food and drink, while the few lead weights and vessels for measuring and selling refer to commercial activity. It remains crucial to address the question whether the deposit derived from cleaning operations of the same place, or whether debris containing destroyed vessels from several locations with various functions were brought together and placed here. This would impact the interpretations as to whether the symbols found in the cistern relate to the lead weights and the vessels for measuring and selling out goods. Regardless, with their special characteristics, the *symbola* from the Makrygiannis plot make a probable candidate for *symbola* that functioned within a private context. This is a usage that has not previously been asserted; on the contrary, such interpretations have been contested in

---

527 Eleftheratou 2020, 57.

528 Two of these are biconical jugs, one on: Eleftheratou 2006, 113 (no. 318). Only a few examples of these vessels are known from Athens; see Rotroff 1997, 129–30, 297 (nos. 511–14 pl. 50). On Delos, similar vessels came to light in the ruins of a small tavern destroyed in 69 BC; found in three pairs of fractional sizes, they are believed to have been measures for the sale of liquids, as well as perhaps solids; see Hadjidakis 1997, 296; Hadjidakis 2000, 122 (pl. 72); Hadjidakis 2017, 337 (no. 229). In addition to the biconical jugs, at least ten round-mouth juglets have also been found. One on Eleftheratou 2006, 112 (no. 313). These are vessels suitable for the measuring out of liquids and are thought to have served as unofficial measures; see Rotroff 2011, 702–04; Rotroff 1997, 133. For similar examples from Athens, see Rotroff 1997, 132–33, 299–301 (nos. 533–55 pls. 51, 52 figs. 39, 40).

529 For this conical lead weight, see Eleftheratou 2006, 41 (no. 72).

530 For this four-sided lead weight with a representation of a Panathenaic amphora and an inscription *HMI-METPO*, see Eleftheratou 2006, 40 (no. 70). Two conical lead weights were also found together, but it is uncertain whether they served as standard weights or had other uses.

531 For an extensive discussion on this issue of interpretation, see Lynch (2016), where she examines the contents of Well 2:4 in the Athenian Agora, consisting of debris from the cleanup following Athens’ sack by the Persians in 480 BC, and discusses methodological problems involved in the research.
the case of Athens, especially in the Classical period. It is increasingly clear, however, that this cannot be wholly rejected. Crosby, based on analogy, thinks that Athenian tokens should have had similar uses with Roman tesserae, which ‘served a variety of purposes’, including their use as admission tickets for the theater, baths, inns, or ‘as small change used by individual merchants or shops’. Ancient sources provide some albeit sparse information for such a use. The comic writer Hermippos refers to a token used in retail commerce:

“I will get the token (symbolon) from the shopkeepers” (Hermippos Fragment 61, = Pollux, Onomastikon 9.70: παρὰ τῶν καπήλων λήμνοι τὸ σύμβολον). Similarly, from a verse of Theophrastus’ work ‘Characteres’, dated to 330-320 BCE, we learn that a token existed that permitted entrance to street spectacles:

“At a show, he will go round collecting small change from every man, and wrangle with such as bring the token (symbolon) and claim to look on for nothing.” (Theophrastus, Characters 6.4: καὶ ἐν θαύμασι ὑμιν χαλκοὺς ἐκλέγειν καθ’ ἕκαστον περὶῶν καὶ μάχεσθαι τούτως τοῖς τὸ σύμβολον φέρουσι καὶ προίκα θεωρεῖν ἀξιοῦσι). There is no mention, however, of the form these tokens took, much less how and especially for what reason they were used.

If, based on the above, we accept that the *symbola* from House Λ of the Makrygiannis plot were indeed employed in private life, many additional questions may arise to which few answers can yet be offered. The main question is who issued these tokens and why. Were they a kind of voucher for the provision of a special category of goods and services, or were they ‘special purpose’ money, as their value-marks may indicate? The fact that the same numbers are constantly combined with the same design – II for hare, III for bird, IIII (?) for mouse – suggests that the pairings do not refer to quantities of different units, but of one and the same unit, may that be a particular good, service, or indeed monetary value. However, this does then beg the question as to why there are two varieties for the hare type.

---

532 According to Bubelis (2010, 192), the *symbola* of Athens ‘developed as purely administrative devices’.

533 Crosby 1964, 76.

534 Cf. Csapo and Wilson forthcoming, I. section I Ax.
An interesting remark is that the symbols with numeric signs (nos. 1-11), bear animal designs which do not appear on Athenian coinage, and they seem in general not have been state-issued, while symbols with no numeric signs (nos. 12-19), and in particular the cicada type (nos. 12-15), share common iconography with one of the most popular coin types of the time. The latter types could be symbols which had been issued by the state and had thereafter acquired another function, perhaps under special circumstances.\(^535\) Another possibility is that of symbols which had been privately issued in order to imitate the economic function of the currency.

In any case it is tempting to assume that the unit – whatever this unit is – which is not represented on any of the symbols types with numeric values, would be represented by the symbols types with no numeric values, especially by the cicada, the most common coin type of the period.

Such a hypothesis is more probable if the signs represented monetary values, such as obols – very probable on account of the design – or even smaller denominations. In that case, the symbols were a kind of fiat currency of unofficial nature; not a general-purpose money, but money issued for a specific function. Their employment as small denominations, a hypothesis accepted also by Crosby, constitutes a plausible alternative.\(^536\)

The function of tokens as unofficial money is well attested in Rome, Byzantium, and in medieval societies.\(^537\) Nevertheless, the use of Athenian tokens as petty currency has been seriously contested.\(^538\) The debate was given fresh impetus by the discovery of a number of tokens mixed with coins excavated inside a rock-cut basin, very close to the assumed Agora of the deme of Koile.\(^539\) This is an interesting mix of small Athenian silver denominations, bronze Athenian and foreign issues, one bronze jury token, and twenty lead tokens and should be considered, according to Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou and Apostolou, as a hoard of the second

\(^{535}\) If this case applies, then it is of significance that all tokens with no numeric signs (nos. 12-18, excluding no. 19) depict insects, which should not be regarded as a coincidence.

\(^{536}\) Crosby 1964, 76.

\(^{537}\) Sheedy 2019, 19 with n. 10

\(^{538}\) Kroll 1993, 24–25, nn. 7–8, Kroll 2015.

\(^{539}\) Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou and Apostolou 2020, 275–89; Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou in this volume.
century BCE. Its composition probably reflects a sample of the circulating petty currency, and the tokens form a substantial part of the lot.\textsuperscript{540}

Even if the numeric signs on the tokens from House Λ represent monetary values or some other unit, there still remains an additional question to address: who issued them? William Bubelis, who first examined tokens from medieval and Early Modern Europe in comparison to Athenian counterparts in order to gauge the development of the phenomenon and the percentage of public to private issues in Classical and Hellenistic Athens has reached the conclusion that in Athens there had not existed the appropriate conditions which led the transformation of the European charity tokens to fiduciary coinage. Furthermore, Bubelis thinks that in Athens the only institution analogous to the charity institutions of late medieval Europe was ‘the polis itself’, which did employ tokens for the distribution of goods and benefits to the citizens. Benefactors were mere individuals, while merchants and bankers did not form companies and therefore, they would not have ‘employed tokens for commercial purposes’. Although he considers the use of symbola for personal or private use almost certain, Bubelis rejects their use by institutions independent of the polis.\textsuperscript{541}

The matter remains open to discussion and this presentation does not aspire to put forward a definitive solution. Instead, it aims to lay out the premises for further research and discussion. Nevertheless, if the symbola with numeric signs were official issues, destined perhaps to distribute goods in certain quantities to the citizenry, then what kind of building provided the material of Cistern III?

\textbf{Catalogue}

\textsuperscript{540}Sheedy (2019), 24–25; Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou and Apostolou 2020, 275–89; Dakoura-Vogiatzoglou in this volume.

\textsuperscript{541}Bubelis 2010, 183–86.
1–4. Hare running right; on the left, two strokes. The two strokes can be interpreted as numerical symbols or they designate two obols. Uniface.
1. NMA 4647 (fig. 3), Ø 11 mm, 1.33g. From Cistern III.
2. NMA 4320 (fig. 3), Ø 12 mm, 1.67g. From Cistern III.
3. NMA 713 (fig. 3), Ø 11 mm, 0.81g. From Cistern III.
4. NMA 711 (fig. 3), Ø 12 mm, 1.55g. From Cistern III.

5–8. Same as nos. 1–4, but symbol at bottom, possibly a flower or wheat ears in a container.
5. NMA 4646 (fig. 4), Ø 12 mm, 1.38g. From Cistern III.
6. NMA 4645 (fig. 4), Ø 12.5 mm, 1.22g. From Cistern III.
7. NMA 4317 (fig. 4), Ø 12 mm, 1.50g. From Cistern III.
8. NMA 710 (fig. 4), Ø 11 mm, 0.97g. From Cistern III.

9–10. A bird pecking at an illegible object, probably the letter Thēta (Θ) or perhaps a phiale; lower right, a wreath; above the bird’s head, probably a letter (Α or Δ). On the left, three strokes. The three strokes can be interpreted as numerical symbols or they designate three obols. Uniface.
9. NMA 716 (fig. 5), Ø 14 mm, 1.04g. From Cistern III.
10. NMA 4318 (fig. 5), Ø 12 mm, 0.92g. From the circular pit.

11. Mouseseatedfacing right, playing the flute (aulos). On the lower right, four vertical, uneven strokes. The four strokes can be interpreted as numerical symbols or they designate four obols. The strokes are not straight as in the previous examples, and therefore they may not denote numbers but they may be some kind of or a part of a design. Uniface.
11. NMA 718 (fig. 6), Ø 12 mm, 1.10g. From Cistern III.
12–15. Insect, probably a cicada.
12. NMA 712 (fig. 7), Ø 10 mm, 1.20g. From Cistern III.
13. NMA 714 (fig. 7), Ø 13 mm, 1.07g. From Cistern III.
14. NMA 715 (fig. 7), Ø 12 mm, 1.06g. From Cistern III.
15. NMA 4648 (fig. 7), Ø 11 mm, 0.87g. From Cistern III.

16. Insect, probably a scorpion or perhaps an ant. Uniface.
16. NMA 717 (fig. 8), Ø 12 mm, 1.14g. From Cistern III.

17–18. Bee crossed by a staff possibly terminating at left in a caduceus; above, a star; below, the letter Alpha (Α). Uniface.
17. NMA 4321 (fig. 9), Ø 13 mm, 1.59 g. From the layer covering the circular pit.
18. NMA 4319 (fig. 9), Ø 12 mm, 1.02g. From the circular pit.
19. A central jar with a tall neck and raised handle, flanked by an ear of wheat (left) and a poppy head (right).
19. NMA 709 (fig. 10), Ø 12 mm, 1.90g. From Cistern III.
Captions

Fig. 1: Topographical plan of the South Slope of the Acropolis. To the south the Makrygiannis plot excavations are visible. ©Acropolis Museum, 2019, Eleftheratou, S., Nikas, A.

Fig. 2: The area of the Makrygiannis plot in Classical and Hellenistic times, showing the location of House Λ, Cistern III, and the circular pit. ©Acropolis Museum, 2019, Eleftheratou, S., Nikas, A.

Fig. 3: Lead tokens with a hare running right; nos. 1, 2, 3, 4. © Acropolis Museum, 2019, photo: Irini Miari.

Fig. 4: Lead tokens with a hare running right and an additional symbol below; nos. 5, 6, 7, 8. © Acropolis Museum, 2019, photo: Irini Miari.

Fig. 5: Lead tokens with a representation of a bird; nos. 9, 10. © Acropolis Museum, 2019, photo: Irini Miari.

Fig. 6: Lead token depicting probably a mouse, playing the flute (aulos); no. 11. © Acropolis Museum, 2019, photo: Irini Miari.

Fig. 7: Lead tokens bearing an insect, probably a cicada; nos. 12, 13, 14, 15. © Acropolis Museum, 2019, photo: Irini Miari.

Fig. 8: Lead token with an insect, probably a scorpion, or perhaps an ant; no. 16. © Acropolis Museum, 2019, photo: Irini Miari.

Fig. 9: Lead tokens with a bee crossed by a staff; nos. 18 (left), 17 (right). © Acropolis Museum, 2019, photo: Irini Miari.

Fig. 10: Lead token depicting a jar between a wheat ear and a poppy head; no. 19. © Acropolis Museum, 2019, photo: Irini Miari.

Fig. 11: Pottery dumped in Cistern III. ©Acropolis Museum, Photo Archive.
Nike on Hellenistic lead tokens: iconography and meaning

Martin Schäfer
Archaeological Society at Athens

This study discusses the iconography of the type of Nike standing at rest and in a long garment on Hellenistic lead tokens from Athens.542 We will start by giving a brief account of the tokens, which are listed in a catalogue at the end of the text, here arranged according to “Darstellungstyp” (figure scheme), referring to the types of representation (A to E). After a brief summary of the nature of the goddess, we will attempt a comparison with the figure of standing Nike on other artifact categories and will discuss the meaning of the iconography.

Athenian Tokens with Nike

Most of the tokens depicting a standing Nike are stored in the Numismatic Museum in Athens. The provenance of none of them is known. The only tokens with a known find spot are the two from the Ancient Agora, now in the Agora Museum, which are also the only ones which have been published properly (A 1 and B 1, figs. 1a-b, 3).543 Because of their importance, they will be presented first – others from recent excavations at the Agora will be

542 I am most grateful to M. Gkikaki for the invitation to this workshop and for multiple support and constructive remarks. I would also like to express my gratitude to Director Prof. J. McK. Camp and especially to S. Dumont from the Agora Excavations and also to Director G. Kakavas and A. Nikolakopoulou, V. Stephanaki, E. Apostolou and G. Nikolaou from the Numismatic Museum, Athens. For the photographs of the pieces in the Numismatic Museum I am grateful to the photographer G. Mestousis, to those from the Agora Museum to K.-V. von Eickstedt. I also owe special thanks to Prof. em. E. Vikela for remarks on the text and to K. Papoutsis for technical support. – Additional abbreviations: ABV = Beazley, John Davidson 1956, Attic Black-figure Vase-painters, Oxford, Clarendon Press; ARV² = Beazley, John Davidson 1963, Attic Red-figure Vase-painters, 2nd ed., Oxford, Clarendon Press; LIMC = Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae; SNG = Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. – All dates used are BCE. – The publications “Postolacca 1866” and “Postolacca 1868” were signed by Achilles Postolakas in the Italian version of his name.

543 For another token in the Numismatic Museum at Athens the place of discovery is mentioned in a very general way (B 2, fig. 4). Tokens, which do not show the goddess standing calm, but slightly moving, are not considered in this study, such as the example from the North Slope of the Acropolis (Athens, Agora Museum IL 722 in Crosby 1964, 89 L34 pl. 20) with Nike moving right and the garment fluttering behind the legs, a type similar to representations on coins of Mithridates VI Eupator see Tekin 1999. For tokens, which bear the inscription NIKE instead of a depiction of the goddess see Crosby 1964, 79. One of these tokens shows a warrior on the obverse and another figure on the reverse in Engel 1884, 16 (no. 138 pl. IV).
published in the future, followed by a small selection of tokens from the Numismatic Museum, and a token from the British Museum.

[INSERT FIG1a-b HERE]

[INSERT FIG2a-b HERE]

The first of the tokens in the Agora Museum shows a Nike, probably clad in a peplos (A 1, fig. 1). The lower parts of her legs are not preserved. She is standing facing left, the right arm raised to the viewer’s left, and the left arm lowered. In her right hand she holds an object, which is difficult to identify. The interpretations range from a trophy, as suggested by J. Kroll, to a small cult image. This token was found together with 8 others, which depict on one side a piece of defensive armour, either a helmet, corselet, shield, or single greave, and on the other side a letter (Alpha, Gamma or Delta). This group of tokens, published by J.H. Kroll in 1977, was found in a well, three metres north of the so-called crossroads enclosure, a small sanctuary in the northwest corner of the ancient Agora. The set is dated by other finds – pottery and coins of Antigonos Gonatas – to the middle or third quarter of the third century. According to Kroll, the tokens were used by Athenian citizens who were provided with state-owned defensive armour, an interpretation which is widely accepted. Thus, the financial burden for the citizen soldiers in procuring military equipment was reduced by state support, by providing them with helmet, corselet, shield, and a pair of greaves. If these tokens were for cavalrymen – as Kroll believes because of the inscribed lead tables and clay sealings from the cavalry archive found also in the well – or for infantry soldiers of the Athenian army, for instance

544 These lead tokens IL 2181 and IL 2194 and the clay token MC 1232 with the depiction of Nike will be published by M. Gkikaki. Due to the circumstances with the pandemic, it was not possible for me to get a publication permit for those. I am grateful to M. Gkikaki for informing me of the existence of these tokens and of A 2.

545 Kroll 1977b, 143 (no. 9 pl. 40); Schäfer 2019, 53–54, 57 (no.I.i fig. 9 on p. 43).


547 For the sanctuary and the well see Shear 1973(a), 126–34, 165–68, 176–79 (fig. 1 pls. 25–28, 36a-d, 39a-g); Shear 1973(b), 360–69 (figs. 1–2 pls. 65–67); Camp 2010, 84-6 (figs. 51–53); Di Cesare 2014(b), 978–79 (figs. 590–91); Rotroff and Lynch 2022 with further bibliography. For the ‘Crossroads Well’ (Agora Deposit J 5:1) and its contents see also Monaco 2004, 28–32; Schäfer 2019, 41–45 (figs. 10–12).

548 E.g. Monaco 2004, 29–30; Di Cesare 2014(b), 979 (with caution).

549 Kroll 1977b, 145–46. For those finds see Shear 1973(a), 176–79 (pl. 39a-g); Kroll 1977a; see also Schäfer 2019, 44–45.
hoplites – as I believe\textsuperscript{550} – is of little importance in this context. While the items depicted on the obverse indicate the armour given to the citizen soldiers, the letters on the reverse represent – according to Kroll – the different sizes of a weapon type. Remarkably, there is also a letter on the reverse of the token with the Nike, an A (A 1, fig. 1). In contrast to the defensive equipment on the tokens, the figure of Nike (fig. 1a) is more difficult to explain. Should it represent a piece of armour which “does not lend itself to depiction in the small field of the token” like a spear or a sword, rather than a military standard, as Kroll believes?\textsuperscript{551} Or could the figure symbolize a whole set of armour, as I have proposed elsewhere?\textsuperscript{552} Both proposals are not without problems. The first, because there are indeed coins which show a single offensive weapon, like a spear or a sword, and therefore prove the capability of the die-cutters in depicting those weapons.\textsuperscript{553} If the second proposal is accepted, what is a whole set of armour: is it only defensive armour or also/or exclusively offensive weaponry (spear or sword)? Until now, no token is known with the representation of offensive weapons except for a few with a bow or a quiver.\textsuperscript{554}

\[\text{[INSERT FIG3 HERE]}\]

The second token with a Nike from the Agora was found in the southern part of the Great Drain, in a disturbed late Hellenistic context (B 1, fig. 3). Another token with a greave\textsuperscript{555} was found essentially in the same disturbed context, along with another token featuring the image of a griffin-like creature, which has not yet been adequately published.\textsuperscript{556} The finding of the

\textsuperscript{550} Schäfer 2019, 48, 55–56. Similarly, already D. Buitron Oliver and J. McK. Camp II in Ober and Hedrick 1993, 107 (figs. 16.12–18) (used “for the arming of irregulars, thetes”, not hoplites), and, although not excluding cavalrymen, Couvenhes 2007, 531 with n. 53.

\textsuperscript{551} Kroll 1977b, 143.

\textsuperscript{552} Schäfer 2019, 54.

\textsuperscript{553} Examples, on which are represented single weapons, include a spearhead and a sword on the reverse of Macedonian bronze issues from around 300 see SNG Greece Vol. 4, nos. 895-6.

\textsuperscript{554} See Schäfer 2019, 46–47 and 57 (no. II.c fig. 16 on p. 47); 52–53 and 58 (no. IV.f fig. 31 on p. 53); 55–56 with further references.

\textsuperscript{555} Agora Museum IL 946 (C18:14.1) in Crosby 1964, 104 (L 184 pl. 26); Schäfer 2019, 49, 57 (no. Ill.a fig. 17 on p. 49). See also below n. 15.

\textsuperscript{556} It is catalogued by Crosby, but not depicted: Agora Museum IL 945 (C18:14.2) in Crosby 1964, 99 (L 129c pl. 23). For the context, deposit C 18:14 see Crosby 1964, 135-6 and below n. 100. The token with greave – Agora Museum IL 946 (see above with n. 14) – was found one day later, on August, 7th, 1947, nearby in another part of the sand filling of C 18:14 in the Great Drain South (C 18:14.1, see archive card and notebook page 5675 of the Agora Excavations). Crosby (1964, 136) discusses the deposits. Another armour token, Agora Museum IL 903
aforementioned piece (A 1) together with armour tokens leads to the possibility that B 1 was also connected with armour tokens, because it was found nearby to the token with greave. The token B 1 (fig. 3) shows a different type of standing Nike than A 1 (fig. 1a): the goddess is clad in a peplos, girdled below the breast, with apoptygma. The garment does not reveal the shape of her body underneath. She has her head lowered to the left, to the direction of the object which she holds with her right hand. The object is struck off flan. Of the two wings, the left is visible in full length, while the upper edge of the right wing appears to the right of her head and above her right shoulder. While her left arm is hanging down loosely, her right arm is bent on the elbow holding something. According to M. Crosby the object is probably a wreath. Stylistically, the token is difficult to date, but because of the rendering of the figure it could belong to the third century or the first half of the second century.

From the tokens with depictions of a standing Nike in the Numismatic Museum about 20 are known from the articles of A. Postolakas, I.N. Svoronos and A. Engel, but there are more, (Crosby 1964, 108 L 227a pl. 27, L227 obviously wrongly mentioning C 19 as find spot, with the same mistake repeated in Crosby (1964, 136)), depicting a corselet, was accordingly to the archive card (see also notebook page 5638 [found on July 30th, 1947]) found together with other lead tokens in the same part of sand filling (C 18:14.2) as the Nike token B 1. Another token with corselet in relief, Agora Museum IL 988, comes also from C 18:14, but from the “bottom sand”: Crosby 1964, 108 (L 229 pl. 27); see also archive card and notebook page 7046 found on August 4th, 1947.

This interpretation seems to me more likely compared to those who would connect it with the payments made to citizens for their participation in the Assembly (Ekklesia) as argued by D. Buitron Oliver and J. McK. Camp II in Ober and Hedrick (1993, 67–68 figs. 7.6) without further explanation. This payment was made to enable less well-off citizens to participate in the assembly, compensating the participants for the associated loss of income. Due to the lack of evidence, this interpretation remains purely hypothetical.

Crosby 1964, 96 (L93 pl. 22).

D. Buitron Oliver and J. McK. Camp II in Ober and Hedrick 1993, 68 fig. 7.6 (legend of the image): fourth century. – The close similarity with the tokens, which are listed by Postolacca (1868 no. 235 (=B 2, fig. 4), nos. 236–39, was already noticed by Crosby (1964, 96 L93 pl. 22).

Postolacca 1868, 271 no. 37; 279–80 nos. 231, 235 (=B 2), 236-9 (nearly similar with 235), 240 (maybe with wreath in the right), 241 (maybe with wreath in the right, holding palm branch in the left), 243 (sacrificing on altar), 244 (=D 1), 245 (similar type with 244), 245* (wreath in the raised right, palm branch in the left). Two tokens show Nike striding: 279 no. 225 (from Chalkis/Euboea), 280 no. 232, two others rushing: 280 nos. 229-30. Some others show Nike flying (see below with n. 28), another one kneeling (280 no. 233) and another one standing in a quadriga and holding a palm branch (280 no. 246). – Engel 1884, 7 (no. 31 pl. I standing frontally); 15 (no. 130 pl. IV =B 3, no. 131 pl. IV frontal, with palm branch and inscription, no. 132 pl. IV =C 1); a striding Nike: 15 (no. 129 pl. IV); a sitting Nike: 15 (no. 128 pl. IV). – Svoronos 1900, 334 (nos. 188–89 pl. III 35 slightly striding), see below n. 25; 335 (no. 190 pl. III 36 = E 1) all with inscription. Nike together with the figure of a bearded man, perhaps the eponymous tribal hero Leos: Svoronos 1900, 327–28 nos. 103–09 pl. III 1, cf. Russo in this volume.
because of later additions of lead tokens to the Museum’s collection. Unfortunately, it was not possible to study more than the few presented here. Therefore, they are only partly representative for the whole corpus of those tokens with a standing Nike.

[INSERT FIG4 HERE]

[INSERT FIG5 HERE]

The first (B 2, fig. 4) shows a figure with the body in nearly frontal stance in an elaborate girdled peplos with apoptygma and with straight vertical folds covering her right, weight-bearing leg, whereas the free left leg appears in three-quarter view under the garment. The upper part of the right wing, which is hidden behind the back, is visible above the right shoulder. She holds an object in her right hand, which seems to be a wreath and her head is in profile facing left. Perhaps the piece can be dated to the third century.561 According to Postolakas there are four other tokens with a similar Nike.562 A second token (B 3, fig. 5) depicts a figure, clad again in a girdled peplos with apoptygma, whose upper body is once more nearly frontal. The free leg is only slightly drawn back in comparison to the figure mentioned previously. In her right hand there is again an upright wreath. The edge of the round field is visible on the upper left side of this token. On another, corroded token (D 1, fig. 8) Nike faces left and clearly bends forward. Her right hand is extended downwards and to the left, towards a grounded vase with pronounced belly. With the left she holds presumably a palm branch or tropaion. The great size of the depicted wing is remarkable in relation to the body. A similar depiction is to be found on a token from the Agora.563

[INSERT FIG6 HERE]

[INSERT FIG7 HERE]

[INSERT FIG8 HERE]

A Nike facing right appears in the round field of another token (C 1, figs. 6, 7a), which is smaller than the others (which have a diameter from 1.32 up to 2 cm), because its diameter

561 Similar is the figure of Athena on an Athenian document relief from ca. 330, which indicates the underlying model: Meyer 1989, 297 (A 111 pl. 47,4).


563 Crosby 1964, 92 (L55 pl. 20 from deposit C 18:14). The interpretation of the winged figure is uncertain (Tyche?), as is the reading of the monogram.
measures around 1.25 cm. Because of the severe corrosion, the winged figure is mainly visible in outline, and also her attribute is also nearly unrecognizable: in her outstretched right hand she holds a wreath, which is not bound (fig. 7a). According to A. Engel, there was a cruciform feature on side B (fig. 7b), which has now vanished.\footnote{Engel 1884, 15 (no. 132 pl. IV).}

A token in the British Museum (A 2, fig. 2a-b) shows Nike with a tall, slim body standing in three-quarter view to the left. In her left hand she holds probably a wreath. Because of the letter Γ on the reverse, and also the similarity of the figure with that from A 1 (fig. 1a), it is very likely that the provenance of the piece is Athens, and that it could belong to the category of the lead lettered tokens with depictions of armour or Nike on the other side. Therefore, a date in the middle or the third quarter of the third century can be assumed.

Interestingly, most of the figures of the goddess follow a more conservative, or Classical, mode of representation (B 1, B 2, B 3, C 1, figs. 3-7a),\footnote{This phenomenon can also be noticed in Hellenistic coin representations of Nike (see below p. .. with n. 72).} while only two, maybe both of the same die, correspond to a more contemporary, i.e. Hellenistic, form (A 1, A 2, figs. 1a, 2a).

Finally, let us briefly examine two tokens from the Numismatic Museum with other iconographic depictions of Nike, which are accompanied by the inscription ΠΕ or [Π]ΕΝ. The first shows a Nike without wings standing facing right, with her right arm raised to decorate a tropaion, and the left lowered, perhaps holding a wreath, accompanied by the letters [Π]ΕΝ on the right (E 1, fig. 9).\footnote{In the collection of the museum there are two more tokens with an upright Nike and inscription ΠΕ or [Π]ΕΝ (see Svoronos 1900, 334 nos. 188–89 pl. III, 35), but without tropaion and a quite different figure of Nike, walking to the left and holding a wreath with both hands. – For a token with inscription ΠΕ and tropaion, but without Nike, see Svoronos 1900, 336 (no. 223 pl. IV, 5).} The scene is reminiscent of the depiction of Nike on Early Hellenistic coins from Agathokles of Syracuse in memory of a victory over Carthage, on which the goddess nails or puts a helmet on a tropaion. In contrast to the token, Nike presents her (naked) chest in three quarter view, raising the left hand and lowering the right.\footnote{See Bellinger and Berlincourt 1962, 24 (pl. VI, 6); Grote 1992, 891-2 (no. 631); 902 suggesting 310-304 as a likely date; Herzog 1996, 34–35; Gerring 2000, 68–70 (fig. 5). This mint presents this iconographic scheme for the first time in the extant material: see Grote 1992, 891–92, 902. A figural type of Nike closer to that of our token is represented at a tropaion on a coin of Seleucus I, celebrating the triumph over Antigonus and Demetrios.} Because of
the archaeological evidence, it is possible that the scene on the coin is based on a sculptural synthesis, i.e. a dedication. That the scene on the token may also depend on a model from the sculpture in the round cannot be ruled out either.  

The second example with the inscription ΠΕ depicts a Nike flying to the left, holding an object in her outstretched hands, possibly – as on other unpublished tokens with the flying goddess – with a wreath, a figural motive which exists from earlier times in Greek art. According to Svoronos, who published the first token, the letters ΠΕ or ΠΕΝ indicate ΠΕΝΤΑΚΟΣΙΩΝ, referring to the Council of the Five Hundred. If these tokens are indeed connected with the Boule, perhaps used for the compensation paid to each member, we would have a *terminus ante quem* for them, i.e. 307/6. But this interpretation was questioned recently, because this corporate body issued tokens with the inscription ΒΟΛΗ or ΒΟΥΛΗ. Also, in my opinion, the token should be dated later than the fourth century, maybe to the second-first century due to the stylistic characteristics of the figure of Nike decorating the *tropaion*. Therefore, the legend [ΠΕ]EN must have a different meaning. It has been proposed recently to interpret the inscription as *Pentedrachmia*, i.e. five drachmai, in this case proving that these tokens would be *Theorika*, a means of payment for the participation of citizens in festivals. However, this token reveals, maybe with a cultic connotation, the military character of the goddess. In any

---

568 See Grote 1992, 891–92 c, 902. For the motif of Nike at a *tropaion*, see also Gerring 2000, 68–70 (cat. nos. XI/14 and VII/1, XII/6 figs. 4, 68, 95).

569 Athens, Numismatic Museum 3085α: unpublished. Other tokens depicting the flying goddess are also stored in the museum and listed by Postolacca (1868, 279 nos. 226–28; 280 no. 242).

570 For a depiction of flying Nike in metalwork, see Schwarzmeier 2018/19, 16 (fig. 14) from the late fifth/early fourth century.

571 For other representations on tokens with ΠΕ/ΠΕΝ inscriptions, see Svoronos 1900, 334–36 (nos. 181–228, pl. III 30–52, IV 1–9; Gkikaki 2020, 103, 108.

572 The Council was enlarged in this year when two new *phylai* were added, increasing the membership from 500 to 600 (Crosby 1964, 79). After this year the expression ΠΕΝΤΑΚΟΣΙΩΝ could not have been used. For tokens with this inscription in general s. Crosby 1964, 79 with n. 13, 80, 81–82, 83 and recently Gkikaki 2021, 58, 61. For the Council see Rhodes 1972; Stockton 1990, 84–95. For the state pay to the Councilors: Stockton 1990, 85 (only Classical period); Pritchard 2016, 57–60.

573 Gkikaki 2021, 61 n. 25, 64. For the the Council as issuer of tokens, see Gkikaki 2021, 65–67.

574 Gkikaki 2021, 61. For the *theōrika* see Gkikaki 2021, 60–62 with further references.

575 Goulaki-Voutira 1992, 850 interprets the scenes with Nike decorating *tropaia* as a cult act.
case, the use of this piece in a state function is obvious. The same applies for the second example with the flying Nike, whose iconographic motif suggests a more peaceful context, perhaps in connection with games.

**The goddess in Athenian ideology and cult**

To establish a framework for the interpretation of the function of the Nike tokens, let us consider the occurrence of Nike in Athenian politics, ideology, and religion, to better understand the possible meanings of the goddess on these objects.

Nike does not appear in literary sources before her first mention by Hesiod in his *Theogony* (ll. 383-384), where she is presented as the daughter of the Titan Pallas and Styx. In general Nike was not regarded as granting but bearing victory. Her role was not restricted to victory in war (often associated with the war-like deities Zeus and Athena), but also extended to that in sports and other peaceful contexts. Therefore it remains possible, that besides the military sector some of the tokens depicting Nike could have been connected with a different sphere.

However, the religious meaning of Nike on our tokens seems to be limited. Created as a personification for victory, in the beginning Nike was not considered a religious figure. On the Athenian Acropolis there was a cult of Athena Nike at least as early as the first half of the 6th century. However, in Athens the cult of Nike as an autonomous divine figure could perhaps already be demonstrated in the early fifth century by the so-called inscription of Themistocles from Troezen, where a sacrifice to Athena and Nike is mentioned, which should have been conducted before the Athenian ships left for the Battle of Salamis, although the historicity of this inscription is often doubted. That there was indeed a special connection

576 Bulle 1897-1909, 306; Bellinger and Berlincourt 1962, 30.

577 Iakovidou 2010, 31–32, 46, 332 (sports). In general, see Bulle 1897-1909, 306–08.

578 Thöne 1999, 58. Therefore, she was not worshipped as an independent deity in the Greek motherland, apart from in Magna Graecia and maybe also in the region of Elis, before – as some believe – the middle of the fourth century: Bernert 1937, 294; Scherf 2000, 907.


580 See Mikalson (2016, 276–78) arguing against Nike as an independent deity. For the decree see e.g. Meiggs and Lewis, 1969, 48–52, esp. 49 l. 39. As Falaschi, (2018, 76–78) points out, from the later fifth century up to the
between Nike and this decisive naval victory is testified: the Greeks believed, according to Herodotus 8.77, that they owed to Zeus and Nike – here called πότνια Νίκη) – the victory over the Persian fleet at the Battle of Salamis and therefore their freedom. This leaves no doubt that Nike was venerated then, at least in some parts of Greece, as an autonomous deity in the first half of the 5th century. Some years later, in the time of Cimon, probably a statue, perhaps of Nike, was erected on the column of the victory monument at Marathon, from which only a small fragment has survived. In summary, even though for Athens and Attica there seems to be no clear evidence for a cult of Nike as an autonomous goddess in the Archaic and Classical periods, the foundation was laid for Nike’s particular importance in Attic art at the latest with the goddess’ role at the Battle of Salamis. It is even possible that the figurative representation of the goddess already found its way into the official Athenian iconography in the aftermath of the Battle of Marathon, at Cimon’s time.

**The goddess in coinage**

Coins and tokens share common iconography. Not identical but similar designs can be found on Athenian tokens and Athenian coins alike in the Late Classical and Hellenistic Periods. This iconographic similarity is a phenomenon which has neither been addressed nor explained adequately. Fact is that the owl, the kernos as well as the panathenaic amphora – to name but a few – are found on tokens as well as on coins. On no occasion were they produced by the same dies and it is equally possible that certain designs made their first appearance on tokens rather than on coins.583

581 The majority of the scholars seems to be against a cult of Nike as autonomous deity, e.g. Gulaki 1981, 134; Thöne 1999, 58. Iakovidou (2010, 47) believes, that Nike was worshipped as an autonomous deity only from the time of Alexander the Great.

582 Pausanias 1.32.5. Vanderpool 1966, 99–100, 106 pl. 34f; Goulaki-Voutira 1992, 861 no. 127 (“Nike”). Vanderpool (1966, 106) considers “perhaps a Nike preparing or crowning the trophy such as is sometimes represented on vases, reliefs, and coins”. Korres (2017, 172–73) supposes a figure of more than double life size, strongly striding like Athena on Panathenaic Amphoras. For the architecture of the monument see Korres 2017.

583 According to a statement by M. Gkikaki, to whom I am very grateful. – For the relationship between the devices on tokens with those on coins see Gkikaki 2020, 103–08 esp. 108. For the mentioned symbols (owl, kernos and panathenaic amphora) on tokens see Gkikaki 2020, 104, 105–11; Gkikaki 2021, 60, 65, 66–67, 69.
It is worth asking the question if Athenian coinage and Ancient Greek coinage had acted as a host for the type of standing Nike on the Athenian tokens. In general, the depiction of Nike is abundant not only in Greek sculpture and vase-painting, but also in minor arts, where she is often in motion. In coinage the goddess was shown as an autonomous figure for the first time on early coins from Elis, namely from the first half of the 5th century, where she appears in an advanced form of the “Knielaufschaem” (striding) holding a wreath, and obviously symbolises victory in the Olympic games. Later in the same century, Nike appears for the first time on coins of Elis standing still. Depicted here is one of these few coins from ca. 432 (figs. 10a-b); the body in front view (fig. 10b), is dressed in a chiton and peplos, facing left and with the end of a hanging ribbon in her raised right hand and a palm branch in her lowered left. It should be noted that in this period the striding type of Nike was abandoned gradually in the coinage of Elis in favour of other postures – the seated and only rarely the standing Nike, which vanished shortly afterwards. The goddess as a standing autonomous figure seems to be absent from coins of the Classical period from other cities in the Greek motherland, but also from other regions of the Hellenic world, with the exception of some Western Greek mints. To sum up, the figures of the goddess on our tokens couldn’t have been influenced by images on Classical Greek coins.

[INSERT FIG11 HERE]

In coinage, the earliest precursor of the type of figure which is similar to that of some tokens is the Nike on the gold staters of Alexander the Great which show Athena’s head on the


585 Bellinger and Berlincourt 1962, 3–4 (pl. I,1); Lacroix 1974, 13 (pl. I,1); see also Iakovidou 2010, 46–47, 321. For the meaning on these coins, where she is depicted only on the reverse, see Iakovidou 2010, 328–40, 467.


587 Hoover 2011, 81 (no. 332 with fig.).


589 A similar figure on early coins from the Greek city of Terina in Calabria dating to the mid-fifth century is convincingly interpreted as the nymph Terina, adapted to Nike to symbolise “victory”: Caccamo Caltabiano 2018, 85–86 pl. X, 29. For the coins see also Iakovidou 2010, 229, 237, esp. 246–52. On coins of other Western Greek cities winged female figures of other types unmistakably represent Nike, depicted sometimes with an aphlaston (a ship’s stern), see Iakovidou (2010, 183–84) nos. 2, 4, with figs. (city of Himera).
obverse. On the reverse of the coin (fig. 11) Nike is depicted standing in three-quarter view facing left, holding a wreath in her outstretched right hand and a *stylis* upright with her left.\(^{590}\)

Therefore, the figure type of fully clothed Nike was first used by Alexander the Great for political propaganda on these gold staters.\(^{591}\) However, the more precise interpretation of the figure on Alexander’s coins is controversial: according to Bellinger and Berlincourt\(^{592}\) Nike was used by Alexander as a new ideological concept, symbolizing not a particular victory, but “the career of conquest that he set out for himself”.\(^{593}\) Similarly, Grote sees this specific type of Nike as a symbol for Alexander’s general predisposition for victory,\(^{594}\) while Price interprets it as a recall of the great victory over the Persians at Salamis in 480, symbolically offering Alexander, as head of the league of the Greek states, “the crown for new victories”.\(^{595}\) Slightly deviating from this opinion, Miedico believes she was a reference to Athens, celebrating the Athenians and Greeks, who constituted much of Alexander’s army, and that the *stylis* commemorated the historic Greek naval victory over the Persians at Salamis in 480.\(^{596}\) The reference to an actual historical naval victory from the time of Alexander can be excluded.\(^{597}\)

Others suggest that this figure on Alexander’s coins was a copy of a monument in Athens, perhaps a statue or statues of the goddess on the Acropolis dedicated by Alexander the Great, on the occasion of his victory against the Illyrians in 336/5.\(^{598}\) Indeed, a precursor of this type

---


\(^{591}\) E.g. Grote 1992, 902. The Nike of the stater appears, together with Athena’s head on the obverse, on a lead seal of official use (Berlin, private collection), which was stamped with a coin stamp of the Alexander gold stater of Magnesia ad Maeandrum: see Krengel and Sode 2005/6, 70 (no. I figs. 1–3), 71; Callataý 2010, 230, 255 E with fig.

\(^{592}\) Bellinger and Berlincourt 1962, 21.

\(^{593}\) Bellinger and Berlincourt 1962, 21.

\(^{594}\) Grote 1992, 902.


\(^{596}\) Miedico 2010, 36.


\(^{598}\) See Thompson (1944, 177), who suggests also (ibid., 209), that Alexander contributed to the restoration of the extant *Nikai*. Against the suggestion that the Nike on Alexander’s gold coins was a reflection of an assumed
of Nike can be found on a Panathenaic prize amphora of the archon Pythodelos from 336/5, holding an aphlaston in the right hand and a stylis in the left.599 Regardless of whether the figure type on Alexander’s staters was based on a particular statue dedication or not, it was probably, as Mørkholm believes, a homage to Athens, to assure good relationships with this polis, the traditional main adversary of the Persian kingdom, in respect to his campaign against the Persians.600 This was achieved by using a divine figure, particularly popular in Attic iconography, serving often to project success of the state or of persons involved in public affairs or winning contests, as we will see below.

In the following period, the Successors use this type of Nike on their coins only for a limited time with exception the Seleucids.601 Notable examples include a gold stater of Demetrios Poliorketes from 298-295,602 and a coin of Seleucos II Kallinikos (245/4-225) with a palm branch instead of a stylis in the right hand of the goddess.603 This figure was in general very popular on Seleucid mints starting from Seleucos I, mostly with wreath and/or palm branch, but also on clay sealings from Seleucid cities.604 It is suggested, that the majority of these seals were from private persons, who were thus using official iconographic details for personal commercial affairs.605

[INSERT FIG12 HERE]

[INSERT FIG 13 HERE]

The figure of the standing Nike also enjoyed popularity on some issues from Asia Minor, as well as from the periphery of the Greek world.606 In contrast, this figure appears to be extremely rare in the coinage of the Greek motherland in the Hellenistic period. It does not exist on

599 See Thompson 1944, 177 (fig. 14); 205; Eschbach 1986, 111–12 (cat. 65 fig. 65); 130–31 (pl. 29,4).
600 Mørkholm 1991, 44; similarly, Gerring 2000, 71.
602 Athens, Numismatic Museum: SNG Greece Vol. 4, 897 pl. 46.
603 Athens, KIKPE Collection: SNG Greece Vol. 7, 1046 pl. 103.
604 Messina 2006, 19, esp. figs. 1c (a seal impression from Seleucia on the Tigris) and 3 (a seal impression from Uruk).
605 Messina 2006, 22.
606 See Bellinger and Berlincourt 1962, 38–40 (pl. VIII, 7, 9 and 10).
Athenian coins, but it is known on the reverse of some Boeotian types. For instance, a coin of the Boeotian League dating to 225 to 171 (fig. 12b) depicts Nike standing facing left holding trident and wreath, with her arms positioned in a different manner than those on our tokens. Interestingly enough, a similar figure of Nike, again with a maritime reference, occurs on a Western Greek gold ring with round bezel from around the second quarter of the third century (fig.13). The goddess is standing frontally in front of a thymiaterion and holds a trident or stylis. It should be noted here briefly that Nike, in a wide variety of figures, is one of the most popular iconographic themes on Hellenistic metal rings.

At first glance, more promising seems to be the connection with a figure of Nike on Athenian silver coins of the ‘New Style’. On the reverse of the issue of Aphrodisios and Apolexis from 123/2 a standing Nike clad in a long garment is depicted as symbol at the right of the owl. The body of the figure appears nearly frontal, the right leg being the weight-bearing, and the free left leg slightly moved to the side. The head is turned to the left, looking in the direction of a large wreath held with the right hand, whereas one of her wings appears on the right. The fact, that the garment covers only the lower part of the body and leaves the upper naked, shows that this Nike represents a different figure type of that one from our tokens and therefore cannot contribute much directly to our discussion. Nevertheless, it is important to note that the goddess is used here as the signature of a particular mint magistrate.

A certain conservativism in the artistic rendering of the figures of the goddess has recently been noted for the coinages since the time of Alexander the Great by A. Moustaka. She explains...
this with the more official character of the coinages and the fact that they usually repeat the numismatic types of already known models.\textsuperscript{613}

\textbf{The goddess in Athenian state art and ideology}

In searching for the origin of this type of Nike in Athenian art, the possibility of a larger iconographic tradition should perhaps be mentioned. The winged Nike standing, holding a wreath in her outstretched hand was already known in the Archaic period, if the figure on a fragment of the tondo of a black-figure cup from around 500/490 from the Athenian Agora can indeed be interpreted as Nike, and not as another female divinity with wings (such as Iris, for example).\textsuperscript{614} The figure holds the wreath in her left hand, while her chest is turned to the viewer.

From shortly before the mid-fifth century, Nike gained special importance in Athenian art, as apparently evidenced by the Nike on the right hand of the bronze statue of Athena Promachos, a work of the sculptor Pheidias, which was erected on the Acropolis in commemoration of the Persian Wars\textsuperscript{615}. In the second half of this century more important monuments depicting the goddess were created, including the construction of the Temple of Athena Nike on the Acropolis with its balustrade and its multiple depictions of the goddess – although none of them corresponding to the types of figures on the tokens.\textsuperscript{616} The latter applies also to the gold and ivory Nike of Pheidias’ Athena Parthenos in the Parthenon, which wore a gold wreath on her head and roused the special admiration of Pliny the Elder.\textsuperscript{617} Although cult statues of Nike are not known from the Archaic and Classical periods, neither in Athens nor anywhere else,\textsuperscript{618}

\textsuperscript{613} Moustaka 2021, 219.

\textsuperscript{614} Athens, Agora Museum P 22986: ABV 707, no. 594bis; Moore, Philippides and von Bothmer 1986, 315 (no. 1829 pl. 117); Moustaka 1992, 853 (no. 10 pl. 558).

\textsuperscript{615} See Tsouli 2021, 69 with further bibliography.

\textsuperscript{616} Schultz 2002, 92–210; Leventi 2021, 90–101 fig. 8–16. For the interpretation of the figures on the balustrade see Thomsen 2018, 62–63, 65 (fig. 1). For the iconography of Nike in Athenian art from the middle of the fifth century, see Thomsen, 2018, 65–66 and the contributions in M. Lagogianni-Georgarakou, ed., 2021.


the representation of the goddess evidently formed an important part of some of Pheidias’ most famous sculptural creations, namely the Athena Promachos, and the cult statues of Athena Parthenos in Athens and of Zeus in Olympia. On several occasions other official statues of Nike in Athens and Attica were erected, which are only known from written sources. Apart from the possible statue of Nike already mentioned on the Tropaion at Marathon, there are other recorded erections of statues in the Classical period.

About a dozen golden statues of Nike, i.e. bronze statues covered with sheets of gold, were dedicated on the Acropolis sometime in the years around and after 434/3 on the occasion of different military victories, mostly naval battles. These works, which are known from inscriptions, could have been mostly melted down or rather were dismantled by their gold in the crisis of 407/6. Of these, a single golden Nike was restored (or less likely, newly erected) afterwards in 374/3, which held a wreath in her outstretched right hand. A bronze statue, dedicated by the Athenians on the Acropolis after the military triumph at Sphakteria in 425, is mentioned by Pausanias. Due to the lack of iconographic information, the exact appearance of these statues is unknown – for example if in motion or standing still, in spite of the fact, that accessories and attributes are mentioned in the inscriptions like headband, wreath, aphlaston, or stylis. In 334-330, Lycurgus reconstructed these figures of Nike, but their golden sheets were melted down at the beginning of the third century to mint gold coins for the tyrant Lachares, so that he could pay his mercenaries. Another statue of the goddess is

619 Pausanias 5.11.1; see Goulaki-Voutira 1992, 868 (no. 205), 899; Lapatin, 2018, 52–53; Tsouli 2021, 74–77.
620 Thompson 1944, esp.173–77, 205–09. Thompson (1944, 176) refers first to a melting-down of the Nikai of the 5th century and afterwards (ibid. 209) contradictory to a re-covering of these statues with gold “in the latter part of the fourth century, possibly by Alexander and certainly by Lykourgos”.
621 Thompson 1944, 177, 209.
622 Pausanias 4.36.6. Thompson 1944, 176, 209; S. Kansteiner and R. Krumreich in Kansteiner et al., eds., 2014, 453 no. 1204. Löschke (1884, 96 n. 8) interpreted the Nike with aphlaston and sceptre besides an altar on an Attic red-figured lekythos (Berlin, Antikensammlung F 2211: ARV² 423 no. 125; Iakovidou 2010, 46; Beazley Archive Pottery Database no. 204670) as a votive statue, dedicated on occasion of a naval victory, as this statue mentioned by Pausanias.
623 Thompson 1944, 176, 209.
624 Thompson 1944, 193 (fillet), 194 (wreath); 201–03 (aphlaston and stylis).
625 Pseudo-Plutarch X, Vitae decemorum 852b. Thompson (1944, 189–92 figs. 7-9) suggests as prototype the Nike of the Athena Parthenos in the Parthenon, therefore “floating quietly forward” and discusses further possible models.
assumed by some scholars for the Acropolis, depicting Nike holding a garland in both hands, on top of a column on a ship’s bow, as shown on a Panathenaic amphora from 332/1, and therefore interpreted as commemorating the naval victory against the Persian fleet at Salamis.\textsuperscript{626} Besides sculptures in the round, for which we have only the mentioned indirect evidence, the goddess is also depicted on a few Attic document reliefs from the 4\textsuperscript{th} century, standing in the outstretched hand of Athena and always different from those on our tokens.\textsuperscript{627} Only in one case, a badly preserved honorary document relief of the phyle Erechtheis, does Nike appear iconographically as an autonomous figure, crowning a victorious \textit{choregos}.\textsuperscript{628} The relief on a victory dedication by the prytany of Kekropis from about the second quarter of the fourth century again shows her separately and in front of Athena, only slightly smaller in size, apparently crowning a small male figure, who perhaps symbolizes the \textit{prytaneis}.\textsuperscript{629} In both cases, the stance recalls that of Nike on tokens \textbf{B 1-3 (figs. 3-5)}. Unfortunately, the figures on the reliefs are not preserved in their upper part, wherefore it is pointless to speculate if they, together with the figures on the three aforementioned tokens, could trace back to a particular common model of the goddess.

\textbf{[INSERT FIG 14 HERE]}

I have not been able to find any figure similar to one of our Nikes in existing statues, but influences can be detected from earlier sculpture. The figure of Nike on the token from the Numismatic Museum (\textbf{B 2, fig. 4}) but also the figures on other tokens (\textbf{B 1, fig. 3;}\textbf{B 3, fig.5}) resemble in some ways the type of figure used for Athena in sculpture from the High Classical period onwards, as far as the arrangement of the lower part of the body is concerned, with the right weight-bearing leg entirely hidden under the straight vertical folds of the peplos and the

\textsuperscript{626} Miedico 2010, 36 fig. 3b. For the depiction on this vase of the archon Nikētēs (London, British Museum B 610) see Eschbach 1986, 138–39 cat. 69 figs. 72-3; 140–41 pl. 34,1–2.

\textsuperscript{627} Meyer 1989, 285–86 A 70 pl. 23,1; 287 A 75 pl. 23,2; 292 A 93 pl. 25,2; 296-97 A 109 pl. 32,1; 301–02 A 129 pl. 33,1; Lawton 1995,40–41, 59, 96–97 no. 30 pl. 16; 127–26 no. 97 pl. 51; 130 no. 106 pl. 56; 139 no. 132 pl. 70; 151–52 no. 164 pl. 86. In one case she appears as charioteer: Lawton 1995, 134–35 no. 122 pl. 65.

\textsuperscript{628} Athens, Epigraphic Museum 7696 (third quarter of the fourth century): Meyer 1989, 119, 299–300 (A 122 pl. 37,1); Lawton 1995, 59, 137–38 (no. 128 pl. 68); IG II\textsuperscript{2} 1147.

knee of the free leg slightly protruding.\textsuperscript{630} The same motif occurs on figures of Athena Parthenos on Athenian document reliefs throughout the 4\textsuperscript{th} century, as on an example from the Acropolis from around 340,\textsuperscript{631} but sometimes also on other figures of Athena.\textsuperscript{632} A Nike in relief appears on a base from Claros in Ionia from around 300, showing the same motif but with clear differences in the posture of arms and head (fig. 14).\textsuperscript{633} It confirms that the type of figure on the aforementioned tokens (\textbf{B 1-3}, figs. 3-5) can be found at least as a variation also in relief sculpture.

As we have seen, the figures of Nike on the tokens presented here, which are only a small part of the whole corpus of tokens depicting this goddess and are therefore not fully representative, are quite different in their details and style. The overview of similar figures of Nike on coins points to the conclusion that the figural types of Nike on the tokens are not derived from a special type in coinage, because the figures show important differences. In contrast to the Nike from the Alexander coins (fig. 11), for example, on the tokens the wing on the left is minimized and only the small upper part is visible above the right shoulder (\textbf{B 1-3}, figs. 3-5). No sculpture seems to exist, to serve as a model, as we have seen. Of course, it cannot be ruled out that the figures on some coins were based on statues that have been lost. The many statues of Nike in gold and other materials, which were dedicated on the Acropolis in the second half of the fifth and in the fourth century, mentioned above, prove the popularity of the goddess of victory as an iconographic subject in Classical Athenian sculpture in the round. The fact that the Nike on the majority of the tokens shows drapery in a Classical form, adopting the stance and the garment which is known from Classical figures of Athena in Athenian sculpture, proves that the figures on the tokens are influenced by figural types from Athens.

\textbf{The interpretation of the tokens}

As for the meaning of the figures of the standing Nike, the interpretation is still elusive. Only in one case, the token from the well in the Agora (\textbf{A 1}, figs. 1a-b), can the original context of

\textsuperscript{630} Athena of Myron: see Daltrop and Bol 1983, 24–25 (fig. 61).

\textsuperscript{631} Athens, Acropolis Museum 2437-3001: Meyer 1989, 166, 168–69, 244, 292 (A 93 pl. 25,2). For the Parthenos type in relief sculpture, see Meyer 1989, 166–69; Baumer 1997, 71–73.

\textsuperscript{632} Meyer 1989, 174, 275–76 (A 36 pl. 11,3).

\textsuperscript{633} Smyrna, Kultürpark, Arkeoloji Müzesi no. 3502: Gulaki 1981, 93–94 (with n. 363 fig. 43).
its use be understood, because it belongs to a group of armour tokens, as maybe also the other token from the Agora (B 1, fig. 3) and very likely also that one in the British Museum (A 2, fig. 2a-b). The goddess here surely recalled military victory, but the exact exchange value of the token in comparison with other armour tokens is still under discussion. We may recall the two possibilities already mentioned, that the token depicting Nike was to be exchanged either for an offensive weapon or a whole set of armour. The other presented tokens (B 2-3, C 1, D 1, figs. 4-8) could have served a different purpose. Therefore, it cannot be ruled out that those with Nike holding a wreath (B 2-3, C 1, figs. 4-7a) were connected with games, because this object served also as a prize for agonistic victories.634

**Conclusions**

The importance of the tokens with standing Nike treated in this paper lies in the fact that they provide a new, previously neglected iconographic complex of this goddess in the Greek motherland in the Hellenistic period that is supplementary to those of coins, rings, and sculpture. Obviously, the tokens with this goddess belong to different contexts of meaning: some are part of a system of state distribution of armour to citizens (A 1, likely A 2, and perhaps B 1, figs. 1-3), while those with inscription ΠΕ(Ν) (e.g. E 1, fig. 9) maybe are Theōrika, connected with festivals. It is possible, that the other tokens belong to different contexts of meaning.635 However, much as on Greek coins,636 the Nike on the Athenian tokens was part of the political symbolism of the state. The goddess’ political significance emerged in the Early Classical period, possibly originating in – or at least strengthened by – her decisive role in the Battle of Salamis.637

---

634 See Blech 1982; Syrkou 2017. For the wreath in connection with Nike, see Blech 1982, 177–81.

635 The use of an illustration on tokens from different contexts of meaning is not unusual, as Crosby (1964, 82) points out.

636 Iakovidou 2010, 471.

637 According to Smith (2011, 20) in early Classical Athenian vase-painting Nike “begins to take on an allusively political role”. As a kind of forerunner concerning the political connotation could be considered maybe the striding Nike of Callimachos from the Acropolis from ca. 490, on which see, Moustaka 1992, 853–54 (no. 23 with fig.); 896; Donos 2008, 288, 449, 521–23 (K 117 fig. 5); against a connection of this monument with a victory in battle and instead with a victory at games, see Thöne 1999, 18–20; see also Franssen 2011, esp. 161–63 (B 143 pl. 9). Dedications of statues representing Nike on the Acropolis began around 530 and show the goddess in motion: see Franssen 2011, 160–63.
The growing importance of the goddess to the Athenian state and its imagery was indicated by the statues in precious metal and marble, dedicated on the Acropolis in the fifth century, and perhaps already earlier by the marble statue on the Marathon Tropaion. Likewise, Nike’s presence in the city’s consciousness is suggested by her presence in the hand of the statues of Athena Promachos and Athena Parthenos and on the parapet of the temple of Athena Nike, for the fourth century by the restoration or re-creation of the aforementioned golden Nikai and by the goddess’ occurrence on the document reliefs. The public character of the goddess of victory is also obvious in her figures on the Panathenaic Amphoras, continuing into the Hellenistic period.\footnote{For Nike on Panathenaic Amphoras of this period, often in motion, see e.g. Eschbach 2017, 51, 155 (no. 4.046 pl. 42,4); 53, 163 (no. 4.066 pl. 50,1 A); 53 (with n. 424 fig. 8); 53, 163 (no. 4.067 pl. 50,4); 61–62. For the role of this figure on those vases see Eschbach (2017, 69–70) who supposes, it could be interpreted as device of a particular workshop, which in my opinion doesn’t contradict necessarily the figure’s public connotation, because Nike in various figure types are common as column figures in the whole fourth century; see also Tiverios (2007, 8, 10–11 with a different interpretation from that one of Eschbach, emphasising that the statues chosen for the shield devices and later, in the fourth century, for the columns are an expression of political propaganda by the eponymous archons, though only until the beginning of this century. See also Tiverios 1996, 163, 170–71.} In the final analysis, Nike was the personification of the success and the power of the state, and possibly an expression of ‘Athenian national pride’,\footnote{Suggestion proposed by M. Gkikaki during a meeting.} connotations which are surely communicated also in the iconography of the tokens, regardless of their particular use.

Though at the same time, on other objects the figure of the goddess could have been chosen as iconographic theme by private individuals, as we have seen in the case of the finger rings, the image of Nike retains a particular public significance.\footnote{Gerring 2000, 68. See also above p. ... n. 67.} Obviously, the slightly different types of the goddess standing calm and, at least sometimes, holding a wreath on the presented tokens are based on one or more Athenian iconographic models, proving that the Nike on the tokens is an iconographically genuine Athenian figure. The conservative rendering of some figures (B 1, B 2, B 3, C 1, figs. 3–7a) can be explained by this orientation towards Classical models.

Future publications of still unpublished tokens depicting the goddess could contribute towards a more complete picture of the iconographic variations of the figure, providing better clues for the interpretation of these tokens, and therefore could lead to a better understanding of their meaning and importance.
Catalogue

The measures of the author are marked with *. If available, the find place is indicated. The description is presented as obverse/reverse. A blank reverse is indicated by –.

A 1

fig. 1a-b Athens,
Agora Museum IL 1580. From the Ancient Agora, Crossroads Well (Agora deposit J 5:1). Ø 20 mm.

Nike standing left, holding an object in her right hand / A.

References: Kroll 1977b, 143–44 (no. 9 pl. 40,9); Schäfer 2019, 53–54, 57 (no. I.i fig. 9).

A 2

fig. 2a-b

London, British Museum no. 1922, 0416.126 (donated by Spink & Son Ltd, previously in the collection of Wilhelm Froehner). Ø 15 mm.

Nike standing left, holding an object in her right hand / Γ.


B 1

fig. 3 Athens,
Agora Museum IL 944. From the Ancient Agora, Great Drain South (C18:14.2⁶⁴¹, disturbed late Hellenistic context). Ø*15.5 mm.

Oval stamp. Nike standing left, head lowered / –.

⁶⁴¹ When checking the archive card together with the corresponding notebook page 5673 (from August, the 6th, 1947) from the Agora Excavations with the help of Sylvie Dumont (Archive of the Agora Excavations), the mention of “C 19“ as deposit by Crosby (1964, 96 pl. 93) turned out to be wrong and “C 18:14.2“ to be correct instead. The token Agora Mus. IL 945 with a kind of griffin (see above n. 15) was found according to the archive card also in Deposit C 18:14.2.
References: Crosby 1964, 96 (L 93 pl. 22); Ober and Hedrick 1993, 67–68 (fig. 7.6) [D. Buitron-Oliver and J. McK. Camp II] (“fourth century”); Schäfer 2019, 54, 58 (no. III.f fig. 32).

**B 2**

fig. 4 Athens, Numismatic Museum 7539. Ø*17 mm. Found 1860 in Athens in a pit inside a house.

Token of oval shape. Nike standing left (corroded) in a round field, holding an object in her right hand, according to Postolakas a wreath / – .

References: Postolacca 1868, 280 (no. 235 pl. 52); Schäfer 2019, 54, 58 (no. IV.g fig. 33).

**B 3**

fig. 5

Athens, Numismatic Museum 672 (formerly in the collection of the Archaeological Society at Athens). Ø* 14.5 mm.

Nike standing left, holding a wreath in the raised right / – .

References: Engel 1884, 15 (no. 130 pl. IV).

**C 1**

figs. 6, 7a-b

Athens, Numismatic Museum 7528α. Ø* 12.5 mm.

In a round field Nike standing right, holding an untied wreath / formerly cruciform feature.

References: Engel 1884, 15 (no. 132 pl. IV).

**D 1**

fig. 8

Athens, Numismatic Museum 7546. Ø* 13.2 mm.
Nike standing left and extending the right hand towards a vase in front, according to Postolakas she holds a palm branch or a tropaion in the left, which cannot be verified because of the strong corrosion of the figure/ –.

References: Postolacca 1868, 280 (no. 244 pl. 52); Benndorf 1875, 590 (no. 18 pl. 56); briefly mentioned also by Crosby (1964, 92 no. L55 pl. 20).

**E 1**

fig. 9

Athens, Numismatic Museum 952. Ø 14 mm.

Nike standing right in front of a tropaion/ –.

References: Svoronos 1900, 335 (no. 190 pl. III 36).

**Captions:**

Fig. 1a: Cat. no. A 1, Pb token, Obverse, Athens, Agora-Museum IL 1580 (photo by K.-V. von Eickstedt)

Fig. 1b: Cat. no. A 1, Pb token, Reverse, Athens, Agora-Museum IL 1580 (photo by K.-V. von Eickstedt)

Fig. 2a: Cat. no. A 2, Pb token, Obverse, London, British Museum no. 1922, 0416.126 (courtesy of the British Museum)

Fig. 2b: Cat. no. A 2, Pb token, Reverse, London, British Museum no. 1922, 0416.126 (courtesy of the British Museum)

Fig. 3: Cat. no. B 1, Pb token, Athens, Agora-Museum IL 944 (photo by K.-V. von Eickstedt)

Fig. 4: Cat. no. B 2, Pb token, Athens, Numismatic Museum 7539 (photo by author)

Fig. 5: Cat. no. B 3, Pb token, Athens, Numismatic Museum 672 (photo by G. Mestousis)

Fig. 6: Cat. no. C 1, Pb token, Athens, Numismatic Museum 7528α, side A (photo by G. Mestousis)
Fig. 7a: Cat. no. C 1, Pb token, side A, Athens, Numismatic Museum 7528α (reproduction after Engel 1884, pl. IV no. 132)

Fig. 7b: Cat. no. C 1, Pb token, side B, Athens, Numismatic Museum 7528α (reproduction after Engel 1884, pl. IV no. 132)

Fig. 8: Cat. no. D 1, Pb token, Athens, Numismatic Museum 7546 (photo by G. Mestousis)

Fig. 9: Cat. no. E 1, Pb token, Athens, Numismatic Museum 952 (reproduction after Σβορόνος 1900, p. 335, no. 190, pl. ΙΘ’ [III] 36)

Fig. 10a: Silver stater of Elis-Olympia, Obverse (reproduction after Hoover 2011, fig. on p. 81, no. 332)

Fig. 10b: Silver stater of Elis-Olympia, Reverse (reproduction after Hoover 2011, fig. on p. 81, no. 332)

Fig. 11: Gold stater, Athens, Alpha Bank Numismatic Collection 2144, Reverse (courtesy of the Alpha Bank Numismatic Collection, reproduction after Stampolidis et al. eds. 2017, 213, no. 141, fig.)

Fig. 12a: Coin of the Boeotian League, Athens, Alpha Bank Numismatic Collection, Obverse (courtesy of the Alpha Bank Numismatic Collection, reproduction after SNG Greece 6, pl. 39, no. 843)

Fig. 12b: Coin of the Boeotian League, Athens, Alpha Bank Numismatic Collection, Reverse (courtesy of the Alpha Bank Numismatic Collection, reproduction after SNG Greece 6, pl. 39, no. 843)

Fig. 13: Gold ring (reproduction after Boardman 2001, p. 229 fig. 245)

Fig. 14: Relief base from Claros, Smyrna, Kültürpark, Ark. Müz. no. 3502 (reproduction after Gulaki 1981, fig. 43)
Alexander the Great on Lead:
Notes on some tokens from Roman imperial Athens
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Introduction

The deeds and legend of Alexander the Great have notoriously had a strong attraction for both ancient and modern scholarship up to the present day. However, while the representation of the Macedonian king on coins and in literary sources has been the focus of a number of studies, the evidence from ancient tokens has yet to be properly addressed. This article focuses on a small group of Athenian tokens (symbola) from the Roman Imperial period depicting a male head with windblown hair which will be interpreted as Alexander the Great. The purpose of this contribution is to explore the meaning of these special ‘Alexanders’, whose previously neglected iconography highlights unseen components and intersections in the development of the Alexander’s imagery in the Graeco-Roman world. Also, these coin-like objects offer a first-hand insight into the appreciation of Alexander’s legend in imperial Athenian society and encourage us to investigate the motivations of the contemporary authorities that were responsible for their production.

In the following pages, I will give an overview of the specimens belonging to this series (I.1) and a summary focusing on the find-spots of these pieces as well as the chronology proposed to date in modern scholarship (I.2). I will then conduct an iconographic and stylistic analysis of the development of Alexander-related coin iconography over the imperial period (II.1) in order to determine the prototypes used for the creation of the tokens in question (II.2). The typological connections allow new thoughts on the chronology of these pieces (III). Finally, a discussion of the potential purpose of these ‘Alexander’ symbola within Athenian society of the high empire will be addressed (IV) in light of the examined evidence.

I.1 The ‘Alexander’ series on the Athenian tokens

The Athenian Agora excavations have notoriously provided a large number of tokens from both the Hellenistic and Roman periods, and they have revealed Athens as the first city in the ancient Mediterranean to have minted, circulated, and employed tokens on a scale without precedent. Employed for a variety of purposes, these coin-like objects were continuously in use in Athens from the middle of the fourth century BC up to the sack of the city by the Heruli in AD 267. After this date, neither tokens nor many other Athenian public institutions apparently survived. Given the frequent absence of inscriptions, as well as the use of a common iconographic repertoire (including deities, heroes, animals, objects, and various symbols), great efforts were made by modern scholarship in dating and providing an interpretation of these artefacts, which do not otherwise offer any certain clue to their specific use. It is well known that Margaret Crosby’s publication *The Athenian Agora*, Vol. X (1964) remains the primary reference text for examining these objects. This study has provided a

---

642 In this paper, the ‘Alexander’ token specimens are indicated by their relevant catalogue number which is provided at the end of the contribution. Any other token specimens mentioned in this contribution are indicated by their relevant inventory number (IL). Reference to types is given by M. Crosby’s (1964) catalogue number (L).

typological classification of tokens, sorted in chronological order (from the Classical period up to the Herulian destruction of Athens), addressing questions of authority, chronology, and purpose.644

Among the subjects depicted on imperial Athenian *symbola* is a youthful male head, which occurs on a small but significant group of specimens. Currently part of the Museum collection of the Agora of Athens, this series includes 19 pieces, all of small size, whose diameters vary between 17 and 20 mm, while their weight ranges from 4.04 to 7.80 g.

Three of the pieces (cat. nos. 1-3, Pl. I, 1-2) bear a male, mature, and bearded bust right on one side, and a youthful head left on the other, which exhibits short flowing curls and head turned upwards.645 A very similar youthful head, facing left and looking upwards, is depicted on fifteen examples, whose reverses show a full length draped female figure standing left, a rudder on her right, and often a crescent above her outstretched right hand at her left (cat. nos. 4-18, Pl. I, 3-14);646 in at least eight cases (cat. nos. 5, 9-15, Pl. I, 4 and 8-14), the female figure holds a cornucopia in her left hand and can be identified as Tyche. All the eighteen specimens considered so far share the same male youthful head facing left (Type 1). Although not accompanied by any legend, this type was identified by Crosby and Gkikaki as a portrait of Alexander the Great (hereafter this type will be labelled as ‘Alexander’).647 The absence of any attribute or inscription makes it necessary to demonstrate the correctness of this identification.

Finally, another type (Type 2) carrying a youthful head with short curls but smaller in size and facing right is depicted on a single lead token (cat. no. 19, Pl. I, 15), which is plain on the other side. Although considered as similar to some of the aforementioned youthful heads by Crosby and Gkikaki, the physiognomic and stylistic features of this second obverse type are slightly different compared to those of Type 1.648

I.2 The find-spots and proposed chronology

As with the other Athenian tokens excavated in the Agora, some of the considered specimens can be loosely dated through the excavation evidence, which provided the attack of the Heruli on Athens in AD 267 as a certain terminus ante quem.649 Three pieces were found on Kolonos

---

644 Crosby 1964, 69–138. A new and complete study on the tokens of Hellenistic and Roman Athens is currently being undertaken by Mairi Gkikaki, University of Warwick.

645 As for the male, mature, and bearded bust shown on one side of these token specimens, some details might suggest that they are two different figures: one (Cat. no. 1) might represent Poseidon, according to Crosby 1964, L266; the other (Cat. no. 3), which is wreathed or with hair gathered in a bun, could be identified as Dionysos or Zeus (Crosby 1964, L 272), or as the personification of the Demos (Gkikaki 2019, 132, and cat. no. 88).

646 Of these, a specimen found on the Stoa of Attalos shop floors was published by Mylonas, 1901, 119–22, pl. 7. The other fourteen pieces were published by Crosby 1964, 121, under the same catalogue number (L 322) as they were either arranged by type or considered duplicates from the same dies.

647 Cf. Crosby 1964, 113 L 266 (‘the head […] is not unlike some Alexander heads’); Gkikaki, 2019, 130, 132, and cat. nos. 58 (fig. 16) and 88 (fig. 27).

648 Crosby 1964, 114 L275; Gkikaki 2019, 139 cat. no. 58. According to the relevant Agora card published in the ASCS Digital Collection, the portrait on this specimen represents Hermes or a female head: http://agora.ascsa.net/id/agora/card/il-244-1?q=il%20244&t=&v=list&sort=&s=2

649 For the date of the Herulian destruction (AD 267) as a terminus ante quem see Crosby 1964, 115–16. In this paper, find places and deposits are indicated by the squares of the Agora grid. A reproduction of the Agora grid after Kroll 1993, pl. 36, is given here with the addition of the find-spots of the tokens discussed in Fig. 1.
Agoraios and its slopes (fig. 1). An example (cat. no. 1) was located while cleaning the bedrock at the lower slope of Kolonos Agoraios (E 12), near the Great Drain South. The other two pieces are from the area of the so-called ‘Roman House’: one (cat. no. 19) was found together with 59 tokens in a small pit dug into the bedrock at the northeast corner of what it has been named as Room II (D 11:6),\(^{650}\) the other (Cat. no. 3) was contained together with 21 tokens and 19 coins inside a cistern 12m northwest of the house (D 10:1). The cistern’s fill was the result of the Herulian destruction.\(^{651}\) Six specimens were excavated in the Stoa of Attalos and its immediate vicinity. Four of them (cat. nos. 5, 10, 16-17) are from the front of the Stoa (N-P 7-13), one (cat. no. 6) from the west of Stoa,\(^{652}\) and another (cat. no. 18) was found along with about 150 tokens in piles resting on the floors of the fourth and fifth rooms of the Stoa in 1898 during the excavations of the Greek Archaeological Society.\(^{653}\) Evidence shows that these pieces are rare and occasional finds, which were found scattered in late Roman levels from different areas of the Athenian Agora. A termus ante quem of AD 267 is possible for the eight tokens from the deposits of the ‘Roman House’ on Kolonos Agoraios and from the Stoa of Attalos, which were filled with debris of the Herulian sack.

As for the chronology, Crosby placed the ‘Alexander’ tokens from Kolonos Agoraios and the un-inventoried specimen from southwestern part of the Agora (i.e. Cat. nos. 1-3, and 19) in ‘Section IV’ of her catalogue, which includes the tokens believed to belong to the broad period between Augustus and the sack of Athens by the Heruli (31 BC - AD 267).\(^{656}\) A more precise dating was proposed for the tokens found in and around the Stoa of Attalos (‘Section V’). Since they are from a context that is dated to the third century AD by coin and other artefact finds,

---

\(^{650}\) Gkikaki, 2019, 130, has regarded Room II of the ‘Roman House’ as a ‘space providing controlled access’, as it is accessible through an antechamber (Room I) unlike the adjacent Room III. No pottery and no datable finds were recorded in the fill where the hoard of 60 tokens was uncovered. On the debated nature of the structure labelled as ‘Roman House’ see Crosby 1964, 137; Thompson and Whycherley 1972, 228; Gkikaki 2019, 129–30.

\(^{651}\) The latest coins found in the filled dump were two of Gallienus (AD 253-268) and one of Posthumus (AD 258-267). Another filled dump related to the Herulian destruction (D 11:7), which contained eight tokens and 22 coins that run down into the reign of Probus (AD 276-282), was spotted in the stratum over the northern side of the house at Room I: Crosby 1964, 137.

\(^{652}\) IL 528: [http://agora.ascsa.net/id/agora/object/il%20528?q=il%20528&t=&v=list&sort=&s=1](http://agora.ascsa.net/id/agora/object/il%20528?q=il%20528&t=&v=list&sort=&s=1)

\(^{653}\) On the tokens assemblage from the Stoa of Attalos cf. also Gkikaki, (forthcoming).

\(^{654}\) IL 1421: [http://agora.ascsa.net/id/agora/object/il%201421?q=il%201421&t=&v=list&sort=&s=1](http://agora.ascsa.net/id/agora/object/il%201421?q=il%201421&t=&v=list&sort=&s=1)

\(^{655}\) Of these, IL 1096 (Cat. no. 14) was contained in a deep gravel fill, west of Byzantine wall AB (fifth-sixth c. AD): [http://agora.ascsa.net/id/agora/object/il%201096?q=il%201096&t=&v=list&sort=&s=1](http://agora.ascsa.net/id/agora/object/il%201096?q=il%201096&t=&v=list&sort=&s=1)

\(^{656}\) In a note on the catalogue arrangement, Crosby herself warned that some Athenian tokens may have been misplaced because of the uncertainties in dating, especially those that may belong to the Augustan period: Crosby 1964, 85–86.
Crosby regarded them as a special group of the third century AD, in current use when the Heruli sacked Athens in AD 267.657

Moreover, the ‘Alexander’ tokens are connected to other groups of Athenian lead *symbola*, which have been found in different deposits from both the Agora and Kolonos Agoraioi. Indeed, the ‘Alexander’ pieces share common types and countermarks with other series, and all the groups in question include examples that are similar in terms of weight and diameter. The type of the bearded male head facing right, which occurs on one of the considered pieces (cat. no. 1), also appears on the ‘Poseidon bust’ series,658 the ‘Poseidon bust / Prow (?)’ series (fig. 2),659 and the ‘Athena / Poseidon’ series.660 The draped female figure standing left (‘Tyche’ type), which is attested on the majority of the ‘Alexander’ tokens (cat. nos. 4-18), is also attested on the ‘Athena head / Tyche’ series, two examples of which were found in the area of the Attalos Stoa (fig. 3).661 According to Crosby, some of the pieces of the ‘Alexander / Tyche’ and ‘Athena head / Tyche’ groups may have been produced with the same stamps.662

Furthermore, at least three specimens belonging to the ‘Alexander’ series are countermarked. The countermark of a dolphin swimming right on one of the pieces (cat. no. 19, Pl. I, 15) is also attested on a number of specimens that belong to the ‘Poseidon bust’ series,663 the ‘Hermes bust’ series,664 the ‘Athena bust’ series (fig. 4),665 the ‘Athena head / Boukranion’ series,666

Furthermore, at least three specimens belonging to the ‘Alexander’ series are countermarked. The countermark of a dolphin swimming right on one of the pieces (cat. no. 19, Pl. I, 15) is also attested on a number of specimens that belong to the ‘Poseidon bust’ series,663 the ‘Hermes bust’ series,664 the ‘Athena bust’ series (fig. 4),665 the ‘Athena head / Boukranion’ series,666

---

657 Crosby 1964, 115–17. However, not all the specimens included in the catalogue number L322 are from the area of the Stoa of Attalos, but the chronology of every single piece and its context were not discussed by Crosby case by case.

658 IL 257 (= Crosby 1964, 113 L265), from deposit D 10:1.

659 IL 261 (= Crosby 1964, 113 L267), from deposit D 11:6.

660 Thirteen examples are known of this type, ten of which are from in front of the Stoa (O-P 7-10) and three from deposit Q 7:3. On these pieces see Crosby, 1964, 118, L 309.

661 IL 554, IL 1088 (= Crosby 1964, 118 L308 a-b), respectively from in front of the Stoa (P 9-10) and from south of the Stoa (Q-R 12-15).

662 See Crosby 1964, 121 L322: ‘Note that stamp A (sc. that of L 322) is also used as reverse on L 308. The impressions of stamp A are all much worn and the attributes far from certain’.

663 IL 257 (= Crosby, 1964, 113 L265)

664 See the fifty examples that are from deposits D 11:6, D 11:7, and F 12:4, from Kolonos Agoraioi (A-F 9-15) and from the Southwest Area (B-C 16-17), of which only one may not have been countermarked: Crosby 1964, 112, L 264.

665 IL 1086 (= Crosby 1964, 110 L248), from Panathenaic Way (Q 14).

666 Crosby 1964, 110 L 251 a-e, including five examples from deposits D 11:6, D 10:1, and from Kolonos Agoraioi (A-F 9-15).
and the ‘Athena on ship’ series, on which the dolphin is placed either at right or at left of the main design. The countermark of snail and rabbit, which was added on two of the discussed pieces (cat. nos. 5 and 10, Pl. I, 4 and 9), is also found on some of the specimens of the ‘Athena / Theseus and Minotaur’ series, the ‘Athena / Tyche’ series (see Fig. 3), and the ‘Herakles and tripod’ series, all from in front of Stoa and from deposit Q 7: 3. Given the sharing of common types and countermarks, it is necessary to investigate the background as well as the real nature of the relation between the ‘Alexander’ series and the associated other groups.

II.1 Alexander’s iconography between tokens, coins, and medallions during the imperial period

The identification of the youthful male head is not provided by a legend in either Type 1 or Type 2. As is well known, this issue not only applies to Athenian tokens, but also to many other similar male portraits that are found in ancient material culture, particularly in sculpture. A large number of individual heads, statues, and busts, whose names were lost alongside the inscribed base they once stood on, share those physiognomic characteristics (i.e. beardless youthful head with flowing hair and front locks forming an anastolé) that scholars generally associate with Alexander, although they do not offer secure evidence for a positive identification. Therefore, one should be cautious in identifying these anonymous male heads, since the physiognomic features are not restricted to Alexander alone, but are also applied to eponymous heroes of Greek cities (e.g. the eponymous hero of Kyzikos) and some personifications.

Recently, K. Martin has asserted that the personification of the Demos (‘people’ of a Greek polis) as it appears on bronze coins struck over the imperial period by Greek cities of Asia Minor (Lydia, Phrygia, and Caria) was inspired by eponymous heroes, already well established on Attic reliefs of the late Classical age, and heroic portraits of Alexander the Great.

According to this view, some of the anonymous beardless youthful heads that are depicted on

---

667 Crosby, 1964, 111 L256 a-b, whose two specimens are from D 11:6.

668 A quite different dolphin countermark, 8 mm long and stamped in outline only, occurs on other three types: see Crosby 1964, 110 L252 (Athena head right / Three Graces), 114–115 L289 (Helmet?), 115 L291 a-f (Lion’s head with tenon).

669 Crosby 1964, 118 L306.

670 Crosby 1964, 118 L308 a-b.

671 See Crosby’s catalogue number L 317 a-i, which includes nine examples showing three countermarks (a stork and a lizard, and a plump pitcher or an owl, in addition to that of snail and a rabbit): Crosby 1964, 120.

672 Dahmen 2007, 2. In sculpture, only the so-called ‘Azara herm’ can be safely identified as a portrait of Alexander thanks to the inscription engraved on its shaft (ἈΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΙΟΥ ΜΑΚΕΔ.: ‘Alexander, son of Philip, the Macedonian’): see Smith 1998, 60 and 155, no. 1, pl. 1; Stewart 1993, 42 and 423 figs. 45–46.

673 See von Fritze 1917, 15–18; SNG Glasgow no. 2009, pl. 141; Dahmen 2007, 2.

674 Martin 2013, 10–61. Martin claims that the sex of the two personifications, the Demos and the Boule, whose iconography differed from city to city, was determined by grammar, so that the Demos was invariably male, and the Boule was usually feminine, while the two coin portraits taken together were the visual rendition of prescripts of public decrees of Greek cities (‘ὁ δῆμος καὶ ἡ βουλή’ followed by the city ethnic in the genitive): Martin 2013, 13–14.
these civic coinages, which sport a diadem, laurel wreath, or long flowing locks, should be interpreted as personifications of the Demos. However, similar portrait-types are conveniently identified by the legend as Alexander on a larger sample of civic coins struck by different mints of Asia Minor, Syria Palestina, and Arabia (Nikaia, Apollonia Mordiaion, Abila, Kapitolias, and Gerasa) from the first to the third century AD. These issues were a product of self-representation and identity of eastern Greek cities that proclaimed themselves as ‘Macedonian’ settlements, and they met the need to create a noble past (eugeneia) as part of the city's present identity by including Alexander’s images in their iconographic propaganda.675 Particularly, the type of Alexander diademed, which is often accompanied by the legend ktistes (‘founder’), is popular on provincial civic coinages throughout the Roman period, and is prominent compared to the type of Alexander wearing a leonte or an elephant’s scalp (fig. 5).676

[INSERT FIG5 HERE]

The close resemblance between these Alexander busts and those lacking any legend on imperial civic coinages of the Greek cities of the eastern provinces should bring into question any systematic interpretation of the anonymous male heads as the Demos, except for the issues of Blaundos, Dokimeion, and Peltae, whose obverse portrait-type is identified as the Demos by the legend.677 Even though the considered physiognomic features are quite common and applied to various subjects, neither the portraits of heroes and basileis, nor any of the types of Alexander used on the civic coinages of the Greek cities of Asia Minor, is comparable with Type 1 attested on the Athenian tokens. Moreover, it is unlikely that the portrait of Type 1 is to be identified as the Demos. The personification of this civic institution occurs on the Athenian tokens only during the Hellenistic period, and the surviving Demos images are quite different from Type 1. On tokens, the Demos is evoked only by an inscription, or is depicted in the guise of a diademed, bearded, mature head to right – that is, one of the two guises with which Demos is generally represented on imperial provincial coinages – or as a male figure standing left crowning the personification of the Boule on his right.678 Moreover, the Demos image constitutes a rare type, which apparently was not included in the iconographic repertoire of the tokens issued in the Roman period.679

---

677 The legend reading ‘Demos’ accompanies a beardless youthful head with laurel wreath or long flowing locks on the imperial civic coinages of Blaundos in Lydia and Dokimeion in Phrygia, as well as the portrait of Alexander as Herakles wearing a lion’s scalp on the imperial civic issue of Peltae in Phrygia: Martin 2013, 59–60.
678 For the Demos tokens cf. Svoronos 1900, 326–27 nos. 90–99, pl. II, 39–42; Martin, 2013, 15–16. Also, the legend Ο ΔΕΜΟΣ following the name of a magistrate together with the depiction of an unclothed warrior (variously interpreted as Theseus, Perseus, Harmodios, or even Demos himself) appear on the so-called ‘New Style’ tetradrachms that were issued by Athens in 164–63 BC, which are usually regarded as an ‘exile mission’ of Athenian citizens and an expression of protest against political conditions in the city: Martin 2013, 20–22.
679 Even if one considers the mature and bearded bust shown on one side of piece IL 240 (cat. no. 3) as a depiction of the Demos, as proposed by Gkikaki 2019, 132, and cat. no. 88, it is difficult to believe that two images depicting the same figure - the Demos - were represented on both sides of the token.
Although the youthful male head on Athenian tokens has been related to the busts of Alexander adopted on the civic issues of Asia Minor, the anonymous portrait of Type 1 is closer to some of the types utilised over the third century AD on the provincial coinage of the Koinon of Macedonia. Inaugurated in the first century AD, this pseudo-autonomous bronze coinage almost totally replaced the emperor’s bust with a variety of Alexander-related images from AD 218 down to AD 246, according to Gaebler’s sequence.  

On the coins in question, obverses exclusively feature a large number of head and bust-types of Alexander (A-K, according to Gaebler’s sequence) together with a legend giving Alexander’s name (generally in the genitive form ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ), including among others the type of Alexander as Herakles wearing a lion’s scalp (D and J), Alexander with a ram’s horn (G), and the king wearing an Attic helmet (E). Very similar to the Type 1 depicted on Athenian tokens is Alexander’s beardless, youthful bust wearing a royal diadem, characterized by long hair and an expressive physiognomy (Types B-C) (figs. 6-7). In particular, both tokens and coins share the prominent feature of the windblown hair of the king, which appears to move in a breeze as the king rushes forward. Similar expressive coiffures are only found in late Hellenistic ruler portraiture, as they occur on the portraits of Seleucid rulers (Alexander IV and Tryphon) and Mithradates VI of Pontos. The feature of flame-like locks was applied

---

680 So Gkikaki 2019, 132 with n. 40.

681 Gaebler’s chronological sequence is based on die-links and the number of temple wardenships recorded on the coins of the Koinon of Macedonia (once or twice neocorate): see Gaebler 1906, and further additions in Gaebler 1935; Dahmen 2005. A parallel small civic coinage with dates of the Actian era and identical images was also struck by the provincial administrative capital of Beroia, where the assembly of the Macedonian League took place: Dahmen 2007, 31.

682 Also the reverses, among agonistic and national Macedonian types, are related to Alexander and interestingly even to his mother Olympias, whose elaborated scenes are otherwise known from contemporary gold medallions and later Roman contorniates: Dahmen 2007, 31 and 138–41.

683 Types B and C featuring Alexander diademed with hair waving in the wind are quite common on the provincial coinage of the Macedonian Koinon. According to Gaebler’s chronological sequence, Type B, showing Alexander’s head facing right, occurs on all six series dating from AD 218 to 246, that is from the time of Elagabalus (AD 218-222) to that of Philip the Arab (AD 244-249). Less frequent is Type C showing a similar head of Alexander’s facing left, which is attested on series IIIa (during the time of Elagabalus) and on series II (under the late reign of Severus Alexander: c. AD 231-235).

684 Unlike the types depicted on the provincial coinage of the Macedonian Koinon, the youthful male head represented on the Athenian symbola (Type 1) is bare and does not wear any diadem. The latter feature emphasizes Alexander’s royal rank on coin types. A youthful portrait of Alexander not diademed, which has been recognized as the first Alexander portrait on coins, is attested on a small issue of bronze units assigned to the city of Naukratis in Egypt (c. 330 BC), whose obverse shows the bare head of a young and beardless male with tousled hair accompanied by the Greek letters ΑΛΕ below, while on the reverse is a head of a woman (presumably the city’s main goddess) accompanied by the legend ΝΑΥ, that is the abbreviated identification of the issuing city: Price 1981, 33 and 35 fig. 7; Stewart 1993, 166, 173, 433 no. 2 fig. 51. However, the rarity of this bronze series (currently documented by a single specimen) and the geographical and chronological gap make any direct connection between the portrait attested on the Naukratis issue and that of Type 1 occurring on Athenian tokens improbable.

to Alexander’s iconography only from the third century AD onwards, as it appears for the first time on the Macedonian Koinon’s coins; indeed, there are no earlier examples in existence.686

[INSERT FIG6 HERE]
[INSERT FIG7 HERE]

Interestingly, the feature of windblown hair applied to Alexander’s iconography appears also on one of the three gold medallions from a hoard that surfaced in 1863 near Tarsos in ancient Cilicia.687 In addition to the type of Alexander as Herakles with a lion’s scalp and that of a bearded mature man with a diadem (probably to be identified as Alexander’s father Philip II), the portrait on the third medallion (labelled ‘Tarsos III’)688 shows Alexander wearing a diadem in his hair, which moves romantically in the wind. This type is similar to Types B and C adopted on the Koinon’s coins, which has led to a typological connection between these two groups, while Alexander’s hair usually falls down along his neck on earlier numismatic representations. Furthermore, the stylistic rendering of Alexander’s physiognomy in ‘pathetic’ style689 as shown on Type I of the Athenian tokens – that is, with a head turned upward, gazing to heaven – occurs on both the Koinon’s coins and the Tarsos medallion. These same facial features are otherwise only known from a number of gold medallions from the hoard of Aboukir (Abu Qir).690 Particularly, the diademed head of Alexander with ram’s horn facing left (Dressel A, F, G, from the same die), whose type is modeled on the famous portrait of Alexander introduced

686 So Dahmen 2007, 43. An exception is represented by the tetradrachms issued in the name of Aesillas the Roman quaestor of Macedonia (c. 90-70 BC), which combine the feature of the windblown hair with a ‘baroque’ bust of Alexander wearing a ram’s horn that was inspired by late Hellenistic art: de Callataý 1996; de Callataý 1998, 113–17; Bauslaugh 2000. But only the tips of Alexander’s hair are actually flying in the wind, while the strands on his neck and below his ears are rendered in natural waves and remain motionless. On this point, see Dahmen 2007, 98 n. 21: ‘The portrait of Alexander on the coins of Aesillas differs in its flame-like locks and the fact that the hair at his temples does not follow this direction, but simply falls vertically’. The fluttering effect now performed by the lion’s skin is very rarely found on some posthumous Alexanders of the Herakles type: Martin 2013, 62.

687 The hoard from Tarsos was assembled during the third century AD and buried late in the reign of Gordian III or in that of Philip the Arab around AD 244. This chronology is suggested by the materials included inside the hoard, especially the coins: twenty-three Roman aurei, the majority of which come from the period AD 198-217. It was claimed that the hoard came from the superstructures of an ancient building in the plains around Tarsos, but actually very little is known about the find-spot or the archaeological context: de Longpérier 1868, 309; Noe 1937, 279, no. 1064; Dahmen 2008, 494–95 and passim.

688 The gold medallion labelled as ‘Tarsos III’ is held in the BnF (Paris), inv. F 1672.

689 For this expression cf. Dahmen 2008, 504 and 506.

690 The hoard of Aboukir was probably buried at the beginning of the fourth century AD and then discovered in 1902. The assemblage of ancient gold from this hoard, which was quickly dispersed in trade, is believed to have included six hundred or more Roman aurei dating between the reigns of Severus Alexander (AD 222-235) and Constantius I (AD 293-306), eighteen to twenty bars, and twenty Alexander medallions. No information is available on the character of its hiding place, and this has led some scholars to question its authenticity: e.g. Toynbee, 1944, 69, n. 43. Against this view see Dressel 1906, 72-85; Dressel 1909, 137-157; Dahmen 2008. On the hoard from Aboukir see Eddé 1905; Dressel 1906; Vermeule 1982; Dahmen 2008, 494–97.
by Lysimachos for his royal coinage, share with the Tarsos medallion (‘Tarsos III’) and some of the Koion’s bronzes the same physiognomic features and drawing of the facial lines, including the area around the eyes and nose (Fig. 8). The portrait on the Aboukir medallions also possesses exactly the same pose with a slightly tilted neck and elaborate front, although the windblown hair is not reproduced here.691

[INSERT FIG8 HERE]

The adoption of such facial features on Athenian tokens deserves attention. The stylistic rendering of the youthful male head of Type 1 not only identifies the subject as Alexander, but reflects some of the iconographic conventions (windblown hair, facial features in ‘pathetic’ style) applied to Alexander’s physiognomy in the first half of the third century AD. It is remarkable that the feature of Alexander’s windblown hair occurs afterwards on the so-called ‘contorniates’, namely bronze medallions with incised rims that were issued in the city of Rome from the mid-fourth to the fifth century AD, maybe to be distributed as gifts on New Year’s Day. In particular, some of the obverse dies carrying the type of Alexander as basileus (i.e. Alexander, XIV–XVIII, XX, in Alföldi’s catalogue) represent careful reproductions of the designs depicted on the third century gold medallions and the Koion’s coins (Fig. 9). On the other hand, die XIX features a much more static version with smooth, but long hair and a diadem positioned high on Alexander’s head.692

[INSERT FIG9 HERE]

In addition to the bronze coins of the Macedonian Koion, the medallions from Tarsos and Aboukir, and the ‘contorniate’ medallions, the youthful head (Type 1) depicted on Athenian tokens thus provides a further precious piece of evidence illustrating the development of the portrait-type of Alexander with hair flying in the wind on coins and coin-like objects.693 As

691 On the Aboukir medallions, these facial features are also applied to the representation of Alexander with an Attic helmet combined with various bust types (Dressel B, H, I, from same die, and Dressel M, N), whose designs derive from late Hellenistic or early imperial prototypes: Dahmen 2008, 501–02. Scholars have generally assumed a close relationship between the bronze coinage of the Macedonian Koion and the gold medallions from Tarsos and Aboukir in terms of place production and authority, since each of the aforementioned features are only found on these three groups. Such a relationship between the coin and medallic groups in question is also suggested by other similar obverse and reverse types and further details: Dressel 1906; Dahmen 2008, 505–09 and passim.

692 See Alföldi and Alföldi 1976, 13–18 and 168–69; Mittag 1999, 164–66, 277–78, Pls. 1–3. In light of the numismatic materials in existence, K. Dahmen has regarded the feature of the windblown hair applied to Alexander’s physiognomy as an invention of the early third century AD, which modernized already existing representations of the Macedonian king, and was still utilised on ‘contorniate’ medallions in late antiquity: Dahmen 2007, 32 and 43. The windblown hair combined with the diademed head of Alexander is depicted also on at least three other smaller medallions in gold and silver that were perhaps used as talismans, and whose production perhaps followed the example of the medallions from Tarsos and Aboukir: see Dahmen 2008, 496, 519 cat. nos. 5, 15, 16. On the meaning of the Alexander images on contorniates, see Sánchez Vendramini, (forthcoming).

693 A similar portrait-type showing the head of Alexander with a ram’s horn and flame-like hair is also attested on the obverse of a lead tessera that recently appeared in an auction sale, whose reverse bears the group of a
will be explained below, the above identified typological and stylistic parallels provide a clue to determine the chronology as well as the models used for producing the ‘Alexander’ series.

Finally, a unique Athenian token (Type 2) (Cat. no. 19, Pl. I, 15) shows a male head slightly turned upward to right, gazing to heaven, with short curls, which was interpreted as Alexander the Great. A male head similar to Type 2 is found on some of the lead tokens issued at Ephesos during the imperial period, perhaps over the second and third centuries AD. The Ephesian male head, usually wearing a ram’s horn, has been identified as Lysimachos of Thrace, probably because of his resemblance to the types depicted on Lysimachos’ coins. Nevertheless, the absence of Ammon’s horn on the Athenian token makes it uncertain whether Type 2 should be regarded as an image of Alexander or even Lysimachos as Alexander. Furthermore, the end of the diadem on the back of his neck was misinterpreted by Crosby as a small snake or another lock of hair; it instead reveals the royal rank of the subject. Since this iconographic detail is known from a number of portraits of Hellenistic rulers and diadochoi (e.g. Mithradates III of Pontos, Mithradates VI, Ariarathes IX), it is not possible to safely identify the portrait of Type 2, although its proportions and facial structure are close to those of the male head on the Ephesian tokens.

II.2 Connecting types and patterns: a Macedonian prototype?

The remarkable parallels between the ‘Alexander’ tokens and the groups including the bronze coinage of the Macedonian Koinon and the gold medallions from Tarsos and Aboukir raise the issue of the relationship between coins and medallions. As seen above, the Koinon’s coins date from AD 218 (the first year of the reign of Elagabalus) to AD 246 (the rule of Philip the Arab, AD 244–249), based on die combinations and the numbering of the neocorate (temple warden) title on the reverse. With regards to the gold medallions, the chronological information provided by analyzing the Aboukir medallions on iconographic grounds suggests the period between AD 211-12 and 244-47 as their date of issue. Lion and a human figure accompanied by the Greek legend ΑΛΞΕΑΝ]-ΔΡΟΥ: Freeman & Sear, Mail Bid Sale 13, 25.08.2006, lot 526.

694 Crosby 1964, 114 L275; Gkikaki 2019, 139 cat. no. 58.

695 Gülbay and Kireç 2008. The portrait-type in question appears on five one-sided specimens (nos. 195, 197–200) and two double-sided pieces, whose reverses respectively carry the head of Lysimachos in incuse (no. 188) and the figure of Artemis Ephesia, that is the symbol of Ephesos itself (no. 196).

696 For this (not discussed) identification, see Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 35–36. However, the diademed male head with a ram’s horn that was introduced without any legend on Lysimachos’ tetradrachms in 297-81 BC should be interpreted as a portrait of Alexander himself since it recalls Alexander’s visit to the oracle at Siwah in 331 BC, although it is tempting to see this image as Lysimachos’ portrait and his own urgent need for legitimacy: Dahmen 2007, 119. Moreover, this same type-portrait with a ram’s horn was reused even later by Ptolemaios, one of Lysimachos’ sons, on bronze coins issued around BC 240: Hill 1923, 207–12 no. 3 pl. 9.4. The aforementioned Ephesian type is instead interpreted as Alexander the Great by Gkikaki 2019, 132. In general, the type of Alexander with a ram’s horn is well documented after Lysimachos on coins and even on a few rare tokens: in addition to the specimen mentioned at footnote 52, see the lead tesserai described by Rostovtsew & Prou 1900, no. 664 pl. II.14.

697 Crosby 1964, 114.
production, thus preceding the coins by about seven years.\textsuperscript{698} The dating of the Tarsos pieces, whose imagery lacks any chronological reference, is less certain; however, technical and iconographic similarities support the view that the medallions from Tarsos and Aboukir were produced over the same time frame, although it is unclear whether they are to be considered as a single series or two distinctive issues.\textsuperscript{699} As for the historical background, both coins and medallions have been related to the agonistic festivals, games, and competitions in honor of Alexander the Great (called ‘Alexandreia’), which took place on an annual basis together with the imperial cult in Beroia, the provincial capital of the Macedonian Koinon.\textsuperscript{700} In order to identify the relation between the ‘Alexander’ tokens and these objects, it is necessary to take into consideration the iconographic dependence between the Macedonian Koinon’s coinage and the Tarsos and Aboukir medallions. While previous scholars assumed that the Aboukir medallions were the source for the Koinon’s bronzes,\textsuperscript{701} K. Dahmen has recently asserted that both coins and medallions were dependent on now lost prototypes from Macedonia: statue groups or paintings likely formed a common source of inspiration for both groups.\textsuperscript{702} Similar images of Alexander, as well as scenes related to his legend, appear again on late Roman contorniates, including not only Alexander’s bust with windblown hair but also other reverse scenes showing, for instance, Olympias on a kline or the king sitting on a chair.

\textsuperscript{698} Dahmen 2008, 497–99, 520 and passim. The start date of the production of the Aboukir medallions is indicated by the portrait of Caracalla depicted on three pieces (Dressel E, S, and T), though a posthumous resurrection of this type after the reign of this emperor is possible as well.

\textsuperscript{699} Dressel 1906, 57–59 and 73, recognized the medallions from Tarsos and those from Aboukir as two major groups, which were produced in different times and by different engravers, but all within a single workshop. Contra Dahmen, 2008, 511-13, who argued that the Aboukir and Tarsos medallions should be considered as a single series struck at the same place and time, given their technical similarities and the close relationship between the reverse designs of Tarsos II and Dressel A. Nevertheless, the differences in diameter, weight, and fineness between these gold medallions (see Peixoto Cabral, Alves, and Hipóolito 2000, 401–14; Dahmen 2008, 509–10) support the hypothesis that the medallions from Tarsos and Aboukir were produced as two distinct issues.

\textsuperscript{700} Epigraphic evidence on these Alexander festivals of Beroia, especially from honorary and sepulchral inscriptions naming athletes and magistrates involved, is available from AD 229 onwards: Leschhorn 1998, 400–05; Burrell 2004, 195–96; Dahmen 2007, 33–34 and 136. Afterwards, these Alexander games were made ‘isolympic’ and took place every four years starting in AD 242-43, and a second time in AD 246-47: Gaebler 1906, 13, 22 nos. 795–801, 856, 871. Because of their close iconographic parallels with the Koinon’s coinage, the gold medallions from Tarsos and Aboukir have also been related to Macedonia: Arnold-Biucchi 2006, 79; Dahmen 2008, 519–20. About their purpose, it has been generally argued that the gold medallions were distributed as prize money (the so-called Niketeria) to the victorious athletes in agonistic competitions: see e.g. Dressel 1906, 56; Leschhorn 1998, 405. Recently, Dahmen 2008, 517–22, has interpreted these gold medallions as gifts presented by the Agonothetes and Makedoniarchos to high-ranking visitors and officials.

\textsuperscript{701} Dressel 1906, 60, considered the Koinon’s coins as ‘Volksausgaben’ (‘popular issues’) of the rarer gold medallions, while Toynbee 1944, 71–73, interpreted them as copies after the design of the medallions. See also the less drastic position of Vermeule 1982, 70.

\textsuperscript{702} Dahmen 2008, 515–17, in particular 515: ‘The representations of Alexander and the known veneration of a cult to Alexander the Great suggest that statues and paintings in existence at Beroia inspired the types of both medallions and coins’. This would not exclude a gradual process of adoption of the Koinon’s coins from the gold medallions, as the chronological sequence of the appearance of the shared motifs within the two groups might indicate.
and holding a shield decorated with the depiction of Achilles and Penthesileia. These similarities make it probable that some of the images put on contorniates had their origins in the same designs as the Koinon’s bronzes and the gold medallions from Tarsos and Aboukir. How should one assess the origin of the iconography of ‘Alexander’ on Athenian tokens in light of the third century coins and medallion imagery? Given the chronological distribution of both coins and medallions and their high quality, it is likely that the portrait-type on the Athenian tokens may originate from either the Koinon’s bronzes or the gold medallion types. However, a dependence on both groups of materials as patterns might also be possible. Vice versa, it is unlikely that the Koinon’s bronzes or the gold medallions were inspired by the Athenian tokens, due to the poor quality and workmanship of the latter – as usual for such class of objects – and their limited circulation. Also, it cannot be said with certainty that the designs on the tokens were inspired by now lost prototypes in sculpture, since there are no extant examples which depict Alexander’s windblown hair apart from those found on coins. Moreover, the typological and stylistic similarities of token specimens with the Koinon’s bronzes and gold medallions are too tight to consider Type 1 depicted on the Athenian symbola as an original, autonomous, or even earlier iconographic model. In light of this, it could be argued that the portrait of Alexander on the Athenian tokens (Type 1) derived from an earlier Macedonian pattern, which should be identified with either the bronze coins of the Macedonian Koinon or the gold medallions, or even with both groups of artefacts. In terms of relative chronology, this evidence gives a terminus post quem of AD 211-18 for the ‘Alexander’ tokens, whose production was probably later than that of the Koinon’s bronzes and the Aboukir and Tarsos medallions.

III. Chronology and archaeological evidence

The evidence discussed above does not contradict the archaeological context data, which allows further considerations about the chronology of the ‘Alexander’ tokens (Type 1). The sharing of certain common types and countermarks means that some of the ‘Alexander’ pieces found on Kolonos Agoraioi and other deposits of the Agora are connected, inter alia, to the special group of tokens from the Stoa of Attalos and its vicinity, which have been dated by Crosby to the third century AD based on the excavation context, with AD 267 as a terminus ante quem. Indeed, the type of Poseidon on one ‘Alexander’ piece from Kolonos Agoraioi (cat. no. 1) is also attested on thirteen symbola from in front of the Stoa (O-P 7-10) and three from

703 Dahmen 2008, 514 figs. 7-10 and 523.
704 See Toynbee 1944, 71–73; Dahmen 2007, 38 and 44. About the relationship between the medallions from Tarsos and Aboukir and the contorniates, see also Martin 2013, 65–66, who does not exclude the possibility that the contorniates served as a model for forging the Tarsos and Aboukir medallions, in case the hypothesis on the non-authenticity of the latter is accepted.
705 On this point, see Dahmen (2007, 43), who supposed the feature of windblown hair found on coins was possibly added to Alexander’s portrait during the Severan dynasty, when Alexander the Great formed a focus for rulers such as Caracalla, Elagabalus, and Severus Alexander.
706 However, given the uncertain dating of the Tarsos pieces as well as the controversy about the authenticity of both groups of gold medallions, the start date of the coinage of the Macedonian Koinon production (AD 218) should be considered as a more reliable terminus post quem for the issue of ‘Alexander’ tokens. Should the authenticity of the gold medallions be confirmed, the terminus post quem to take into consideration for the start date of the ‘Alexander’ tokens issuing would more safely move to a slightly earlier date, that is AD 211-12.
deposit Q 7:3,\textsuperscript{707} the pieces of the Tyche / Alexander group (\textit{cat. nos. 4-18}) share the Tyche type with two token specimens, both from in front of (P 9-10) and south of the Stoa (Q-R 12-15).\textsuperscript{708} The countermark of snail and rabbit on two of the ‘Alexander’ specimens (\textit{cat. nos. 5 and 10}), which were excavated in the area immediately in front of the Stoa (O-P 7-10), occurs also on some of the specimens belonging to three distinct series (‘Athena / Theseus and Minotaur’, ‘Athena / Tyche’, and ‘Herakles and tripod’ series), all from in front of Stoa and from deposit Q 7:3.\textsuperscript{709}

These connections make it possible to apply the \textit{terminus ante quem} of AD 267 to the ‘Alexander’ series as a whole, which was determined by Crosby for the tokens from the Stoa of Attalos and its vicinity via the archaeological evidence. Interestingly, the iconographic analysis provided in this study gives a close \textit{terminus post quem} for the ‘Alexander’ tokens and allows us to place the production of the series within a shorter time frame. By cross-referencing archaeological evidence and iconographic analysis, it can be argued that the ‘Alexander’ series of the Athenian \textit{symbola} were struck from AD 211-18 (i.e. after the start date of the Aboukir medallions and the Koinon’s coins production) and continued up to AD 267, remaining in production at the time of the sack of Athens. This relative chronology is to be ascribed not only to the six ‘Alexander’ specimens found in the area of Stoa of Attalos,\textsuperscript{710} but also to the examples bearing the same male portrait from Kolonos Agoraios and other deposits of the Agora, some of which – as seen above – have been generically assigned by Crosby to the period between 31 BC and AD 267.\textsuperscript{711}

\section*{IV. Some remarks about the potential function of the ‘Alexander’ series}

\textsuperscript{707} Cf. Crosby 1964, 118 L309. The deposit Q 7:3 is a trench dug below the floor level against the foundations of the piers for the interior columns, whose fill contained, in addition to 230 tokens, metal fittings and fragments from the marble façade of the Stoa itself, sherds dating from the middle of the third century AD and 105 coins which run down into the reign of Gallienus (AD 255-268). On this point, see Crosby 1964, 116: ‘The trench was presumably dug shortly after the attack on Athens by the Heruli in A.D. 267, probably to investigate the strength of the foundation in the process of building the Late Roman Fortification Wall’.

\textsuperscript{708} Crosby 1964, 118 L308 a-b.

\textsuperscript{709} The dolphin countermark is not attested on the tokens from the Stoa of Attalos, but is instead consistently found on specimens of three closely related deposits on Kolonos Agoraios (i.e. D 10:1, D 11:6, and D 11:7), as shown by Crosby 1964, 112. Cf. also Gkikaki 2019, 130 and 132–34.

\textsuperscript{710} See above § I.2.

\textsuperscript{711} One may wonder if this relative chronology can be also applied to the other token groups that are connected with the ‘Alexander’ series for sharing a few types (Poseidon bust, Tyche) and countermarks (the snail and rabbit countermarks as well as the dolphin one): see above, § I.2. Nevertheless, consideration should be given also to the possibility that common types and countermarks were adopted at different times on the various interconnected groups, thus revealing different dates for each series. However, a very long period does not appear very probable given the close typological and stylistic similarities between the groups in question. For instance, with regard to the Athenian tokens carrying the dolphin countermark, Gkikaki 2019, 132, has suggested a short period of time by considering how the countermark was applied to the token specimens, which is consistently placed to the right on the majority of the ‘Hermes bust’ pieces.
As for the purpose of the ‘Alexander’ tokens, all preserved examples are uninscribed and this makes it problematic to assign them to specific uses, as has often been noted regarding the majority of the Athenian symbola.\textsuperscript{712}

The nature of the close relation between the ‘Alexander’ series and the series of tokens found in and around the Stoa of Attalos as well as on Kolonos Agoraios (including common morphological aspects as well as identical types and countermarks) needs a closer look. The countermarks hint that all closely interconnected tokens had a common background at least in terms of manufacture and distribution. As has already been stated, countermarks helped regulate and bring order to a complex system of token distribution in Athens, and were the medium by which the authority behind the production confirmed the validity of the tokens.\textsuperscript{713}

Special attention shall be paid to the fact that a second or more stamps and countermarks were commonly added on the Athenian tokens at different times. Traces of reuse, including a small, punched hole or a second stamp, are also found on some of the ‘Alexander’ pieces,\textsuperscript{714} except for those bearing the dolphin countermark, as well as the snail and rabbit one (i.e. cat. nos. 5, 10, 19). This evidence of reuse might suggest a second or third use of the token, which probably returned to the source and was countermarked – after a first use and before the collection of the tokens back – in order to be distinguished from the original issue. The countermarking procedure would seem the natural one to follow for recurring events.\textsuperscript{715}

Besides the countermarks, morphological similarities as well as the sharing of common types support the view that all interconnected groups were issued from a single workshop maybe at different times, and were part of a single major series, a fact which implies the same function for all pieces associated with one another. This excludes the idea that the ‘Alexander’ series was produced as an autonomous issue with its own function. Also, the use of common types by different groups suggests there is no semantic link between obverse and reverse types on a single token, a phenomenon that is often attested even on later contorniates.\textsuperscript{716} There is thus no meaning in the connection between Alexander’s head and the types of a male and bearded bust (Poseidon on L266, cat. no. 1; Dionysos, Zeus, or the Demos on L272, cat. no. 3) and Tyche, which are also adopted by other groups of Athenian tokens.

Moreover, it is noteworthy that the portrait of Alexander constitutes an innovation within the multifaceted iconographic repertoire of Athenian tokens. Indeed, it does not appear on the token issues during the Hellenistic period, nor during the first two centuries of the imperial period. This also applies to the Poseidon and Tyche types, which do not occur on tokens prior

\textsuperscript{712} On this point see Crosby, 1964, 76–78. On the differences between Greek and Roman tokens in terms of appearance and purpose, see also de Callataj 2010.

\textsuperscript{713} Cf. Crosby 1964, 83; Gkikaki 2019, 132–34. Countermarks are also found on the Greek provincial coinages of the imperial period: see Howgego 1985, 7–11, and 13–14. On the countermark types occurring on the Athenian symbola see Crosby 1964, 83. On the dolphin countermark and its meaning, see Crosby 1964, 112; Gkikaki 2019, 132–34.

\textsuperscript{714} A second stamp is visible on the reverse side of two specimens (cat. nos. 6–7); a small hole is punched through on two specimens (cat. nos. 12 and 14).

\textsuperscript{715} So Crosby 1964, 116. One might assume that the addition of a small hole, generally punched in the center or near the edge of the flan, was due to the need to authenticate the token within a short time frame, for example to allow admission or exit on the occasion of a single event. Traces of reuse are also attested on a number of contorniates in the shape of metal inserts as well as of graffiti, which were engraved at different times by different hands: cf. Mondello 2019.

\textsuperscript{716} Alföldi 1943, passim; Mazzarino 1951, 126; Michelini Tocci 1965, 18–20.
to the third century AD. As outlined above, the Alexander’s portrait of Type 1 was not invented by the token die-cutters, but it possibly derived from a Macedonian model. Interestingly, this portrait follows a long-standing iconographic tradition focusing on Alexander’s royalty and his status as a great ruler and military leader, leaving only the subtle gaze to the sky as a symbol of divine inspiration. No images of Alexander as a divine figure and theios aner were selected for the production of the Athenian tokens, which was well-established and wide-ranging in the numismatic representations of the great conqueror since the Hellenistic period. The use of Alexander’s image on tokens from the third century AD can partly be explained as adaptation of contemporary coin and medallion issues over the imperial period. But this choice may also have been connected to the very purpose of the tokens on which the Alexander image is displayed.

In terms of function, Crosby asserted that the third century group of tokens found in and around the Stoa of Attalos (‘Section V’, L299 – L331) – including six ‘Alexander’ pieces – served as entrance tickets to ephebic festivals, which were celebrated each year in Athens by the ephebes in honor of emperors, heroes, and gods. Each of the types used would thus have alluded to a different event that took place within these festivities. Given the archaeological context where tokens were found, Crosby also stated that the Stoa of Attalos was possibly the place where the tokens were distributed or brought back for re-stamping before another use. Conversely, M. Gkikaki has recently connected the issuing of the tokens from the hoard on Kolonos Agoraioi – including the two ‘Alexander’ specimens IL240 and IL244 – with the distributions of money, foods, and gifts in general as part of the politics of euergetism in Roman imperial Athens. The types used, some of which commemorate divine forefathers and historical ancestors (e.g. Hermes, Sarapis, Poliade), would reflect the elite’s concern to gain the praise of the citizenry and preserve their prestige.

What role did the ‘Alexander’ tokens play within the social context of third century Athens? Is it possible to infer the purpose of these objects through their imagery? There is no doubt that Alexander the Great had great prominence in the Greek world since the Hellenistic period. A cultic veneration of Alexander (and Hephaestion, revered as theos paredros, ‘assistant deity’) existed in Athens before 322 BC, and ‘divine honors’ were awarded to Tyche bearing attributes different than L 322 might occur on a Hellenistic Athenian token, but the interpretation of the figure remains uncertain: cf. Crosby 1964, 92 L55.

See Crosby 1964, 85–86, and 115–17, who regarded some of these types (Asklepios, Theseus and the Minotaur, Athena, Nike and Zeus) as directly referring to some of the ten games (i.e. Asklepeia, Theseia, Athenelia, Epinikia) mentioned in the latest known complete ephebic inscription of 262/3 or 266/7 AD (see IG, II², 2245); other depictions could instead be speaking symbols for the names of the agonothetai, who are considered as those responsible for the issue of the admission tickets: see Crosby 1964, 116–17.

Although this hypothesis is tempting, there is no evidence to support the connection of the Stoa of Attalos with the organization of the ephebic festivals, despite the fact that excavations in the area of the Stoa have brought to light numerous ephebic inscriptions: see Thompson and Whycherley 1972, 220. Also, the nature of the deposits in and around the Stoa, whose fillings are mostly debris of destruction, do not demonstrate that the Stoa was the place where the tokens were collected and distributed.


A fragment of a Hyperides’ speech (322 BC) records that Alexander’s cult in Athens included statues, altars, and a temple: Hyperides 6.21. According to Dixon 2014, 33, these structures were abandoned in the immediate aftermath of the Lamian War (BC 323–322/19). Later legends report that Alexander was worshipped as ‘Neos Dionysus’ or an additional god to the twelve traditional gods of Athens: see Dreyer 2009, 230 with n. 95.
granted to the Macedonian king by the Athenians during his lifetime (324-23 BC), after a formal debate in the Ekklesia.²²² Afterwards, a divine cult to Alexander was also extensively consecrated by other Greek and Greek-Eastern communities over the imperial period, in particular under the Severans.

Given the parallels with the Macedonian Koinon’s bronzes and the Tarsos and Aboukir medallions, both of which have been related to agonistic festivals of Beroia, it is tempting to suppose that the ‘Alexander’ tokens served as mementoes or admission tickets to festivals or agones hieroi that were held in Athens in honor of Alexander. However, no information is apparently available on the existence in Athens of such events for Alexander, although other ‘Alexandreia’ and games were dedicated to the king in different areas of the Greek world besides Beroia. The small number of the ‘Alexander’ specimens²²³ and their connection to other series make it more probable that these pieces were used in broader Attic festivals together with the other associated tokens: in addition to the ephebic festivals, one might contemplate the Panathenaia, which were held up to the third century AD and incorporated religious festival and ceremony, athletic competitions, and cultural events.²²⁴ In one of these contexts, the image of Alexander may have been used as a model of a great ruler, conqueror, and athlete par excellence, in line with his posthumous fame and the socio-cultural and political impact his legacy had upon the late Hellenistic reigns and, afterwards, even upon the Roman empire.

An alternative scenario is also possible. As seen above, civic coinages of the Greek cities of Asia Minor played a role in the competition for obtaining imperial privileges (such as maintaining temples for the imperial cult and honorary titles) during the second and third centuries AD. Through a variety of Alexander-related images and legends, these cities of the eastern Roman provinces exploited Alexander’s name and person in order to build and emphasize the importance and noble descent of a city claiming to have been founded by the famous conqueror.²²⁵ Just like the advertising propaganda of the contemporary civic coinages of the Greek cities of Asia Minor, the issuing of the ‘Alexander’ tokens could be related to the ambitions of the Athenian elites for promoting their distinguished status in middle imperial Athens through a policy of euergetism. As with the tokens of the hoard from Kolonos Agoraios, the specimens with the portrait of the Macedonian king, which should be ‘linked to the self-consciousness and self-portrayal of the elite’,²²⁶ might be regarded as exchange tokens for donativa made by Athenian magistrates and offices, whose imagery alluded to Athen’s civic history and its divine and historical ‘ancestors’.²²⁷ The portrait of Alexander on tokens might have had a remarkable meaning in an era that saw the Barbarian invasions running throughout

---


²²³ However, it cannot be excluded that the scarcity of duplicates showing the Alexander type might be due to the fact that the tokens were re-melted once used in order to employed again the lead for next issues, as has been proposed with regard to the lead specimens of Hellenistic period: see Crosby 1964, 78.

²²⁴ On the Panathenaia, the bibliography is huge. E.g. cf. Shear 2012; Shear 2021.


²²⁷ The possibility that the images of Alexander the Great and Hermes on the tokens from Kolonos Agoraios may have constituted a reference to the divine ancestry of the genos of Kerykes (including the family of the Claudii of Melite), who managed the issue and distribution of the tokens of Kolonos Agoraios, is contemplated by Gkikaki, 2019, 135-136. On the genos of Kerykes cf. Clinton 2004.
the Eastern provinces of the Roman empire, which culminated among other things in the Herulian destruction of Athens (AD 267). In these vacillating political and military circumstances, the Athenian elites may even have selected the Alexander image on tokens for the valiant ruling and military ability of the Macedonian king, the image of whom would have risen as a Greco-Roman icon of patriotism and power against the enemy.\textsuperscript{728}

Unfortunately, although one or the other hypothesis is possible, there is insufficient evidence on which to base a choice. Also, the question of whether the ‘Alexander’ tokens were ‘official’ or private products, which is closely connected to their purpose as well as to those responsible for their manufacture, remains open.\textsuperscript{729} Regardless, the addition of countermarks and further stamps on these specimens suggest, in either of the hypotheses considered above, a complex system of token distribution and reuse in Roman Athens. In order to solve the mystery behind the production of these special ‘Alexanders’, there certainly is need for further discussion. In this author’s opinion, the relative chronology for the ‘Alexander’ series (AD 211/18 – AD 267) determined in this study can help to rearrange the different series connected by common types and countermarks as well as to clarify the chronological sequence of the issue. Furthermore, although they have often been regarded as two different groups, the tokens from the Stoa of Attalos and its vicinity and those from Kolonos Agoraios should be considered as a whole, since the sharing of similar or even identical types and countermarks hint that they were part of a major issue of lead \textit{symbola}. Based on these considerations, future research might be able to determine a more detailed dating to be applied to this issue of tokens as well as to shed light on the function as well as the authority behind their production.

Conclusions

The Athenian lead tokens carrying the portrait of Alexander the Great, which are part of the Museum collection of the Agora of Athens, constitute a small but remarkable series of coin-like objects that provide new evidence about the development of the Macedonian king’s iconography during the Roman imperial period. No connection of these pieces with contexts or buildings is shown by the excavation contexts, since these artefacts are rare and occasional findings that were located together with other tokens and coins on Kolonos Agoraios, the Stoa of Attalos, as well as in late-Roman fill contexts excavated in other areas of Athens. Also, these specimens are connected to other series of lead tokens (e.g. the ‘Poseidon bust’, the ‘Athena / Poseidon’, and the ‘Athena head / Tyche’ series) in that they share common types and countermarks. The close morphological and typological parallels between different groups, which implies at least the same background of production, makes it probable that the ‘Alexander’ tokens were part of a larger issue of lead tokens which were issued for the same purpose.

In light of the above discussed evidence, the following points can be made:
(1) Although all examples lack inscriptions identifying the depicted subject, the iconography employed on the ‘Alexander’ series (Type 1) runs parallel to the diademmed portrait of Alexander represented on the provincial coinage of the Macedonian Koinon (Types B and C) and on one of the three gold medallions from Tarsos (‘Tarsos III’). All these artefacts share the special characteristic of windblown hair of the king, which is not attested on any of Alexander’s

\textsuperscript{728} On the apotropaic meaning of Alexander and Trajan’s images attested on later contorniates as icons of Greco-Roman patriotism against eastern barbarism see Sánchez Vendramini, (forthcoming).

\textsuperscript{729} On the matter of the ‘official’ or private nature of the Athenian tokens see Crosby 1964, 77; Bubelis 2010.
earlier images and can reasonably be considered as an invention of the early third century AD. Also, physiognomic features in ‘pathetic’ style provide links to the contemporary gold medallions from Aboukir and point out a close relationship with some of the conventions utilised in Macedonia for Alexander’s iconography over the third century.

(2) The portrait of Type 2 attested on a single Athenian token features proportions and facial features that are close to the diademed male head with a ram’s horn (probably to be interpreted as Alexander) on some of the Ephesian lead tokens struck over the imperial period. However, the absence of the ram’s horn on the type of the Athenian piece makes any identification of Type 2 uncertain.

(3) By cross-referencing archaeological context data and typological connections, it is likely that the ‘Alexander’ tokens (Type 1) were produced in period between AD 211/18 and 267, that is after the start date of the gold medallions and the Koinon’s coins production and before the Herulian destruction of Athens (AD 267).

(4) While the Koinon’s bronzes and the Tarsos and Aboukir gold medallions were conceived in the context of the agonistic festivals for Alexander that were held in Beroia, the ‘Alexander’ tokens from Athens possibly served as mementoes or admission tickets on the occasion of one of the Attic festivals (such as the ephabetic festivals, the Panathenaia etc.). Alternatively, they could be related to the donativa and the energetic propaganda of the Athenian elites, as has been proposed for the tokens from the hoards found on Kolonos Agoraios.

Although further research is needed in order to clarify the authority behind the production as well as the exact sequence of the various interconnected series, Alexander’s images on Athenian lead tokens bear witness to the influence and appreciation of the legend of the Macedonian conqueror in third century Athens. The manipulation of Alexander’s images on the contemporary coin propaganda of the Greek cities of the eastern Roman provinces constitutes only part of a more general interest in the Macedonian king during the third century, especially under the reign of the Severan dynasty. Besides the numismatic sources, the figure of Alexander was at the heart of a flourishing literature focusing on the life and exploits of the Macedonian conqueror, which was inaugurated by the so-called Alexander Romance (whose original version in Greek dates back to the third century AD) and continued with a number of writings and translations in Latin over the fourth and fifth centuries AD (e.g. Commonitorium Palladii, Collatio Alexandri et Dindimi). Devotion to Alexander, embodied by the agonistic festivals at Beroia, was also expressed by the politics and personal choices of the Severan emperors who also partook in ‘Alexander-mania’. The ‘Alexander’ tokens thus provide an unexpected glimpse into the reception of the Macedonian king into third century Athenian society. As coin-like objects, these artefacts precede by at least a century the Alexander-related images on contorniates and rare Roman bronze tesserae (the so-called ‘Asina’ tokens) originating from the fourth and fifth centuries.

---

730 See e.g. Cracco Ruggini 1965; Boyle 1977; Stoneman 1991; Stoneman 2008.

731 On the importance of Alexander as a model for the Severan dynasty, with particular reference to Caracalla who was curiously defined as philalexandrotatos (‘lover of Alexander’) by Dio Cassius (78.9.1), see: Zecchini 1984; Espinosa 1990; Bancalari 2000. According to the Historia Augusta, Severus Alexander placed an image of Alexander the Great in his private lararium maius with those of Apollonius of Tyana, Christ, Abraham, Orpheus and others: Historia Augusta, Vita Alexandri Severi 29.2; 31.4-5. On the value of this tradition see Settis 1972; Blazquez 1990; Mondello 2017.
AD in Rome.⁷³² From a cultural perspective, these artefacts bear witness to the posthumous appreciation of Alexander as a symbol of a shared Greek cultural identity, which is still attested by the fashion of using Alexandri effigies as good luck symbols on everyday objects in the late antique East and West.⁷³³ The Athenian tokens thus enable us to trace not only a specific representation of the Macedonian king but also an unseen development of his cultural legend during the high Empire.

**CATALOGUE**


---

⁷³² As for the so-called ‘Asina’ tokens, some of the specimens in existence connect a portrait of Alexander as Herakles shown on the obverse to a reverse type carrying a donkey suckling a foal, which is sometimes accompanied by the legend Asina (‘she-donkey’): cf. Alföldi 1951a; Alföldi 1951b; Mondello 2020.

⁷³³ See Historia Augusta, Triginta Tyranni 14.2, with reference to the Macriani family in the fourth century Roman West. On this passage see Mondello 2016, 129; Perassi 2017, 239–41. With regard to late antique Greek East, compare also a John Chrysostom’s passage, who condemns those Christians that ‘tie bronze coins of Alexander the Great around their head and feet’: John Chrysostom, Ad illuminandos catechesis 2, 5 (= Patrologia Graeca, 49, 240).
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Introduction

Sicily (Fig. 1) has always aroused interest among scholars due to its complex culture, traditions, and history, shaped by centuries of domination. The Greeks colonised Sicily from the late eighth century BCE, when the first colonisers founded new centres mostly in the eastern coastal areas, meeting previously settled local populations. The Romans conquered the island in the third century BCE, creating a new Provincia Sicilia. At that point, most of local poleis were still maintaining a certain independence and could issue coins with their ethnic names (in both Greek and Latin), revealing a series of types and symbols linked to their customs. Local communities thus kept a stratified set of civic and religious traditions alive. Tokens, which were locally produced, distributed, and used, can offer vital information about this traditional ‘heritage’, which demonstrates some connections with the Greek world and Athenian legacy.

Can we propose a univocal definition of tokens in the Greek and Roman world? A unique explanation of the function and significance of these peculiar artefacts is impossible since their use depended strongly on the community or issuer producing them, and the context in which they were made. The variety of specimens found in archaeological excavations or preserved in European and overseas museums testifies to the significant diffusion of these artefacts in the ancient world. Generally called symbola by the Greeks and tesserae by the Romans, tokens were multi-shaped (mostly circular) objects which were fabricated for a local

---

734 First, I am very grateful to Francesca Spatafora and Caterina Greco, former and current Directors of the Archaeological Museum of Palermo “Antonino Salinas”, for kindly allowing me to examine the tokens published here (authorisation prot. n. 0003179 of 22 July 2021; all token pictures are courtesy of the Archaeological Museum “A. Salinas”). Lucina Gandolfo also traced these finds in the museum’s storehouse. Costanza Polizzi was – as usual – very helpful in assisting me during my work at the “Salinas” museum. ‘On-site’ investigations carried out in Palermo and further bibliographical research in London and Oxford were funded by the European Research Council (ERC) within the Token Communities in the Ancient Mediterranean project (University of Warwick). This project received funding from the ERC under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement no. 678042.

(or sometimes regional) distribution within a community of people. The person who received the token could benefit from privileges or exceptional rights of access to temples and other local buildings, be involved in festivals and local events, or obtain something ‘in exchange’. This process might mean the loss of the token if it was withdrawn by the other authority or person in charge of the event. For instance, substantial clay *tesserae* were produced and distributed among local groups for attending special banquets in Palmyra (Syria). The exchange of tokens was therefore essential to access to social events.  

The main scope of my contribution is to present selected results of recent research into token production in Sicily during the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, carried out at the University of Warwick. Investigations were performed within the *Token Communities in the Ancient Mediterranean* European Research Council (ERC) project between late 2016 and early 2019. In particular, I explored local Sicilian museums in Sicily, assessing sets of finds from past collections or excavations. This essay sheds new light on a set of eight novel artefacts ‘rediscovered’ at the Archaeological Museum of Palermo, which have been neglected by scholars until now. Tokens show a variety of iconographies, including the owl and Athena, Herakles, the caps of the Dioscuri, and elephants. As artefacts they are therefore unique specimens to be contextualised within the broader framework of token production in Sicily and Greece.

I will first outline token production on the island, focusing on the historical and archaeological contexts and offering a brief outline of past scholarship on ancient tokens and its key results. I then assess these new finds, providing all documentary data on their provenance and acquisition. Where archaeological context is missing, a targeted analysis of the token’s iconography and legends will provide a good range of information for examination. I will make some final, essential remarks on token production in Sicily and its links with the wider context, and last but not least, all finds are properly described in a short catalogue which offers the following essential data: progressive find number, inventory number for the Palermo’s museum, type, colour, shape, diameter, thickness, weight, state of preservation, provenance, dating, descriptions of the A and B sides, archival data, and references (where available).

**Current scholarship on tokens from Italy and Sicily**

736 For two up-to-date definitions of ancient tokens in the Greek and Roman periods see Crisà, Gkikaki and Rowan 2019, 1–10; Crisà 2021b, 1–13. We benefit from a large scholarship on collections of tokens, and mention only a few case studies: Casariego, Cores and Pliego 1987 (Spain); Turcan 1987 (France); Overbeck 2001 (Milan); Gülbay and Kireç 2008 (Ephesus); Raja 2015, 165–86 (Palmyra).
Essential (even though sometimes narrowly focused) contributions have examined token production in ancient Italy by assessing a variety of typologies and archaeological contexts which we briefly outline in this contribution. Undoubtedly, the main forerunners of those studies of Italian *tesserae* – the Latin word used for tokens – were F. De’ Ficoroni (1664-1747), the author of *I piombi antichi* (1740), and M. I. Rostovtzeff (1870-1952), who published the remarkable *Tesserarum urbis Romae et suburbii plumbearum sylloge* (1903). Both contributions are essentially catalogues of *tesserae* whose findspots are often irretrievably lost. This also happened with the *spintriae*, or erotic tokens, kept at Italian museums (see, for instance, Milan) with the exception of a remarkable artefact found in a grave at Modena-Mutina. This exceptional discovery, which generated a sensation, allowed archaeologists to date the *spintria* accurately to the first half of the first century CE. We have, at the same time, other essential works on the so-called ‘terracotta coins’ (“monete di terracotta”), a typology of token which reproduces ancient coins of Magna Graecia, mostly found at Paestum within a well-documented archaeological context. On the whole, scholars have become increasingly interested in token production on the Italian peninsula over the past few decades.

What do we know about token production in ancient Sicily? Our knowledge is still relatively limited because we do not benefit from solid, long-standing scholarship. A very rare clay token was discovered at *Iaitas*-Monte Iato (San Cipriello, Palermo). The artefact, which can be dated between the fourth and second centuries BCE, shows a two-letter Greek inscription (ΔΑ) and Achelous, the god of waters, depicted as a bull with a human head. We should also mention the related production of very small objects called *cretulae* (‘clay seals’), generally dated to the fourth century BCE. Antonino Salinas (1841-1914), archaeologist, numismatist, and director of the Museum of Palermo published sets of *cretulae* discovered at Temple C in Selinunte. They show figures, heads, animals, objects, and Oriental types (four typologies) which can be related to the local economy of the temple, testifying to the offering or sealing of goods.

Despite these sporadic contributions, the majority of tokens remain unpublished, and, as a consequence, unknown after their discovery within the island’s archaeological sites or their acquisition by local museums. Thanks to recent investigations carried out in Sicilian museums, we have re-discovered some sets of tokens which certainly help fill the undeniable

---

gaps in our knowledge of token production on the island. As previously mentioned, research has been carried out within the *Token Communities in the Ancient Mediterranean* project, fully funded by the ERC at the University of Warwick. Due to the limited time span and the denial of permission to access local Superintendency and museum storehouses, it has been possible to verify and explore only a narrow shortlist of Sicilian institutions. This has certainly had an impact on the final quantity of Greek/Hellenistic and Roman tokens traced, assessed, and ultimately published, although some minor sets of artefacts are still under study and publication.\(^739\)

\[\text{[INSERT FIG2 HERE]}\]

At this stage – and for the record – it is essential to briefly outline those artefacts which have been already fully studied. First, thanks to focused investigations at the Archaeological Museum by “A. Salinas” of Palermo, we have identified a peculiar set of clay tokens originally discovered at *Makella*, an archaeological site at Marineo in the inner territories of the Palermo province. These artefacts, which can be dated to the fourth century BCE, show a recurring iconography of a draped Demeter holding two torches searching for Persephone (Fig. 15). Their production, use and final discharge might be linked to sacred local celebrations and rites in honour of the goddess. Second, a rare late 1\(^{st}\) century BCE clay token showing the caps of the Dioscuri, dug up in the late nineteenth century at Tindari, has been traced at the local Antiquarium. Since the artefact is highly relevant to this contribution, it will be discussed in more detail below. Third, a recent essay sheds new light on a unique 1\(^{st}\) century CE *spintria* (*coitus a tergo*/numeral X) (Fig. 2) found in the archaeological excavations of the Roman *villa* at Patti (Messina) which has been neglected by scholars.\(^740\)

Amongst the ancient ‘monetiform’ objects kept at the Museum of Palermo and still neglected by scholars, there is also a set of varied Hellenistic and Roman clay tokens recently and luckily traced to the institution’s storehouses. These novel finds need to be assessed in order to highlight the variety of iconographic types, and any potential data on their provenance and acquisition.

---

\(^{739}\) Excluding this work, which collected contributions of the two-day conference held in Athens (December 2019), there are two major publications associated with the *Token Communities* project. Crisà, Gkikaki, and Rowan 2019 and Crisà 2021b.

\(^{740}\) On the clay token discovered in Tindari and showing two *pilei* of the Dioscuri see: Crisà 2019, 63–77; Crisà 2020(b), 47–55. Further references on tokens from Sicily: Crisà 2020(a), 635–48 referring to *spintria* found in Patti Marina; Crisà 2021a, 33–56 on *Makella*’s tokens.
Assessing new finds: context, iconography and history of collecting

This novel set of finds includes eight ancient tokens produced between the fourth century BCE and the 1st century CE. They are all made of reddish or orange clay and are mostly circular in shape. These tokens, which are currently preserved in the numismatic collections of the Museum of Palermo, are not exhibited in the usual rooms accessed by visitors. The museum has been under refurbishment since the late 2000s, however, and it is therefore possible the tokens might be displayed in the near future.

[INSERT FIG3 HERE]

The first artefact to be examined (cat. n. 1) is a clay token which must be included in the so-called imitations of Athenian coins, studied by J. Kroll and already discovered in archaeological excavations. A similar lead specimen is also kept at the British Museum. It reproduces a “pi-style” tetradrachm (ca. 353-294 BCE) (Fig. 3); its name derives from the flower decoration clearly placed on Athena’s helmet which is fully represented on side A of the token. Athena is looking right. Side B shows an owl standing and facing and the legend ΑΘΕ clearly refers to the Greek goddess. This artefact was originally one of a well-documented Athenian production of imitation coins roughly dated to the second half of the 4th century BCE; it is a direct connection between Sicily and Greece. The connection is testified in archival records, namely the Giornale di Entrata, which reports that the artefact, properly identified as a ‘Greek terracotta coin’, was given to the museum by G. Fauci, a collector (or possibly an antiquities seller). He sold the artefact for 15 Italian lira on 27 August 1907. It can be argued that Salinas approved the acquisition immediately for one important reason: the institution already owned other clay tokens, and the new, rare imitation of an Athenian tetradrachm would surely have enhanced the museum’s numismatic collection.

[INSERT FIG4 HERE]
[INSERT FIG5 HERE]
[INSERT FIG6 HERE]
[INSERT FIG7 HERE]
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741 Athens, AR, tetradrachm (ca. 353-294 BCE): Obv.: Helmed head of Athena right showing a profile eye and a pi-style palmette; Rev.: Owl standing right with head facing; in the field, olive sprig and a small crescent; ΑΘΕ; HCG 4, n. 1632.

742 The lead Athenian imitation token currently preserved at the British Museum (inv. n. 1922,0416.132) can be viewed online (https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/C_1922-0416-132) (accessed: 20/12/2021). I am grateful to Mairi Gkikaki for her suggestion about the imitation tokens. In particular, on “pi-style” tetradrachms and imitation coins: Kroll (1993, 291) supposes one or two specimens might be modern imitations; Kroll (2011, 3–26).
The next artefact is a well-preserved small orange clay token (cat. n. 2) which can be roughly dated to the third century BCE. It shows the bearded head of Zeus facing right on side A and a man-faced bull advancing to the right on side B. This represents Achelous, as pointed out by the legend $A(\chi\epsilon\lambda\rho\omicron\omicron\varsigma?)$ placed in the lower field. The god was extensively venerated in Greece, Magna Graecia, and Sicily. As a manifold river-god, Achelous often appears as a bull, an old-man-faced bull, or in the form of a snake. Its multi-shaped iconography is testified on pottery containers, ornamental terracotta, and coins. For instance, it is represented on some coins from the city of Gelas-Gela (fifth century BCE) (Fig. 4)\textsuperscript{743} and Iaitas (fourth-third century BCE) (Fig. 5)\textsuperscript{744} in Sicily, and Acarnania in Greece (third century BCE) (Fig. 6).\textsuperscript{745} There is no information regarding the provenance of our new clay token, and therefore we do not know exactly where it was originally produced or even acquired by the museum of Palermo. As a hypothesis, the artefact might have been made in central Sicily, as there are similar artefacts at Monte Iato and Gela showing Achelous.\textsuperscript{746}

Amongst the Palermo Museum’s artefacts there is an intriguing and well-documented set of three tesserae showing a recurring iconography and one-letter legend. Dating can be established between the second century and first century BCE. The first (cat. n. 3) has a large A (alpha or aleph?) filling most of side A, while side B shows a small elephant advancing left with a sedan chair. Of African or Indian origin, this peculiar animal is also testified in other clay/lead tokens and coins moving forward towards right or left. For example, a silver half shekel struck in northern Africa or Sicily in the late third century BCE (Fig. 7)\textsuperscript{747} shows the head of Melqart and a big elephant advancing right on the reverse, which also displays the Punic letter A (aleph). The elephant is also represented on a well-known silver denarius of

\textsuperscript{743} Gelas, AR, tetradrachm (ca. 480-475 BCE): Obv.: Standing charioteer holding reins and driving a quadriga right; above, Nike flying right; Rev.: Forepart of Achelous right; ΓΕΑΛΣ in the field; SNG ANS Sicily, n. 22.

\textsuperscript{744} Iaitas, Æ (ca. 220-160 BCE): Obv.: Achelous standing right; Rev.: Grain ear and barely grain; CNS, vol. 1, 383, n. 1.

\textsuperscript{745} Acarnania, Acarnanian League, Æ 23 (third century BCE): Obv.: Laureate head of Zeus right; Rev.: Head of Achelous right; in the field, a monogram (À) behind and a small trident above; BMC Greek (Thessaly), n. 15.


\textsuperscript{747} The Carthaginian AR half shekel (231-210 BCE): Obv.: Head of Melqart left; Rev.: Elephant advancing right; Exg.: A (aleph); SNG Copenhagen 8, n. 383.
Julius Caesar (49 BCE) (Fig. 8) and appears on various lead tesserae (Fig. 9). A variety of types are reported by Rostovtzeff; it is essential to stress that some specimens have been found in Spain, of evident northern-African origin.

The second token (cat. n. 4) is very similar to the previous one, but the elephant does not carry a sedan chair. The letter A is slightly visible and placed in the upper field, while the elephant advances right on a flat surface, represented by a line. Archival research helps us contextualise this specimen properly. The Giornale d’Entrata (acquisition list) of the museum reports that the clay token (“tessera di creta”) was bought by the Commission of Antiquities and Fine Arts travelling in the provinces of Messina, Catania, and Syracuse in 1872. The exact place of purchase is unfortunately unknown. It was subsequently acquired by the museum on 22nd March 1873.

Founded in 1827, the Commission was a special body which provided a variety of advices to the Bourbon government regarding the safeguarding of antiquities, fine art objects and excavation licences. Confirmed and kept after the downfall of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies and the Italian Unification (1861), the body was finally abolished in 1875 following the national reform of archaeological safeguarding which introduced the General Direction of Antiquities and Fine Arts (Royal Decree of 28th March 1875 n. 24440). When the artefact was purchased and acquired, the President of the Commission was F. Ugdulena, in charge between 1873 and 1874, F. S. Cavallari was the Director of Antiquities of Sicily, on duty between 1864 and 1876, and A. Salinas was the Director of the Royal Museum (1873-1875).

There are some clear characteristics which equate the second token to the third (cat. n. 5) (Table 1). The colour of clay, which appears very depurated, is almost identical. The elephant is advancing right on the same flat surface depicted by two lines (height: 13.10, 13.30

---

748 Caesar, AR denarius, moving mint in Northern Italy (49-48 BCE): Obv.: Elephant advancing right, CAESAR; Rev.: Culullus, aspergillum and axe with a wolf’s head; RRC 443/1.

749 Anonymous, PB tessera (ca. first century BCE-first century CE): Side A: Elephant walking right; Side B: TO•RQ. No reference is given in TURS.


mm; width: 18.60, 15.44 mm), and the legend A is of very similar dimensions (height: 4.66, 4.55 mm; width: 4.80, 4.97 mm). Both elephants are comparable as well. It can therefore be argued that both tokens were produced in the same context in Sicily. Both were probably acquired/bought from the same person and their acquisition at the museum was finalised at the same time (22nd March 1873), as reported by the Giornale d’Entrata (“140 | 22. Marzo 1873 | Idem”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Cat. n. 3 (inv. 69353)</th>
<th>Cat. n. 4 (inv. 65356)</th>
<th>Cat. n. 5 (inv. 69355)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>reddish</td>
<td>reddish</td>
<td>reddish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>smooth and blank</td>
<td>smooth and blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>circular</td>
<td>oval</td>
<td>oval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legend</td>
<td>A (aleph) (12.42 x 15.66 mm)</td>
<td>A (aleph/alpha) (4.66 x 4.80 mm)</td>
<td>A (aleph/alpha) (4.55 x 4.97 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diameter</td>
<td>22.91 mm</td>
<td>27.05 mm</td>
<td>25.86 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickness</td>
<td>8.67 mm</td>
<td>4.39 mm</td>
<td>5.60 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>3.8 g</td>
<td>3.2 g</td>
<td>2.9 g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Comparison of three clay tokens (‘elephant type’) preserved at the Palermo Museum “A. Salinas”.

Another tessera (cat. n. 6), approximately datable to the first century BCE, shows a standing eagle, a Greek legend (ΘC) which is indecipherable – but potentially visible on both sides – and a quadruped type (maybe a lion?). The eagle is a common iconography on Hellenistic and Roman coins and tesserae (Fig. 10) and symbolises Zeus/Jupiter. Unfortunately, we do not have sufficient archival data to assess the origin of this clay token. It can be inferred that it was acquired from the antiquarian market in Palermo in the late nineteenth century, even if it is impossible to understand its original context of production which may be Sicily, Rome, or even Asia Minor.

In chronological order, the next artefact to be analysed is a token (cat. n. 7) with a very regular, circular shape. The small disk, which is approximately the same size as a Roman sestertius (36.61 mm), is grey which is due to the nature of the clay used to stamp the token. Side A shows two stylised caps of the Dioscuri, Castor and Pollux, the sacred twin sons of

---

752 Anonymous, PB tessera (ca. first century BCE-first century CE): Side A: Eagle standing right; Side B. Sphinx right. TURS 37, n. 272.
Tyndareus and Leda. Each cap is formed by an ellipsis with a very stylised cross on the top, which represents a star, symbol of the Dioscuri themselves. Side B is blank and very smooth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Tindari</th>
<th>Palermo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>orange</td>
<td>grey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse</td>
<td>blank and smooth</td>
<td>blank and smooth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>circular</td>
<td>circular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diameter</td>
<td>34.59 mm</td>
<td>36.61 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>7.18 g</td>
<td>11.3 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickness</td>
<td>4.46 mm</td>
<td>6.19 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellipse (left)</td>
<td>8.74 x 9 mm</td>
<td>11.18 x 17.97 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellipse (right)</td>
<td>10 x 9 mm</td>
<td>10.40 x 17.52 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross (left)</td>
<td>8.74 x 9 mm</td>
<td>8.13 x 6.84 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross (right)</td>
<td>10 x 9 mm</td>
<td>9.01 x 9.24 mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Comparison of clay tokens preserved at Tindari (Antiquarium) and Palermo (Museum “A. Salinas”).

The successful ‘rediscovery’ of this find at the Archaeological Museum of Palermo is certainly remarkable. In fact, the token can be strikingly connected with another specimen, previously referred to in the introduction (Fig. 11)\(^{753}\), which was discovered at Tindari in 1896 by A. Salinas while excavating the ancient Hellenistic and Roman necropolis on the land of Baron Domenico Sciacca della Scala (1846-1900) at Contrada Scrozzo (Fig. 12). Previously transferred to the Museum of Syracuse in the early twentieth century and currently exhibited at the Antiquarium of Tindari, the token has been dated to the late first century BCE thanks to a cogent comparison with a coin of the local mint of Tyndaris\(^{754}\). The tokens are of similar dimensions (Table 2), although the clay colour is slightly different and the Palermo specimen’s caps are slightly bigger than those from Tindari. It can be inferred that the Palermo token was also produced and evidently left at Tyndaris in the same period. It may have been acquired in the late nineteenth century when Salinas often visited Tindari’s archaeological site and met Sciacca who could have donated the find to the museum. Further research might fully confirm this hypothesis, if records are still preserved.

\(^{753}\) Crisà 2019, 63–77; Crisà 2020(b), 47–55.

\(^{754}\) Tyndaris, Æ 44–36 BC?: Obv.: Pilei of the Dioscuri with highly stylised stars; Obv.: Rudder between D-D; Minì 1979, 445, n. 32; CNS, vol. 1, 83, n. 26; Villemur 2016, 439, n. 7.
The last token to be discussed here is a small orange clay find (cat. n. 8) which can presumably be dated to the late 1st century BCE and 1st century CE. The obverse shows Herakles standing, a very recurring type in Sicilian coins. He is well-represented in the coinage of Kephaloidion-Cefalù until the late first century BCE (Fig. 13), and also appears on some lead Roman tesserae (Fig. 14). He is clearly identifiable on our token, and in fact, he carries a club and lionskin. The surface of the reverse, which also preserves traces of a fingerprint, is slightly concave, and it is therefore possible that this artefact is a game piece instead of a tessera.

A remarkable tag found at the museum tells us that the artefact was discovered at Termini Imerese (Palermo), the ancient Thermae, in the area of the castle in November 1840 while excavating the new road (“stradone”). Built in the sixteenth century and reworked many times in the modern age, the castle, which overlooked Termini Imerese, was almost entirely destroyed by the Bourbon troops in 1860. G. Fiorelli described excavations performed there in 1876. According to the antiquarian sources, the castle area was well-known in the mid-nineteenth century for the presence of ancient ruins and buried antiquities. Archaeologists and amateurs often discovered Greek and Roman artefacts (inscriptions, vases, pottery fragments, coins, etc.). It can be argued that the token was found in local works performing excavations within a road construction site close to the castle: the artefact was luckily acquired by authorities (e.g. the local Intendency), sent to the Commission of Antiquities and Fine Arts and finally acquired by the museum. B. Romano can help us to contextualise the discovery. In fact, when mentioning a Greek stamp on a fragmentary terracotta handle discovered in the area in his Antichità termite (1838), the author described the castle as follows:

---

755 Kephaloidion, Α (late first century BCE): Obv.: Laureate head of Herakles right; Rev.: Herakles standing and facing, holding a club in his right hand and a lion skin in his left hand; KE-ΦΑ; CNS, vol. 1, 372, n. 12.

756 Anonymous, PB tessera (ca. first century CE): Side A: Herakles standing left, holding a club in his left hand and Telesphorus in his right hand; Side B: Euthenia (?) reclining left inside a distyle temple; Emmett 2001, n. 4461.

757 Fiorelli 1877, 64–65.

758 On the castle of Termini see: Romano 1838, 101–02; Amico (1855-1859, 575–76); Fiorelli 1877, 64–65; Belvedere 2011, 470, 472. The labours of Herakles are also represented on first century BCE tesserae of Central Italy: Stannard 2015, 357–78.
“Quest’epigrafe è di un manico fittile di due in tre pollici di lunghezza trovato nella collina sottoposta al castello entro la città di Termini. In questa collina sorgeva parte dell’antica città ne’ tempi si greci come romani, ed ora alcuni ruderi, e qualche frantume di mattoni o tegoli antiche ne ridestano la memoria” (Romano 1838, 101).

Tokens in context: some final remarks

This section offers some concluding remarks on the novel finds re-discovered at the Palermo Museum, highlighting the limits and further potential of the research. While studying these artefacts, it has been clear that they are not connected to each other, except for two finds showing an elephant (cat. nos. 4-5). In fact, they represent a sort of assemblage of finds for three essential reasons. First, they do not come from the same or a well-defined archaeological context; as a consequence, their exact findspots are often irremediably unknown. Second, they are too heterogeneous and do not have any connections in terms of dating, iconography (except for the above-mentioned set of ‘elephant’ tokens), or provenance. Third, their origins, whether assumed or known, are different, which implies their acquisition by the museum at different times and occasions which cannot be fully understood due to a lack of archival records.

Archival records have provided essential information on the acquisition of two clay tesserae in 1873 (cat. nos. 4-5). There is no precise data, since they do not report the exact place the finds were purchased in Sicily, but only the vast provinces of Catania, Messina, and Syracuse. Nevertheless, it can be inferred that Salinas bought the artefacts from a local (still unknown) collector for a low price. The archaeologist Salinas, who was also a member of the Commission, used to travel around Sicily to track down inscriptions, vases, coins, and other small finds to increase the collections of the Royal Museum of Palermo. He sometimes also persuaded collectors to donate finds. This was a very ‘inexpensive’ strategy, but otherwise, as an alternative, he purchased finds.759

As already seen elsewhere, it is evident that archival research can reveal information about unknown collectors operating in post-Unification Sicily. In particular, G. Fauci, who offered or sold the Athenian imitation coin to the museum of Palermo in the early 20th century, testifies to the essential role of collectors, donors, and antiquities sellers in increasing the institution’s collections. Salinas, director and in charge of rearranging the museum after Unification, was undoubtedly focused on enhancing the repertoire of coins and small finds. The artefact proposed by Fauci was evidently missing from the museum’s collections; it could

759 On Salinas and his excursions in post-Unification Sicily see: Spatafora and Gandolfo 2014, 28–30; Crisà 2018(b), 34–36.
also demonstrate an undeniable link with Greek numismatics, and was immediately appealing to Salinas, who approved the acquisition and purchased the find.

[INSERT FIG15 HERE]
[INSERT FIG16 HERE]

How can we connect our novel and previously assessed Sicilian specimens with the broader context of Athens and the wider Greek world? Although they appear to be disconnected, these artefacts disclose contact points with a wider heritage. As a quick reference, we briefly mention a convincing link between Sicilian token production and the Punic/northern African world, represented by three tokens showing an elephant and the legend A (aleph). More importantly, the influence of a well-founded set of religious and civic traditions from Greece derives from the early stages of colonisation of Sicily in the eighth century BCE and continues towards the Hellenistic and early Roman period. It is essential to mention the set of clay tokens from Makella-Marino showing Demeter with torches searching for Persephone (Fig. 15). These finds, which presumably circulated in the small community, were probably used to access local events celebrating the cult of Demeter, largely widespread in the inner areas of Sicily. It can be inferred that these ceremonies were similar to the Greek Eleusinian Mysteries performed near Athens. Thus, Makella’s artefacts are well-connected with traditions, cults and myths documented both in Greece and Sicily.  

This connection is further demonstrated by the tokens from Tyndaris. The ancient Sicilian centre in the province of Messina, founded in 396 BCE by a group of colonists expelled from Messana on the behalf of Dionysius I of Syracuse, derived its name from Tyndareus. The cult of the Dioscuri, imported from the homeland of early founders, had been constantly practiced at Tyndaris with a persistent veneration for the sacred twins. The clay tokens – together with various coins and a Roman mosaic at insula IV – demonstrate a long-standing continuity of, and on-going approval for, old civic and religious traditions which are directly connected with Greece. In this regard, the iconography showing the two caps of the Dioscuri is also testified by a lead token discovered in the Agora of Athens (inv. no. IL 812) (Fig. 16).  

Last but not least, Athens and Sicily are also inter-connected by the clay reproduction of an Athenian tetradrachm preserved at the Archaeological Museum of Palermo. Such a specimen (whether an original or a modern reproduction remains unclear), sold by Fauci and

760 Crisà 2021a.
761 The artefact discovered in Athens is a small lead token showing two caps of the Dioscuri with two stars above (inv. IL 812) (Ø 12 mm) (courtesy of the Greek Ministry of Culture).
purchased by the director, would certainly enhance the museum’s collection. As a mere hypothesis, Salinas, who was a well-known expert in Greek and Sicilian numismatics, and also lived in Athens after the Italian Unification during an educational stay, could have used this artefact for teaching purposes. In fact, he taught archaeology and Classical numismatics at the University of Palermo and brought his students to the museum to show them artefacts including coins, vases and inscriptions.  

Finally, such artefacts, including their symbolic, religious, and civic iconography, offer essential points of comparison with Athenian token production as well as the imagery and the functions of Athenian tokens. These Sicilian specimens clearly demonstrate the mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion in daily life, disclosing (or not) a code of symbolism for obtaining rights or gaining access to special events. They also clearly represent the local identities of the small communities in Hellenistic and Roman Sicily. They offer a great deal of information on the history of collecting and museum studies in the late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century Sicily.

**Catalogue**

1 | inv. n. 65357 | imitation of an Athenian tetradrachm, grey clay, circular shape | Ø 19.00 mm; h.: 7.49 mm; 2.4 g | State of preservation: good (no fracture) | Provenance: Athens (?) | Dating: 353-295 BCE.
Side A: Head of Athena right (h.: 15.45 mm).
Side B: Standing and facing owl (h.: 13.43 mm; w.: 8.72 mm); in the left field AΩE (h.: 2.84 mm).

2 | inv. n. 69354 | tessera, orange clay, circular shape | Ø 25.90 mm; h.: 8.52 mm; 5.7 g | State of preservation: good (no fracture) | Provenance: Sicily (central area?) | Dating: third century BCE (?)
Side A: Bearded head of Zeus right (h.: 22.92 mm; w.: 21.49 mm).

---

762 Columba 1915, 23; Pottino 1977, 429–32.
Side B: Achelous facing and advancing right (h.: 15.30 mm; w.: 22.97 mm); in the lower field Α(χελώος?) (h.: 4.13 mm).

3 | inv. n. 69353 | tessera, reddish clay, circular shape | Ø 22.91 mm; h.: 8.67 mm; 3.8 g | State of preservation: good (no fracture; surface shows some white concretions) | Provenance: unknown (Sicily?) | Dating: second-first century BCE (?).
Side A: Standing elephant left carrying on a sedan chair on its back (h.: 17.68 mm; w.: 18.96 mm).
Side B: A (aleph) with stem extended towards left (h.: 12.42 mm; w.: 15.66 mm).

4 | inv. n. 65356 | tessera, reddish clay, oval shape | Ø 27.05 mm; h.: 4.39 mm; 3.2 g | State of preservation: good (no fracture) | Provenance: Sicily (area of Catania, Messina, or Syracuse) | Dating: second-first century BCE.
Side A: Elephant advancing right on a flat surface on double groundline (h.: 13.10 mm; w.: 18.60 mm); small legible A (alphaleph?) in the upper field (h.: 4.66 mm; w.: 4.80 mm).
Side B: Blank (a late nineteenth-century museum’s tag reports: “R. MUSEO DI PALERMO: R(egistro) (d’)E(ntrata) N.° 139”).

5 | inv. n. 69355 | tessera, reddish clay, oval shape | Ø 25.86 mm; h.: 5.60 mm; 2.9 g | State of preservation: good (no fracture) | Provenance: Sicily (area of Catania, Messina, or Syracuse) | Dating: second-first century BCE (?).
Side A: Elephant advancing right on a flat surface, represented by a double line (h.: 13.30 mm; w.: 15.41 mm); A (alphaleph?) in the upper field (h.: 4.55 mm; w.: 4.97 mm).
Side B: Blank.

6 | inv. n. 69352 | tessera, grey clay, circular shape | Ø 32.00 mm; h.: 9.85 mm; 9.9 g | State of preservation: good (no fracture) | Provenance: unknown (Sicily, Rome, or Asia Minor) | Dating: first century BCE (?).
Side A: Eagle right showing unfolded wings (w.: 16.75 mm; h.: 22.07 mm); in the left field ΘC (h.: 7.00 mm).
Side B: Quadruped (lion?) advancing left; in the upper field C, below ΘC (?) (h.: 6.36 mm).
References (comparison): TURS 37 n. 272.

7 | inv. n. 69351 | tessera, grey clay, circular shape | Ø 36.61 mm; h.: 6.19 mm; 11.3 g | State of preservation: good (no fracture) | Provenance: Tindari (Messina) | Dating: late first century BCE.
Side A: Two small, stylised caps of the Dioscuri, formed by two ellipses (left: 11.18 x 17.97 mm; right: 10.40 x 17.52 mm) and two crosses representing stars on the top (left: 8.13 x 6.84 mm; right: 9.01 x 8.24 mm).
Side B: Blank.
References: Crisà 2019, 63–77; Crisà 2020(b), 47–55.

8 | inv. n. 65358 | tessera (or game piece?), orange clay, circular shape | Ø 24.04 mm; h.: 5.32 mm; 2.7 g | State of preservation: good (no fracture) | Provenance: Termini Imerese | Dating: late first century BCE-first century CE (?).
Side A: Herakles (h.: 19.62 mm; w.: 13.48 mm) standing, facing and naked, holds a club in his right hand and lionskin (leontè) in his left hand.
Side B: Blank and slightly concave with traces of a fingerprint.
Records: green tag reporting “Trovato negli scavi di Termini nel nuovo stradone del Castello in 9bre 1840”.
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The following paper examines several clay objects which were found as stray finds in Jerusalem and should be dated to the early Roman period. They derive from few different locations in and around the Temple Mount.⁷⁶³

These mysterious objects, which might be defined as ‘tokens’, are almost unknown in research. Some bear Greek and Aramaic legends, some have only designs and some have both. There are several features which combine them into one group: their association to the Temple Mount, their material, their strange shape, especially the shape of their backside, which is conical, as well as their function in gift distributions and/or for secure identification of the courier of a message or even as a means of securing the validity of a precious package.

Most of the objects were scanned in 3D at the National Laboratory for Digital Documentation and Research at the Israel Antiquities Authority.⁷⁶⁴ XRF scans and petrographic analysis were done for several of the objects by Y. Goren from Ben Gurion University of the Negev (see below).⁷⁶⁵ Such objects are extremely rare in the archaeological record, and this is the first time that such items are studied as a group and by using these advanced technologies.

Petrographic study

---

⁷⁶³ I wish to thank H. Geva (of the Israel Exploration Society), and G. Barkay and Z. Dvira (of the Temple Mount Sifting Project), for their permission to study the objects from their projects. This study was supported by a grant from the Roger and Susan Hertog Center for the Archaeological Study of Jerusalem and Judah, based at the Institute of Archaeology, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. I am grateful to M. Gkikaki for inviting me to take part in the conference and for editing this volume.

⁷⁶⁴ See Karasik et. al 2014. We used a device of the company GoMeasure3D with an accuracy of 20 micron. The views that emphasize the pattern were rendered using the program DOR that was developed at Haifa University (Gilboa et. al. 2013). I wish to thank A. Karasik for scanning the objects and preparing the scans for publication.

⁷⁶⁵ I wish to thank Y. Goren for his research and assistance.
The petrographic study attempted to disclose the technology and possible provenance of several of the objects presented above by analytical methods of material analysis. Due to the obvious restrictions resulting from the museological value of these delicate objects, the analyses were limited by the extraction of limited samples (if at all), hence, the results and conclusions are limited accordingly.

The study was planned to be made in three stages. In the first stage the structural and technical aspects of the objects were examined based on surface microscopic observations under a stereomicroscope at 20x magnification, and under a Dino-Lite Edge digital microscope. This was made in order to record minute details of the clay fabric, the seal impression, cord impressions if they exist, fingerprints, and any other imprints. These examinations attempted to address some technical questions, such as the general composition of the fabric and the formation process.

Before sampling, non-destructive testing (NDT) of the element concentrations of the objects was performed to provide their chemical composition. Today, portable Energy Dispersive X-Ray Florescence (pXRF) devices provide fast on-site elemental analysis. We used a Thermo Fisher ScientificNitont GOLDD+ pXRF, using an Ag anode 50 kV and 200 µA. Each object was scanned on different locations (front and back) using the ‘Mining’ filter. Each scan was 90 seconds in length, 30 seconds for each filter, to provide the full range of detectable elements (Mg-U, atomic numbers 12-92).

The pXRF screening was followed by minimally destructive testing (MDT) of sampled material for mineralogical and fabric analysis. Minute samples were extracted from the sealing by the peeling technique, and examined in thin sections under the petrographic microscope. In this method, a thin lamina, only few mm thick, is taken from a broken facet of the sealing or from its reverse side under the stereomicroscope with the aid of a scalpel. The samples were set on circular glass microscope cover slips, and dried on a hotplate at 60°C. Then the slips with the samples were put in a small desiccator, where the samples were impregnated with low viscosity epoxy resin under vacuum conditions. After curing, the resulting pellet was used for the preparation of a standard thin-section and subjected to routine petrological examination under a polarizing microscope (Motic Panthera-TEC POL) using X40–X600 magnifications under plane-polarized light (PPL) and cross-polarized light (XPL), using the common ceramic

petrography examination methods.\textsuperscript{767} This particular petrographic method has been chosen because it was used in all cases where clay seal impressions, namely \textit{bullae}, were analyzed for their mineralogical composition and possible geological origins. Therefore, an existing database of the clays used in the southern Levant to produce \textit{bullae} was available. The pXRF results are summarized with the description of each item.

\textbf{The objects}:

\textbf{Object No. 1 (Fig. 1)} - was found on a floor of a room dated to the 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE, which was excavated in 1970 in the area known as the Upper City of Jerusalem, west of the Temple Mount.\textsuperscript{768} During the Hellenistic and Roman periods, this area was inhabited by upper class Jewish families, who mostly served as priests in the Temple. The object is made of pink clay, covered with a dark patina. Its dimensions are 18mm in length, 12mm width and 10mm height. No intrusive sampling was made. pXRF results may suggest that it is similar to Object No. 2 (below).

[INSERT FIGS1a,b HERE]

The design on its flat oval face includes a hemispherical krater/basin on foot, with decorated handles,\textsuperscript{769} and possibly with a lid, and above it what seems to be three pomegranates. Two unclear objects, in a shape of small trees (?), are located on the left and right of the basin, next to its foot. The design, which combines a hemispherical krater/basin on leg and pomegranates, specifically recalls the design on the Shekel and Half Shekel silver coins struck by the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem during the First Jewish Revolt, between 66–70 CE (Fig. 2).

[INSERT FIGS2a,b,c HERE]

\textsuperscript{767} Quinn 2013.

\textsuperscript{768} The object was found in Area C, Locus 309, B. 6011. See Avigad 1983, 194 fig. 226.

\textsuperscript{769} It seems that the artist who made the seal chose to present the handles as facing, rather than in their original horizontal form, and thus the viewer will be able to recognize their spiral design. Similar handles with spiral designs appear, for example, on a 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE silver Skyphos (Rozenberg and Mevorah 2013, 66).
The hemispherical krater or basin on Object No. 1 and on the coins, as well as on a gem from Masada (Fig. 3), is of a non-classical shape familiar from the Roman period onward.\textsuperscript{770}

[INSERT FIG3 HERE]

The vessel on the coins of the First Jewish Revolt was identified as the Omer cup, one of the Temple utensils. This was a gold vessel used on the second day of Passover, when a measure of barley, representing the first fruits, was offered in the Jerusalem Temple. Earlier descriptions of this cup suggested it was related to drinking wine, but Romanoff argues that this is not a drinking chalice. It seems that this vessel is one of the two golden cultic chalices depicted in the Arch of Titus on a table carried by the Roman soldiers as part of the booty taken by the Romans from the Jerusalem Temple.\textsuperscript{771}

The pomegranates are well-known as one of the main decorations of the Temple itself, and are one of the main motifs in Jewish art of the Roman period.\textsuperscript{772} The pomegranate buds on the coins of the First Jewish Revolt have often been described as hanging on a sprig or branch.\textsuperscript{773} Deutsch, however, asserts that this symmetric object with a large pommel at its end more likely represents the staff of the High Priest.\textsuperscript{774}

This combination of a cup/krater and pomegranates is a recognizably Jewish device, and thus belongs to the repertoire of Jewish art of the first century CE. Similar cups on high foot (such as the Greek \textit{kantharos}) are attested on Ephesian tesserae of the second and third centuries CE.\textsuperscript{775} The possible functions of these tokens have yet to be explored.

\textsuperscript{770} Gershet and Gendelman 2016,1 58–60.
\textsuperscript{771} Romanoff 1944, 21–25; Meshorer 2001, 117–18; Deutsch 2011, 363–64. For another suggestion regarding the possible use of the cup(s) which appear on the table in the Arch of Titus see Fine et al. 2021, 27.
\textsuperscript{772} Meshorer 2001, 118–19.
\textsuperscript{773} Meshorer 2001, 118.
\textsuperscript{774} See Deutsch 2011, 362–63.
\textsuperscript{775} Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 145–47, nos. 218–23; Bulgurlu and Hazinedar in this volume, cat. nos. 82 and 83.
The triangular raised back of the token seems to bear the negative of a fabric which was used to hold it while it was made or possibly, to which it was attached, as some kind of a seal or receipt.

It was recently suggested that clay sealings from the Iron Age II period (seventh-sixth century BCE) with a concave back covered with textile imprint, found in Jerusalem, were probably attached to sacks made of a fabric of coarse fibers, containing hacksilber (irregularly cut silver pieces) or other precious metals, and related to the Temple treasury.\(^7^7^6\)

It is thus possible that Object No. 1 was also used for the same function as the clay sealings from the Iron Age II period, possibly in the Temple treasury. If so, one can suggest some relation between the impressive design on the face of the object (a hemispherical krater/cup on foot, decorated with three pomegranates) and the content of the sacks, e.g. silver coins of the First Jewish Revolt (decorated with a cup and three pomegranates) or the silver bullion used to strike these coins.

The discovery of this object in the Upper city of Jerusalem goes well with its decorations and suggests that it probably belonged to a priestly family and was therefore related to the Temple activity.

Object No. 2 was discovered a few years ago as part of the Temple Mount Sifting Project (TMSP).\(^7^7^7\)

This token is some 12 mm in length, stamped on its face with an amphora surrounded by a Greek legend, all within a plain border (10x7mm in diameter). The conical back is partly

\(^7^7^6\) Dvira and Barkay 2021.

\(^7^7^7\) The Temple Mount Sifting Project (TMSP) was created in order to save as many ancient artifacts as possible from thousands of tons of debris that were excavated and removed from the Temple Mount in 1999 without any archaeological supervision. The project also aims to conduct archaeological research on the finds in order to shed more light on the history of the Temple Mount: a place of significance to billions of people throughout the world. For the project see, Barkay and Dvira 2016. See also, https://tmsifting.org/en/ (last accessed 24/12/2021).
broken (see Fig. 4b), with some remains of a fabric or a finger print still visible. The legend on the face reads ‘ΔΟΥ-ΛΟ[Υ]’ (Doulou), probably genitive of Δούλας or Δούλης (Doulês), a well-known personal name during the Roman period, especially in Thracia, Macedonia, and the northern regions of the Black Sea, areas where Jews were settled already in the late Hellenistic-Early Roman periods.

The letters (2mm high) are mostly perfectly preserved, what is only partly visible is the last upsilon, which was only partly impressed on the clay. The letters, except of the omicron, have serifs; the delta, lambda and upsilon are characterized by an apex on top (all three) and bottom (lambda and upsilon). The petrographic study revealed marly clay with sparse silt and some foraminifers (Fig. 5). The pXRF results indicate the following general composition: silicon (Si): 23.8%, calcium (Ca): 7.5%, aluminum (Al): 5.5%, potassium (K): 4.2%, iron (Fe): 3.4%, and phosphor (P): 1.5%. The relatively high potassium rate may indicate Illite as the clay mineral. The orange translucent particles in the silt may indicate apatite (as phosphor is high). Based on the analytical data, the provenance determination cannot be categorized. However, this sealing differs from Iron Age sealings found in Jerusalem, in that it was not made of terra rossa soil. It should be stated that the pXRF results of Object No. 1 demonstrate similar results including: Si: 24.4%, Ca: 6.6%, Al: 7%, K: 4.7%, Fe: 3.8% and P: 0.7%. These rather similar results may indicate some similarity in the clay mineralogy (though not necessarily a common source).

The name on the token may be that of the man who donated goods, possibly to the temple, or it was the name of the man who was in charge of distribution.

This sealing was most probably made by a seal ring, maybe of a type similar to a one which was recently found in Herodium, the site of Herod’s the Great palace and burial place, and dated from the first century BCE to middle of first century CE (Fig. 6).

The name on the token may be that of the man who donated goods, possibly to the temple, or it was the name of the man who was in charge of distribution.

This sealing was most probably made by a seal ring, maybe of a type similar to a one which was recently found in Herodium, the site of Herod’s the Great palace and burial place, and dated from the first century BCE to middle of first century CE (Fig. 6).
However, while the ring from Herodium is most likely the product of a local workshop, the one which was used to make the token from the Temple Mount seems to be of a non-local workshop. It seems that the shape and decorations of our token with amphora derive from non-local Jewish art of the early Roman period.

The shape of the amphora on our token is pyriform. It has a high neck, a rounded rim and an elongated body, rounded in its upper part and ending in a pointed spike. It has raised handles (above the mouth), which are attached to the top of its rounded body. This amphora is not a common one and seems as a hybrid, probably not presenting a realistic one. The idea was probably to show an amphora, most probably Rhodian (see below), as a general motif.

Various amphorae, none seems perfectly identical to the one on the token, were uncovered in Herodian period assemblages in Jerusalem and Judaea, some bear inscriptions, inscribed with ink on the body of the vessel. Based on the vessel's inscriptions, it can be determined that the products they contained come from estates in the area of Brindisi and Campagna in Italy, as well as from the Greek Islands (Knidos, Chios, Rhodes) and from Spain. These products included wines of various types, honey, apples from Italy, and pickled fish sauce (garum) from Spain.

The shape of the amphora on the token seems similar (only the handles are different) to an amphora type from Masada, dated to 27-19 BCE (Fig. 7). The shape of both seems similar to earlier amphoras produced on Lesbos.

The raised handles of the amphora depicted on the token also seems similar to various Rhodian amphorae, the best example seems to be an amphora type from Bodrum, dated to the late third

---

782 Bar-Nathan 2006, 320 no. 9.
783 See for example Clinkenbread 1986, 355 fig. 3.
and early second century BCE (Fig. 8). This amphora type has a broad geographic distribution, which includes the Eastern Mediterranean, Aegean, Russia, France and Spain.\footnote{Alpözen, Özdaş, and Berkaya 1995, 92.}

**[INSERT FIG8 HERE]**

A local-found parallel could be seen in one amphora found in the Upper City of Jerusalem (Fig. 9) and dated to the mid-first century BCE.\footnote{Finkielsztejn 2006, 170.}

**[INSERT FIG9 HERE]**

To conclude, the amphora on our token seems to be a type of the early Roman period, dated mainly to the second half of the first century BCE. In the present case, and if the amphora depicted on the token is more than just a decorative motif, it might be significant. The origin of such amphorae was apparently Aegean, and this specific amphora seems to be from Rhodes and was probably used for wine. It is possible that this token was attached to a donation or something that was sent, possibly from abroad, to Jerusalem. Or, perhaps, the token served to receive an allotment of wine, and Doulas was the man in charge of giving it out to those who presented the token.

**Object No. 3** was discovered in 2011 in the excavations of the drainage tunnel of the first century CE main street west to the Temple Mount. Another identical item is known from Jerusalem, now in a private collection. I did not have an access to these objects and my discussion here is based on what was published in the media and in the press (below).\footnote{This object has not yet been fully published by the excavation team. I wish to thank E. Shukron for the permission to use the photos by V. Naikhin.}

It is 20 mm in diameter and has on its face a legend only (Fig. 10). The legend is in Aramaic, the common language in Judaea during the Roman period, and includes six letters in two lines. The legend was deciphered by the excavators as יִדְעַ נִלְי / וְהָרֵי, meaning ‘pure to God’, and it was suggested that it was used to mark products which were brought to the Temple and needed to be pure. However, there are other readings of this legend which remains disputed.\footnote{Naeh 2012(a); Naeh 2012(b); Naeh 2015; Shveka 2015; Safrai 2017.}
Object No. 4 was discovered few years ago as part of the Temple Mount Sifting Project (TMSP). It is 20 mm in width and oval in shape and has an unclear scene, possibly two figures facing in the center, or one figure sacrificing in front of an altar (?). The triangular raised back of the token seems to bear, at least on one of its sides, the negative of what seems as a fabric which was used to hold it while it was made or possibly, to which it was attached, as some kind of a seal or receipt (Fig. 11).

It is reasonable that this object was made by using a seal ring or gemstone. The use of figure(s) on this token suggests that it is a non-Jewish item, and thus it might be possible to date it to the second century CE or later, after Jerusalem was rebuilt by the emperor Hadrian as a Roman colony named Colonia Aelia Capitolina. The dark color which covers this sealing or token as some kind of a slip, and the pink color of the clay beneath are similar to those of Object No. 1. This is different from Objects Nos. 2–3, which are made of a yellowish clay and have no coating. However, the petrographic study revealed that Object No. 4 is made of dark reddish-tan clay, rich in quartz silt and opaque minerals, and with some micritic calcite particles (Fig. 12). According to the pXRF test, high iron (Fe) is notable. Based on the analytical data, the provenance determination cannot be categorized. However, this sealing is similar to Iron Age sealings found in Jerusalem in that it was made of terra rossa soil. This is also reflected by the pXRF results where the following major element concentrations were revealed: Si: 23%, Al: 12%, Ca: 7.5%, Fe: 9.6%, K: 1.7%, and P: 0.4%. As compared with Objects No. 1 and 2, the clay is very rich in iron and considerably poorer in potassium and phosphor. As petrography suggests, it supports the attribution to terra rossa soil. Thus, the attribution of this object to the traditions typical to the Iron Age make its dating to the Roman period somewhat doubtful.

Closing Remarks:

This group of tokens differ much in their dimensions and shape from other Hellenistic and Roman period clay tokens, and similar clay tokens are so far unknown to me from other cities in the Hellenistic-Roman world.
Their common characteristics - their extremely small size and their unique shape - raise questions about their function and how they were used. It is clear from their conical back that they could not have sealed a papyrus document. Some of them could have been possibly attached or affixed to another object such as a container, parcel, or bundle, while others have no features suggestive of such a function. In any case, these unique objects cannot stand alone, and it is so far not clear how and what for these token-like object were used, but some suggestions can be put forward.

The tokens from Jerusalem appear to be products of local production, as can be inferred from their manufacturing characteristics, material, and appearance. In the Hellenistic and Roman periods, tokens were similarly locally produced across the Mediterranean. With this local character and circulation, they serviced the various needs of the local communities in question.788

The discovery of the objects presented here from in and around the Temple Mount suggests that they were connected to the temple activity in some way, either directly or indirectly. The objects from the Temple Mount contribute to the discussion of the question of the issuing authority: who was responsible for issuing them – a private person or a group of persons, or a person or persons in an official capacity? The find spot of the first object in the area of the Upper City, west of the Temple Mount, evidences the roles played by tokens in the administration – broadly defined. Members of the elite who inhabited this area and administered the Temple should probably be credited with issuing and distribution. Tokens issued and distributed by the elite re-enforced its prestige and contributed to the creation of relationships among members of the elite or between the elite and its followers. Furthermore, tokens enabled the creation of particular communities within communities. This is probably the case with Object No. 2 with the design of an amphora. The Greek name ‘ΔΟΥΛΟΥ’, as well as the amphora design, betray connections with the world of the eastern Mediterranean. It suggests the existence of a Greek-speaking community that forged bonds between its members through distribution and the marking of such occasions through the sharing of tokens, although this remains a hypothesis only. Tokens certainly advertised the prestige of the issuing authority, whether a central authority such as the Temple priests, or a defined community or even a private individual.

788 Crisà in this volume.
The issue of state tokens – issued by a central authority – is well attested in Athens of the late Classical period. It is well known that in Athens tokens facilitated the workings of the state. More recent studies have showed that tokens in Athens were also issued on a private initiative. Similarly, the use of signet rings for stamping tokens (here Objects Nos. 2 and 4) demonstrate that individuals issued tokens for certain occasion and therefore created communities and relationships with the recipients of these tokens. The same mixture of centrally and privately issued tokens is evidenced in Jerusalem, when considering tokens such as the one with the cup (No. 1) and the one possibly inscribed ‘pure to God’ (No. 3) as issued by a central authority. Additionally, the tokens presented here with the clear traces of having been attached to something (Nos. 1, 2, and possibly No. 4) indicate that tokens served to verify the identity of their carrier and for guaranteeing the integrity of a consignment or even the integrity of a message. Much the same functions have been confirmed for Athens, where tokens sealed the tablets inscribed with the tribute paid to Athens by the members of the Delian League in the fifth century BCE. In Hellenistic Athens military tokens addressed to ‘Peripolarchos Xenokles’ have traces on their back side of having been attached to something, which could have been a message or a parcel.

It should be noted that the architecture of Herod the Great and his successors was greatly influenced by the Hellenistic-Roman world, with its Greek origins, and this is clearly evidenced by the decorations of the Herodian Temple Mount in Jerusalem. Thus, the Greek influence on Jerusalem during the late Hellenistic and Early Roman periods had many faces, the use of tokens in and around the Temple Mount was only one of them.

It is hoped that this preliminary study of these so far unique objects from Roman Jerusalem will encourage the publication of similar objects from other cities in the ancient Mediterranean and will assist us in deciphering their use.

---

789 Crosby 1964, 77.
791 The Kleinias Decree IG I³ 34; https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/IGI3/34 (last accessed 24/1/2022); cf. Finglass in this volume and Gkikaki in this volume.
792 The traces are visible on the backside of the token in the Agora Museum Inv. No. SS8080, published by Kroll and Mitchel (1980, 87 no. I.1 pl. 13a), cf. Finglass in this volume.
Captions

Fig. 1 – Object No. 1; a. photos (credit: T. Rogovski); b. 3D scan (credit: A. Karasik)

Fig. 2a. 22.5mm, 14.18 g, 11h (https://www.cngcoins.com/Coin.aspx?CoinID=365357).

Fig. 2b. 22mm, 14.17 g, 11h (https://www.cngcoins.com/Coin.aspx?CoinID=114732)

Fig. 2c. 20mm, 6.44 g (https://www.cngcoins.com/Coin.aspx?CoinID=44786)

Caption for all three (figs. 2a, 2b, 2c): Fig. 2 – Shekel and Half Shekel Silver coins from the First Jewish Revolt (photo credit: CNG coins)

Fig. 3 – A gem from Masada (after Hershkovitz and Amorai-Stark 2007, 222)

Fig. 4 – Object No. 2 (TMSP No. 55509); a. photos (credit: TMSP); b. 3D scan

Fig. 5. Object No. 2 in thin section. Left, PPL; right, XPL

Fig. 6 – The Ring from Herodium, the inscription reads ΠΙΛΑATO (Greek) (after Amorai-Stark et alii 2018:213, Figs. 5–6); a. photos of the ring and seal imprint (credit: T. Rogovski); b. drawing (credit: J. Rodman)

Fig. 7 – An Amphora from Masada (After: Bar-Nathan 2006: 320 [H. 83cm])

Fig. 8. A Rhodian Amphora from Bodrum (after: Alpözen, Özdaş, and Berkaya 1995, 92)

Fig. 9. An Amphora from Jerusalem (after: Finkielsztejn 2006, 182 fig. 6.3)

Fig. 10. Object No. 3 (photo credit: Vladimir Naikhin)

Fig. 11. Object No. 4 (TMSP No. 37148); a. photos (credit: TMSP); b. 3D scan

Fig. 12. Object No. 4 in thin section, XPL
There are 428 lead tokens in the Ephesos Archaeological Museum collection, located in Selçuk in the province of Izmir.\textsuperscript{794} The tokens were all obtained by the Museum through purchase or donation from villagers living in the hinterland.\textsuperscript{795} Due to corrosion and chemical degradation over time, some are damaged and have become illegible, and others are under restoration. 86 have been chosen for this study, generally in good condition with selectable motifs. With six exceptions, the tokens are uniface.\textsuperscript{796} Their average weight is 2.7g.; the smallest is 6 mm (only one) while the largest 20mm in diameter with an average between 14 and 18mm. Notwithstanding the small surface, the depictions have been made with a certain

\textsuperscript{794} We would like to thank Mairi Gikaki, editor, for her valuable advice and for inviting us to take part in this publication on tokens, in general an understudied subject among archaeologists in Turkey. Thanks are also due to the Turkish Ministry of Culture and to the Director of the Ephesos Archaeological Museum Cengiz Topal for permission to carry out this research, to archaeologist Ramazan Çetin of the numismatic cabinet for his kind cooperation and to Melike Sümertaş, research assistant. Photographs are by Tümay Hazinedar Coşkun. A particular debt of gratitude goes to Clare Rowan (Warwick) for insightful suggestions.

\textsuperscript{795} A private collection of 300 lead tokens from the Ephesos region belonging to Hasan Kireç has been published by the Municipality of Selçuk, entitled \textit{Ephesian Lead Tesserae}, in 2008. Due to the many similarities between the Kireç collection and the lead tokens in the Ephesus Archaeological Museum collection, the Gülbay and Kireç 2008 publication constitutes our main reference for the comparison of the tokens in our catalogue.

\textsuperscript{796} In the text, tokens in the catalogue will be referred to as C plus number in catalogue.
skill, revealing a varied subject matter which allows us to form an exciting picture of the rich culture enjoyed by the people of Ephesos, in both the Hellenistic and Roman period. 32 of the tokens are marked with inscriptions, in a mixture of Greek and Roman letters. The prototypes of most of the iconography on the tokens may be found on Greek and Roman bronze and silver coins. Most topics are from Greek mythology. In her book on the Athenian Agora excavation finds, relevant to the context of the finds, Margaret Crosby confirms the theories formulated in earlier publications that the use of lead tokens as exchange for entrance to festivals, law courts, meetings of the boule, for official donations of grain and possibly more personal donations made by powerful citizens in order to gain popularity, first began in Athens in the fourth century BCE. 797

Dating the Ephesian tokens presents some difficulty. There are no imperial portraits, very few names are inscribed, and more or less the same types are repeated; however by analogy, especially with the Gülbay and Kireç collection of Ephesos tokens, we can state that the majority are from the Roman Imperial era, second and third centuries CE. The iconography mirrors the religious faith of the Ephesians in the ancient Greek structure of the World as they knew it: ruled by the Olympian gods and goddesses. The same pagan worship continues in the Roman era. In the event of Saint Paul’s missionary visit to Ephesos, we learn that the Apostle met with great resistance not only from the Jews but also from devotees of the Artemis cult. 798

Ephesos, along with its neighbouring settlements Tralles, Miletus, Didyma and Magnesia, had been a flourishing city since already the Greek Archaic period, one of the twelve cities in the Ionian League and a religious centre. Thanks to its large harbour, trade activity was busy, while the mild climate and the surrounding land, well-watered by the Meander, enabled the city to enjoy an agriculture prosperity. In the seventh century BCE, due to the silting up of the harbour and multiple enemy invasions, Ephesos decreased in size only to be splendidly rebuilt in the Hellenistic and Roman era 799 eventually becoming one of the most famous and powerful centres of antiquity. Fairly continuous archaeological work commencing in the 19th century until today has brought to light the ruins of magnificent buildings from the Classical, Hellenistic and the Roman Imperial times. There is more than enough material to enable us to actually envisage the lives of the people living in these cities, especially their

797 Crosby 1964, 77.
799 Foss, 1979; Ladstaetter, 2017, 238.
popular cults of the pagan gods and goddesses. The huge theatres in Ephesos, neighbouring those in Miletos and Magnesia, have survived the ravages of time to tell a tale of people thronging to enjoy and be distracted from the monotony of their daily routines, laugh or cry at the performances. A good picture of the importance given to grains and entertainment in particular, at the time of Emperor Hadrian is described by Fronto: “I consider it good policy that the prince did not neglect the theatre or the circus and arena, as he well knew that there are two things which the Roman applaud especially—the distribution of grain, and games. The neglect of the important thing [grains] causes great harm, of the frivolous thing [entertainment] greater hatred—the crowd hungering more for games than for bread, because by the gift to the people [congiarium] only those who are authorized to receive the grain will be gratified, while by the games the whole population is pacified”.

Token C80 was surely used for entrance to the theater, judging by the image of a mask; the four tokens with Medusa heads are probably related to theater ‘tickets’ as well, used as theorika (C15, C16, C17, C18). Crosby mentions the Athenian Gorgoneion/Medusa tokens as appropriate images for the jurors’ pay (the dikastikon), but perhaps they were also on theatre tickets. In Hellenistic-Roman Myra (modern day Demre) in Lykia, the theatre built to accommodate 11,000 people had a massive marble frieze above the stage, which was decorated with variations of Medusa masks, now recovered and displayed in the grounds of the outdoor theatre museum.

The tokens with the victorious horse, identified by the palm branch in its mouth (C61), is a particularly eloquent image of equestrian events. Similarly, the token with the type of two gladiators or athletes facing each other (C27) may be related to athletic games, in preparation for the games to be held.

---

800 2020 was the 125th year of the ÖAW Ephesus excavations, today led by Sabine Ladstaetter. For detailed excavation reports see under ÖAW.


802 ‘Otto Benndorf (1875, 609-610: ‘Theorikonmarken für Dionysische Feste’) in his publication on the Ancient Greek Theatre in 1875 was the first to connect Athenian tokens to the theorika, the free distributions offered by the state for attending theatre performances and festivals in general.’ The assumption that tokens with theatre masks pertain to Theorika is found in Crosby 1964, 81. For Roman Ephesos see Gülbay and Kireç 32 with a reference to TURS about the ‘Mask Group’. For Hellenistic Athens Gkikaki (2021, 61) explains that tokens bearing a theatre mask and inscribed IİEN were meant for the distribution of Theorika.

803 In Turkish museums tokens are named as ‘jeton,’ ie. a metal object to be used in lieu of cash, or ‘billet,’ ticket. Gorgoneion on tokens: Crosby 1964, 103 (L182, L183 Pl. 26).

804 Research is underway led by Nevzat Çevik of Akdeniz University to restore the monumental stage structure, putting together the blocks recovered from five meters of alluvial soil in the past five years of excavation.
for the Olympics. The stadium in Magnesia ad Maeandrum, 15km west of Ephesos, is built entirely of marble, with seats for 40,000 spectators. The wall around the sphendone is decorated with symbols of the gladiators, i.e. 129 images of shields, helmets, and spears while the seats are marked with inscriptions of letters denoting numbers and also names of certain nearby cities, ready for groups of important visitors from those cities.\textsuperscript{805}

The two gladiators (C27) may also relate to circus games and the related entertainment for the public. More types point in the same direction. The lion attacking a smaller animal, probably a hare (C52-55) is an eloquent image alluding to the spectacles staged at the circus. The type is paired with a massive, exotic animal – hippopotamus or rhinoceros – another image of the circus spectacles and public games (C56).\textsuperscript{806}

Artemis Ephesia and Ephesian Tokens

Popular gods and goddesses from Greek and Roman mythology are represented on 31 of our selected tokens. Amongst these, Artemis is depicted on six (C28-34), Nike on four (C42-44) and the Three Graces on four (C34-37), all with slight variations.

Typical of Ephesos coins and tokens is the image of Artemis Ephesia. The Artemision, her sanctuary, originally erected in wood in the eighth century BCE, three times rebuilt but unfortunately finally destroyed during the attacks of the Goths, was one of the Seven Wonders of the World. The temple was renowned for its rich treasury.\textsuperscript{807} The sanctuary of Artemis Ephesia was the most famous cult site of its era, rivalled only by that of her twin, Apollo, at his celebrated Oracle temple at Didyma, some 50 kilometers south of Ephesos.\textsuperscript{808}

\textsuperscript{805} The stadium in Magnesia, excavated under the leadership of Orhan Bingöl of Ankara University, ongoing since 1985, was recovered from 70 metres of earth, measuring from the sphendone. In Ephesos, another Gymnasium has recently been discovered. As the whole structure emerges, Sabine Ladstaettaer from the ÖAW, head of the Ephesos excavation, believes it to be the biggest in the Roman Empire known so far.

\textsuperscript{806} Cf. Rowan 2020, 98, 106–07.

\textsuperscript{807} For details of the first British excavations carried out on the site of the Temple and a list and pictures of the treasure discovered, see D. Hogarth 1908.I and II. This eloquent quotation by Pausanias (4.31.8) expresses the importance of the Temple: ‘But all cities worship Artemis of Ephesus, and individuals hold her in honor above all the gods. The reason, in my view, is the renown of the Amazons, who traditionally dedicated the image, also the extreme antiquity of this sanctuary. Three other points as well have contributed to her renown, the size of the temple, surpassing all buildings among men, the eminence of the city of the Ephesians and the renown of the goddess who dwells there.’ Pausanias. Pausanias Description of Greece with an English Translation by W.H.S. Jones, Litt.D., and H.A. Ormerod, M.A., in 4 Volumes. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd. 1918. Retrieved from http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Paus.+4.31.8&fromdoc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0160 (last accessed 14/11/2021).

\textsuperscript{808} Quotation from Pausanias regarding the temple: ‘The sanctuary of Apollo at Didyma, and his oracle, are earlier than the immigration of the Ionians, while the cult of Ephesian Artemis is far more ancient still than their coming.’ Pausanias (7.2.6). Pausanias Description of Greece with an English Translation by W.H.S. Jones, Litt.D., and H.A. Ormerod, M.A., in 4 Volumes. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd. 1918. Retrieved from
century CE surviving marble cult statue of Artemis, a Roman copy, is mirrored in our tokens, only with a different headdress. The statue is on display in the Ephesos Archaeological Museum, a variation of the goddess’s ancient representation on Greek and Roman Provincial coins, struck at Ephesos. The marble statue was found intact beneath the Prytanaeum of Ephesos in 1956. On seven of our tokens, uniface barring one, the famous Artemis Ephesia image with her tapering figure and impressive turreted headdress is depicted.

The small lead token surfaces are worn, so that it is not possible to discern the decorative details on her statue, familiar from coins and marble or terracotta sculptures, such as the egg-shaped breasts as fertility symbols or the bees, lions, animal figures, her sacred stags on either side of her, though it is possible to envision them.

The tokens C28-34 are worthy of note. On C33, Artemis stands between Androcles, the legendary founder of Ephesos, to her left and Tyche to her right, the whole beneath an arch of branches, reminiscent of the monumental marble gateway entrance to the Ephesos Artemision altar. Another possible interpretation is associated with the ephesian type of Artemis kneeling and bathing inside a semi-circular arch-like grotto surmounted by the figure of Aktaion with antlers. The inscription Μ Α Γ Ι above the arch on C33 could be an abbreviation of ΜΑΓΙΣΤΡΟΣ; ΤΙΜΙ in exergue, to be deciphered. This token in particular gives such a festive air, we may assume it was used during the annual religious celebration in honour of the goddess. C34 is the only Artemis token with images on both faces, her cult statue on A and the Three Graces on B, another reference to the dancing and singing in the Artemision on feast days. Although in mythology Artemis at her own request was endowed with eternal virginity by Zeus, she was also celebrated as a goddess of fertility, which explains her connection in this token with the naked Three Graces. The token C30 shows an unusual, perhaps unique,
Artemis Ephesia with rays of light on either side, a star in the left upper field and a crescent in the right, which may suggest her identification as Selene, the moon goddess whereas the sun could be a reference to her twin brother Apollo, the sun god. The Artemis in C31 is inscribed ΕΦΕΣΙΩΝ on the circumference, a useful label confirming the cult in Ephesos. In C32, a more primitive version of Artemis Ephesia is inscribed ΑΠΟΦΟΡΗΤΟΝ. According to Lidell-Scott Jones, this refers to presents which guests received at table to take home. The token may have been dealt out at a celebration meal and exchanged later for a gift. A similar inscription ΑΠΟΦΟΡΗΤΟΝ is found on the circumference of token C36, surrounding a classical image of the Three Graces, the Charites, dancing naked arm in arm, the central figure with her back turned, the figures on either side facing. In his ‘Sylloge’ Rostovtzeff publishes 84 Roman tokens of the type ‘Modius with ears of Wheat:Three Graces’, which he assumes were used in exchange for wheat.

Artemis is further honoured on the tokens by the representations of her attributes, such as the bee, stag, bull and the dog. Of the three uniface tokens in the catalogue with the image of a bee (C70, C71, C72), token C71 stands out with the inscription ΓΡΑΒΟΥΕΥΡΑΜΙΠ on the circumference. ΓΡΑ may be read as an abbreviation of ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΩΣ, and ΒΟΥλΗΣ (=GRAMMATEÔS BOULÈS, of the Secretary of the Council) while ΕΥΡΑΜΙΠ (...) is the name of the magistrate. C72 comes probably from the same die but the inscription is far less clear. In Roman Imperial Athens a type with the busts of Antoninus Pius on one side and Athena on the other reads ΒΟΥΛΗΣ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΩΣ ΠΑΜΜΙΝΟΥ. Therefore, in

‘there to order the lovely dance of the Muses and Graces. There she hangs up her curved bow and her arrows, and leads the dances, gracefully arrayed, while all they utter their heavenly voice, singing how neat-ankled Leto bore children among the immortals both in thought and in deed.’ Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns, Epic Cycle, Homera. Translation by Evelyn-White, H. G. Loeb Classical Library Vol 57. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. Retrieved from https://www.gutenberg.org/files/348/348-h/348-h.htm#chap62 (14/11/2021).

---


816 Gülbay and Kireç (2008, 42) read on the same types ‘ΒΟΥΛΗΣ ΑΕΩΣ ΠΑΜΜΙΝΟΥ’ and consider this to be a greeting, without explaining the meaning or giving references.

both cities tokens were issued by the Secretary of the Council to be exchanged for some kind of gift or benefaction or simply to permit entrance on a particular occasion.

Both the bee and the deer often appear on Hellenistic Ephesos coins and continue to be used on Roman coins. In the original cult statue, Artemis is flanked by a deer on either side of her providing supports on which she leans. The stag on C59 and C60 comprises a particularly vivid image. On two of the tokens, C47 and C48, the sacrificial bull, also a symbol of fertility and power, is depicted standing, looking right. Traces of an inscription on the circumference of C48 may be read as ? I K O-XA I I ? As the goddess of freshwater lakes and sacred springs, which often surround her sanctuaries, the images of frog (C63), fish (C64), and crab (C65) are also attributes of Artemis. The crab is inscribed BOY[ΛΗΣ] ΠΡΑΜ[ΜΑΤΕΩΣ] on the circumference, indicating the Secretary of the Council as the host of the event that the token was used for.

Artemis/Diana is best known as a huntress. Five of our tokens, C52-56, all similar but not exactly the same, show a lion attacking a much smaller animal with long ears, probably a hare in flight. The lion has a rich mane and a beautifully curved tail ending in a tuft of fur. This is an unusual motif which also appears on three ‘Gülbay and Kireç’ tokens, 54, 55b and 58, where the image is crudely executed. The symbolism indicates the powerful huntress goddess Artemis destroying the weak. In the hunting scene on token C49, this time the hare is attacked by a dog, with an inscription on the circumference, ΑΙΩΝΟ above and ΑΤΟΥ below; a piece is broken off on the right edge and therefore the inscription is incomplete. Her dogs were famed for their strength, enough to overpower a lion.

Coin iconography has served as inspiration for tokens. An interesting example is the coin of Trajan with his portrait on the obverse and the image of Artemis Ephesia with Androclos on her right, the legendary founder of Ephesos, and a captive kneeling on her left not unsimilar to C33. Another coin of Trajan bears the attribute of Artemis, the stag on the reverse. The emperor Hadrian’s Ephesos coin of Leto, carrying the twins, Apollo and Artemis, the basis of the story of the cult of Artemis, is an example of the importance given by

---

818 For references to bees on the Gülbay and Kireç tokens and in Crosby see the catalogue C70-72. For early Greek images of bees on coins, see BMC British Museum Catalogue of Coins from Ionia: Ephesus, Pl. IX 3–8, fifth-fourth century BCE as well as Demeester and Daubersy 2002, 64–65. For a Roman bee image, see RPC Vol.I no.2574 side B: an inscription on the circumference reveals the name of the magistrate grammateus Glaukon of Ephesos. An interesting image of a bee next to the Artemis cult statue is found on side B of a Trajan Ephesos coin: RPC Vol.III no.2050. Side B of an Ephesos coin of Augustus and Livia has a stag standing on ground line looking right, inscribed with the name of the magistrate Asklas: RPC Vol.I.no.2585.

819 RPC III 2053–55.

820 RPC III 2052 also in the collection of Tatiş no: 126, SNG Turkey 10.
Hadrian to the myth regarding the birth of the goddess. However, the best example of the mingling of the Latin culture with the Hellenic one is represented on a coin of Claudius Augustus and his wife Agrippina II. There, we see on the obverse, the imperial portraits and on the reverse, the image of Artemis Ephesia actually labeled as Diana Ephesia in Latin letters. A hundred or so years later, the exact same image appears on a coin of Hadrian.

Ephesian tokens with representations of ancient Greek gods and goddesses and their symbolism

A second well-attested goddess on Ephesian tokens is the winged goddess of victory, Nike/Victoria. Her image on our tokens C42, C43 and C44 is a classical one, a type popular both in the Hellenistic and the Roman era. She is in full figure, turning right, a palm branch on her left shoulder, her right arm outstretched holding out a wreath in her hand, her long wings reaching down to the edge of her robe. Even on the small surface of the token, the figure has a certain grace, flying to purvey victory. One of the most famous Hellenistic statues in the world, the second century BCE marble Nike from Samothrace, must have inspired all artists creating Nike figures for victorious patrons. C42 and C44 are inscribed ΜΥ-ΩΝ on the circumference. A parallel token from an auction bears the same inscription, with the solution ‘Myon’ given as the meaning in Greek of a ‘bundle of muscles’, i.e. strength. On C38, side A, it is possible to recognize Athena the great patroness and protector of Athens, as Athena Nikephoros, holding a small figure of Nike in her right palm, an unusual image on tokens but well-known from the reverse of coins issued by Lysimachos of Thrace. Athena was known never to lose a battle; as we see, Nike is carried as a symbol in her hands, but a combination of

---

821 RPC III, 2057.
822 RPC I, 2224.
823 RPC III 1330–1330AA.
824 For an artistic first century CE image of Victoria on coins see the reverse of a Vespasian coin, RPC Vol.II no.827A.
825 Leu Numismatik AG Web Auction 16 22-24 May 2021, A collection of lead tesserae, lot 3133. The source of the collection is given as Asia Minor, but of ‘uncertain’ locality. However, judging by the parallel iconography to the Gülbay and Kireç Catalogue of the private Hasan Kireç token collection from Ephesos and hinterland, this collection is almost certainly from Ephesos as well. Even the rare image of the elephant emerging from its shell (auction nos 3214,3215,3216; our C50-51) is the same. We are grateful to Clare Rowan for bringing this auction site to our attention. https://www.numisbids.com/n.php?p=sale&sid=4713&cid=145245 (last accessed 14/11/2021)
both goddesses in the image must have been in celebration of a great victory, signifying a special token. Side B is an elaborate rosette in a square frame.

Poseidon, Heracles, Asclepios, Hekate, Tyche complete the group in the token type of god and goddess images. Token C25 with Poseidon is a particularly eloquent example of the sea god riding a large fish, waving his trident in the air.

Images on the tokens of traditional ancient Greek mythical animals such as the griffin (C77-78), the capricorn (C73) and the centaur (C74-76), each with their own function and story, are signs that the people still believed in them. The two griffin tokens are dissimilar: on C77, the body of the griffin is much bigger whereas on C78, the high-stepping body is slimmer and more refined, and his large wings are much more evident. In Greek mythology, the griffin had the power to protect sanctuaries, as it was able to attack enemies from the sky as well as on land. Once more, the Romans adopted this symbolical creature. On C75 and C76, the centaur is Chiron, playing the lyre. Chiron, half man half horse, was said to have been instructed by Artemis, Apollo, Achilles and Asclepios in hunting, music, medicine and prophecy. Chiron was turned into the constellation Centaurus (or Sagittarius) by Zeus. The centaur token C76 is inscribed ΓΕΡ, abbreviation of ΓΕΡΟΥΣΙΑ. In Ephesos, the Sacred Gerousia, Council of Elders, was established before the end of the first century CE and revived by Hadrian when it gained its independence from the city authorities. In the second and third centuries CE, the Sacred Gerousia was responsible for fund management, either by lending considerable sums of money or as recipient of endowments. This body was also charged with the conduct of imperial cult festivals. Tokens struck under the name of the Gerousia bear evidence of the role played by the institution as distributor of gifts and benefactions as well as host of festivals. Similar is the evidence from contemporary Athens, where token types with cult statues are inscribed as ‘Of The Sacred Gerousia’ and a substantial concentration of tokens excavated in or in the immediate vicinity of the seat of the Sacred Gerousia provide powerful evidence for the role that the Council of Elders played as issuer and distributor of participation tokens for festivals run under its auspices. The capricorn depicted on C73, is identified as the satyr Pan turned into a sea-goat with a fish tail. An overflowing cornucopia, symbol of

826 Oliver 1941, 21–27. See in particular the case of the Salutaris endowment (I.Ephesos 27) as analysed by Rogers 1991, 62–63
827 Crosby 1964, 118–19 L244 and L310, dated third century CE; Gikaki forthcoming.
plenty, is included in the background. Pan was also placed in the skies by Zeus as the constellation Capricorn. The capricorn appears on the reverse of Octavian Augustus Asian denarii, but this image, as many other of this type, is very different from the one on our token. The capricorn is thin and long, head turned backwards, with a short fish tail, as opposed to the image on C73, where the body is large and strong, the head upright looking right, and the fish tail is long and curving upwards. Regarding the use of these tokens, it is only possible to generalise that they must have been handed out by the Gerousia to be used for free entertainment.

There is a very fine uniface token C82 with the depiction of a kantharos, a two-handled drinking cup which is typically associated with Dionysos. The shape of the kantharos is very elegant. It has a long stem rising from the base into the full body followed by a thin neck holding up a wide rim. The two handles are long and curved. Uniface tokens with drinking cups are attested in the Athenian Agora. One is very similar in shape to the kantharos on the Ephesian tokens and comes from a Late Hellenistic context.

Thirty-four of the tokens are inscribed, eleven of which are aniconic. Only two tokens are inscribed with the ethnic or its derivatives: Artemis on C31 EΦΕΙΩΝ; Tyche/Fortuna on C40 [EΦΕ]CIAC.

Six bear single letters: Letter B (C1 and C22b); letter N (C2 and C62), letter X (C3), letter Λ or the latin numeral V (C11b). C4 and C5 are inscribed with two letters, XB, in dotted circle and come from the same stamp. The roles and functions of the lead lettered tokens in Ephesos and in Rome remains a puzzle. We are far better informed in the case of lettered tokens of Late Classical Athens. There, lettered tokens were issued in clay, bronze and lead. The bronze lettered tokens assigned jurors to their sitting places in the courts and were labelled with the twenty-four letters of the alphabet plus the character/symbol ‘sampi’. The twenty-five signs were convenient deviators for the numbers 200, 500, 1000, the number of jury men who

---

829 E.g. RPC Vol. VI no.508 side B. Cf. Add a general reference to capricorn as the special propaganda symbol: Rowan 2018, 156-158 for the capricorn as the special symbol of Augustean propaganda.

830 Crosby 1964, 105 (L201). Cf. Another one which seems to be of Hellenistic date from a cistern containing the Herulian debris published by Crosby 196, 105 L202 and Gkikaki 2019, 140 cat. No. 169 with fig. 23 on p. 133.


832 Two examples of lead lettered token types of Rome: https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/TURS3446 and https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/TURS3507 (last accessed: 14/11/2021). The authors wish to thank Clare Rowan for the suggestion.
were impanelled to participate in the Athenian courts. The lead lettered tokens are the Hellenistic successors of their bronze counterparts. Study of the clay lettered tokens has begun only recently. They may have been associated with the workings of the Assembly and the seating arrangement for the Assembly attenders. The Ephesian type with ‘Herm: Letter B’ seems to make a meaningful reference to Athenian token types and could be considered as a type, even deliberately imitating a classical Athenian one. Further considerations can connect the Ephesian type to Athens. The lead token type with Herm and palm branch, inscribed ΓΡΑ and attributed to the Secretary (Grammateus of the Council) is a token type of Roman Athens published by Svoronos. Until further research sheds more light, cautiousness is needed. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the Herm is a type commonly shared by Athens and Rome.

In contrast to the theory that Athens could have served as a model for the lettered tokens, there is another possibility: some of the lead lettered tokens of the Museum of Ephesos are similar to their Athenian counterparts, which lends support to the assumption that tokens travelled. This is at least the explanation which was given for the lead lettered token which was found among the remains of a shipwreck off the coast of Israel.

A token with the types Artemis Ephesia / Bee has been excavated in Sardis from a context of first century CE. It finds its closest parallel on a published token from Ephesos of unknown provenance, a comparison, which nevertheless lends further support to the theory that tokens did in fact travel. However, only future research may enlighten the circumstances under which tokens ‘travelled’ or even demonstrate that certain types were popular in broader areas and were shared by more than one center of production and other communities.

C10, uniface, is inscribed: ΚΤΠΑ|ΤΟΝΕΙΚΟΥΑΓΟΠΑΝΟΜ, with an abbreviation attached to the letter M, designating the diphthong OY. A token of the Gülbay and Kireç

---

833 Boegehold et al. 1995, 67–76.
834 Crosby 1964, 86.
835 Makrypodi 2019.
836 Cf. Makrypodi and Kroll in this volume.
837 Svoronos 1900, 323 (no. 232 pl. III 26). The Athenian example is very similar in terms of style to its Ephesian counterpart.
839 Meshorer 2010, 132 (no. 162 with fig. on p. 133).
840 De Rose Evans 2018, 245 (L1 pl. 6); Gülbay and Kireç 99–100 (no.107). Clare Rowan per litteras.
publication is inscribed ΜΕΝΙΠΠΟΥ ΑΓΟΡΑΝΟΜΟΥ on the reverse. The term agoranomos literally means ‘market inspector’. The agoranomoi were officers who regulated the prices at the agora, ensured the quality of the goods and the fairness of prices and guaranteed the weights and measures. In the Roman Period, the office was considered a liturgy and entailed a certain financial burden. The agoranomoi were members of the elite of a city and secured the food supply, esp. of grain and oil, at reasonable prices. Tokens of Roman Egypt inscribed ΑΓΟ may have been associated with the agoranomoi partly based on evidence of texts preserved on papyri. Denise Wilding, who has recently studied the relevant evidence from Roman Egypt concluded that the agoranomoi sponsored oil and grain distributions for the population, as well as banquets, and that access to all the above was permitted by means of the ΑΓΟ tokens. Of the Athenian tokens inscribed ΑΓ, ΑΓΟ ΑΓΟΡ and ΑΓΟΡΑΝΟΜΩΝ, only the latter should be safely related to agoranomoi and their functions. For the three former categories, the reading ΑΓΟΡΑΣΤΙΚΟΝ and therefore symbola agorastika should be considered as far more probable. The suggestion that the ΑΓ, ΑΓΟ and ΑΓΟΡ tokens were tax receipts has been refuted by Bubelis. The fact that in Ephesos the office of Agoranomos was held by members of the elite and constituted a typical post in the curriculum of the elite members is well attested by inscriptions. The Agoranomos Stratoneikos is known only through this lead token in the Ephesos Museum. The name Stratoneikos is attested on quite a few inscriptions. Among them, there are examples where the name is a cognomen of the tria nomina, according to the naming formula typical from the beginning of the third century onwards with the Constitutio Antoniniana and the institutional Romanisation of all free citizens of the Roman Empire. It would be reasonable to think that it is the same person as G. Julius Stratoneikos, mentioned on an inscription from the time of Commodus among other Kouretes,

Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 152 (no. 234b).
Wilding 2020.
Tokens inscribed ΑΓ, ΑΓΟ, ΑΓΟΡ: Crosby 1964, 102 (L170 pl. 25) and 105 (L194 pl. 26).
Crosby 1964, 80–81; Bubelis 2013,
I. Ephesos 558, 523, 645, 742, 847, 917, 919, 922, 924a, 923, 923a, 927a, 930-1, 934a-7a, 938, 962, 1061, 3014, 3059, 3070, 3144, 3493, 3854, 4343, 5102, 5105.
The token was mistakenly included in the Ephesus Museum Collection of Byzantine Lead Seals.
SEG 48.1381 list of names of the first century AD
Rizakis 2019, 256–57.
the religious association which played an important role in the cult of the Artemis Ephesia. M. Stateilios Stratoneikos is a prytanis on inscriptions of Caracalla’s reign, while Aurelius Stratoneikos is named on two different funerary inscriptions of the third century CE. The prosopography of Roman Ephesos should provide evidence for the interpretation of the tokens inscribed ΔΑΜΑ (C7) and ΜΗΝΟ (C41). The proper name Damas is attested on inscriptions of Roman Ephesos. Among the persons bearing the name, the pankratist and boxer M. Aurelius Demostratus Damas should have been a prominent figure of the late second and early third centuries CE. ΜΗΝΟ should be better understood as the abbreviation of a longer name such as Μηνογένης, Μηνόκριτος, Μηνόδοτος, Μηνόδωρος, Μηνόφαντος, Μηνόφιλος, for which multiple references are preserved on inscriptions of Roman Ephesos.

C11 is inscribed ΤΦΛΛΑ | ΜΙΘΠΙ | ΔΑΤΟΥ on side a: (ΤΙΤΟΥ ΦΛΑΒΙΟΥ ΜΙΘΡΙΔΑΤΟΥ). Mithridates is a name rarely mentioned on inscriptions of Ephesos with one distinct exception: the Arch of Mazaeus and Mithridates erected in Ephesos in the Agora in the year 3 BCE. The arch was commissioned by two freedmen of the imperial household who dedicated the monument in honour of their patrons, Augustus and Marcus Agrippa. It would be tempting to presume the Mithridates on the token at the Museum of Ephesos was also also a freedma. In any case, some evidence points to the second and third centuries CE: Token no. 230, uniface, in the Gülbay-Kireç catalogue, is inscribed with the name ΤΦΛ | ΙΥΛΙΑ | ΝΟΥ ΠΡ | ΟΚΛΟΥ. The Titi Flavii were descendants of the well-known Roman Titus Flavius Python of Ephesos in Kuhn, which the author reinterprets from this inscription. Titus Flavius Mithridates may belong to the same family. Even more intriguing is the sign V on side b. It should be interpreted as a numeral. Numerals on tokens are well attested from a special category of Roman bronze tesserae with either erotic scenes or portraits of the Roman Imperial family on one side and numerals on the other. According to the most probable theory, they have been interpreted as counters of a game. Among those, there is a particular sub-group with a male portrait and the inscription C(aius) MITREIVS L(ucii) F(ilius) MAG(ister)

850 I.Ephesos 47 (line 46).
851 I. Ephesos 476 and 625.
852 I. Ephesos 3283 and 4286.
853 SEG 27.746; 53.486; 53.1279.
855 Kuhn 2014, 139–40.
IVVENT(utis) (Gaius Mitreius, son of Lucius, *magister* of the youth) on one side. In each case the names should refer to familiar and well-known persons of the civic elite, who would have sponsored the issue of these tokens.⁸⁵⁶ In Athens, where the survival record of the tokens of the Roman Imperial period is much lower than in Ephesos, magistrate names have survived on tokens. Besides Pamminos, already mentioned above, there is an issue by the secretary of the Council, Aurelius Vassus.⁸⁵⁷

In addition to those just discussed, other types refer to private individuals. The ingenious designs of the elephant emerging from a sea-shell (*C50-51*) and the chariot driven by mice (*C57*) are well known from Roman gemstones and should be interpreted as the personal choice of the sponsors.⁸⁵⁸

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, judging by the iconographic content of the Ephesian tokens, it becomes evident how the original Greek tradition of borrowing the iconography of fourth century BCE coins, first on their bronze tokens, then on their lead tokens is continued in the Roman Imperial period. The majority of the lead tokens in the Ephesos Archaeological Museum collection and those of the private Kireç collection reflect scenes from ancient Greek mythology of the Olympian gods. The legend ΕΦΕΣΙΩΝ obviously refers to the Demos.

The inscriptions betray the Demos, the Council and the Gerousia as issuers and distributors of tokens, on condition that the legends ΕΦΕΣΙΩΝ, ΒΟΥΓΡΑ, and ΓΕΡ respectively are interpreted correctly. The iconography suggests that the cult of Artemis Ephesia may have served as the occasion for dispensing them, a theory already known through inscriptions and most notably from the Salutaris endowment. The legend - ΑΠΟΦ[ΟΡΗΤΟΝ] – can occasionally refer to such a connection. Members of the civic elite, often in some official capacity, were the initiators of such distributions. The study of tokens serves to preserve their names, which would otherwise be lost in obscurity, as in the case of the newly discovered Agoranomos Stratoneikos and Titus Flavius Mithridates. Tokens were issued and used on a particular wide range of occasions, mostly in connection with institutions. The institutional

---

⁸⁵⁶ Küter 2019, 84 and 93.


framework for tokens as well as private initiatives may be observed in both Ephesos and Athens.

**List of Inscriptions on the Tokens**

C1. Letter B
C3. Letter X.
C4. Letters X B, all in circle of dots.
C5. Letters X B, all in circle of dots.
C6. Monogram, T, M, V, O, all in round incuse. Possible solutions are Amitou, Timaiou, Ammytou, Matou, Amatiou, Tamiou; perhaps Timaios would be the best name.859

C7. Δ A / MA
C8. Three lines crude letters A O | W A V | N
C9. Legend in three lines: IMGI | APAT | OY, all in circle of dots.
C10. CTPA | TONEIK | OYAGOR | ANOM. The last letter bears an abbreviation designating OY.

C12. VILI and L( or N)G (all retrograde).
C22. Side A. Inscription on circumference: left A O, right Π I C ?
Side B: Letter B.
C31. Side A. Inscribed circumference ΕΦΕΣΙΩΝ.
C32. Side A. ΑΠΟΦ[ΟΡΗΣ] [ΟΡΗΤΟΝ].
C33. Side A. Μ A Γ I above arch, T I M I in exergue.
C36. Side A. Inscribed around edge: letters at the left edge cut off flan, TTON or ΠΟΝ at the right edge, Α[ΠΟΦΟΡΗΣ] – TTON
C40. Side A. ΕΦΕ [C I A C]
C41. Side A. ΜΗ-ΝΟ.
C44. Side A. ΜΥ-ΩΝ around edge
C48. Side A. Ι Κ Ο-ΧΑ Ι Ι

---

859 The authors would like to thank W. Seibt for the reading.
C49. Above ΑΙΩΝ, below ΤΟΥ on circumference
C58. Alpha (Α) above and Phi (Φ) below
C65. Side A. ΒΟΥΛΗΣ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΣ on circumference
C67. Side A. inscribed Ο Ο Α above bird, C below, the design and the inscription in incuse
C71. Side A. ΓΡΑΒΟΥΕΥΑΡΜΙΙ
C72. ΡΑΒ…..ΜΙ
C76. Side A. in the field left: ΓΕΡ, abbreviation of ΓΕΡΟΥΣΙΑ.
C79. [Β]ΟΥ left, and [ΓΡΑ] right on circumference
C80. Side A. [.]BOY[.]C
C86. VTNT circumference

Catalogue

The material of all tokens in the catalogue is lead.
The inventory numbers refer to the Museum of Ephesos.

I. Letters and Names

1. 13 mm, 1.60 g., uniface
   Inv. No.: 16/29/80
   Letter B
   Ref: No exact parallels among the Ephesian Tesserae.
   Lettered tokens comprise a special category of Late Classical tokens of Athens. For late Classical lead lettered token with the letter B: Svoronos 1900, 323 (nos. 19–25 pl. I, 10–14 (https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/svoronos1900.19 last accessed 14/11/2021); Crosby 1964, 87 L10 (IL974).

2. 12 mm, 2.00 g., uniface
   Inv. No.: 19/9/86, purchase.
   Letter N in wreath.
3. 14 mm, 2.70 g., uniface
Inv. No.:21/29/80
Letter X
Ref: No exact parallels among the Ephesian Tesserae. For the lead lettered tokens in general see cat. nos. 1 and 2 above.

4. 15 mm, 3.30 g., uniface
Inv. No.:35/29/80
Letters X B, all in circle of dots.

5. 15 mm, 2.70 g., uniface
Inv. No.:39/29/80
Letters X B, all in circle of dots.
Ref: For parallels see cat. no. 82 above.

6. 14 mm, 3.95 g., uniface, incusum
Inv. No.:7/17/85, purchase.
Obv.: Monogram, T, M, V, O, all in round incuse
Alpha on the left side of the My. Possible readings are Amitou, Timaiou, Ammytiou, Matou, Amatiou, Tamiou; perhaps Timaios would be the best name.

7. 13 mm, 1.40 g., uniface
Inv. No.:12/52/80, purchase.
Inscription: Δ A / MA
Ref: No known parallels among Ephesian Tesserae.

8. 18 mm, 3.65 g., uniface, crude letters
Inv. No.:7/29/80
Three lines crude letters;
A O | W A V | . N
This is probably a personal name.
9. 16 mm, 2.75 g., uniface.
Inv. No.: 152/42/81, donation
Legend in three lines:
IMGI | APAT | OΥ, all in circle of dots.
This is probably a personal name in three lines.
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 152 (no. 234b inscribed ΜΕΝΙΠΠΟΥ ΑΓΟΡΑΝΟΜΟΥ).

10. 17 mm, 2.35 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 3/29/80,
Legend in four lines, all in dotted circle.
CTPA | TONEIK | ΟΥΑΓΟΠ | ANOM. The last letter bears an abbreviation designating OY.
This token has already been published as it was wrongly placed among the Byzantine lead seal collection: Cheynet 1999, 319 (no. 2).
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 152 (no. 234b inscribed MENIIPIOY AGORANOMOY).

11. 17 mm, 3.85 g. Inv. No.: 32/29/80
Side a: Legend in three lines: Τ ΦΛΑ | ΜΙΘΡΙ | ΔΑΤΟΥ (ΤΙΤΟΥ ΦΛΑΒΙΟΥ ΜΙΘΡΙΔΑΤΟΥ)
Side b: Numeral V
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 150 (no. 230 the token is uniface and is inscribed with Τ ΦΛ | ΙΥΑΙΑ | ΝΟΥ ΙΠ | ΟΚΛΟΥ but the types of letters are very similar).

II. Heads
12. 17 mm, 3.20 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 43/29/80
Male, head right, bald, wrinkled forehead, crooked nose and long beard, inscribed VILI and L (or N)G (all retrograde).
Ref: No known parallels.

13. 17 mm, 3.25 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 17/9/86, purchase.
Male, beardless portrait with short hair, right (Antinous?)
Ref: Leu Numismatik AG, Web Auction 16, 22-24 May 2021, Lot 3154

14. mm, 2.20 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 6/20/85, purchase.
Male, bearded head right (wearing a cap?)
Ref: No known exact parallels among the Ephesian Tesserae. For a parallel among the Athenian lead tesserae: Crosby 1964, 113 (L273 IL268 side B).

15. 16 mm, 2.40 g., uniface, oval, worn
Inv. No.: 13/29/80
Head of Medusa in high relief, garland below
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 141 (no. 209). Head of Medusa on Athenian tokens: Crosby 1964, 94 (L77-L78) and 103 (L182).

16. 16 mm, 2.90 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 9/17/85, purchase.
Head of Medusa
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 141 (no. 210).

17. 13 mm, 1.95 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 15/14/86, purchase
Head of Medusa
Ref: Gülbay & Kireç 2008, 141 (no. 210).
18. 14 mm, 1.70 g.
Inv. No.: 65/5/86, purchase.
Side A: Head of Medusa
Side B: Bird
Ref: For the Medusa: see cat. nos. 14-16 above. For the bird: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 85 (no. 63).

III. Male Figures

19. 16 mm, 2.85 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 12/9/86, purchase.
Asclepius leaning on staff, holding patera in extended right hand.
Inscription: Π left, Α right.
Ref: Cf. the Athenian token of Roman date Crosby 1964, 95 (L85 IL1192)

20. 17 mm, 2.35 g., uniface.
Inv. No.: 3/27/80, purchase.
Herakles, facing, club in right hand, pouch in the left.
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 71 (no. 32).

21. 14 mm, 2.30 g., uniface. Worn
Inv. No.: 15/31/84, purchase.
Herakles (?) powerful figure standing, facing, stepping on small figure of enemy with right foot, brandishing club in right hand, inscribed with large M left, three more letters on the field right. The design and the inscription are executed in incuse.
Ref: No known parallels.

22. 15 mm, 3.45 g.
Inv. No.: 75/9/85, purchase.
Side A: Herm right on circular base.
Circular inscription: left A O rt Π I C ?
Side B: Letter B.
Ref: No known parallels. For herms on Athenian tokens: Crosby 1964, 104–05 L193–L198. For lead lettered types among the Athenian tokens: Crosby 1964, ###
23. 15 mm, 1.35 g.
Inv. No.:81/6/86, purchase.
Side A: Mars standing left, resting right hand on grounded spear and left hand on grounded shield.
Side B: Semi-draped (?) female figure (Venus?) holding a lock of hair with her left hand and supporting a small winged Victoria with her right hand, another small Victoria in the field left.

24. 19 mm, 4.20 g., uniface
Inv. No.:10/29/80, confiscated.
Poseidon left, resting raised left arm on grounded sceptre, holding something in extended right arm and raised right leg rested on rock, in field right one letter illegible and the letter Λ, all in round incuse.
Ref: No known parallels among the Ephesian tokens.

25. 20 mm, 5.70 g., uniface.
Inv. No.:6/29/80, confiscated.
Poseidon right, trident in right hand, seated on large fish with flipper-like extensions on each side of its mouth.

26. 14 mm, 1.90 g., uniface
Inv. No.:205/28/81, purchase.
Victorious athlete standing facing, head to left, holding wreath in his right hand and palm frond in his left. Leu Numismatik AG, Web Auction 16, 22-24 May 2021, Lot 3156 (uniface)
Ref: https://www.numisbids.com/n.php?p=lot&sid=4713&lot=3156
27. 13.5 mm, 0.95 g., uniface  
Inv. No.: 30/29/80, confiscated.  
Two gladiators standing facing one another.  
Ref: Classical Numismatic Group Electronic Auction 458  
Auction date: 18 December 2019  
Lot number: 564  
https://auctions.cngcoins.com/lots/view/4-80WKW/asia-minor-uncertain-1st-3rd-century-ad-lot-of-two-2-pb-tesserae and  
https://www.coinarchives.com/a/openlink.php?l=1591303|3345|564|5af8faa5986c52cddd66d4c7aa4d671c (last accessed 15/3/2021)

IV. Female Figures

28. 18 mm, 2.85 g., uniface  
Inv. No.: 68/5/86, purchase.  
Artemis Ephesia.  
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 122–30 (nos. 161–81, most of them are uniface or they are paired with some other design on the other side).

29. 14 mm, 1.50 g., uniface  
Inv. No.: 25/9/86, purchase.  
Artemis Ephesia, partially off flan  
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 122–30 (nos. 161–81) (most of them are uniface or they are paired with some other design on the other side).

30. 18 mm, 2.85 g., uniface  
Inv. No.: 7/47/80, purchase.  
Artemis Ephesia, framed by rays of light, in field upper left star, in field upper right crescent.  
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 122–30 (nos. 161–81) with no exact parallels for the rays of light, the star and the crescent.
31. 20 mm, 3.50 g., uniface. Small hole due to corrosion.

  Inv. No.: 29/29/80, confiscated.
  Artemis Ephesia, inscribed around ΕΦΕΣΙΩΝ.
  Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 124 (no. 166 reading ΕΦΕΣΙΩΝ).

32. 15 mm, 1.50 g., uniface. Right edge broken off in parts, small piece broken off lower left edge.

  Inv. no.: 26/29/80, confiscated.
  Artemis Ephesia.
  Inscription: ΑΠΟΦΟΡΗΤΟΝ ..
  Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 148 (no. 224 side B inscribed ΑΠΟΦΟΡΗΤΟΝ). Note the biga with chariot driver, all in doted circle on side A of this type.
  According to Lidell-Scott Jones: ἀποφόρητος, ον, carried away; τὰ ἀ. presents which guests received at table to take home, Ath.6.229c, cf. Petron.56, Suet.Cal.55, Vesp.19.

33. 19 mm, 2.60 g., uniface

  Inv. No.: 18/22/86, purchase.
  Inside a roofed edifice or arch of branches Artemis Ephesia in the middle framed by Androclus (left) and Tyche enthroned and holding cornucopia with her left arm, star between Artemis Ephesia and Tyche.
  Inscription: Μ Α Γ Ι above arch, Τ Ι Μ Ι in exergue.
  Ref.: No known parallels. Similar to the reverse of Trajan’s issue RPC III, 2053

https://rpc.ashmus.ox.ac.uk/coins/3/2053 (last accessed 15/3/2021)

34. 6 mm, 4.05 g.

  Inv. No.: 17/22/86, purchase.
  Side A: Artemis Ephesia.
  Side B: Three Graces in dotted circle.
  Leu Numismatik AG, Web Auction 16, 22-24 May 2021, Lots 3126-99


35. 17 mm, 3.70 g., uniface
Inv. No.:4/27/80, purchase.
Three Graces
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 78-82 nos. 52-53 (one of the two sides); 82-83 nos. 55-58, 109-110 no. 131 (side B); Leu Numismatik AG, Web Auction 16, 22-24 May 2021, Lots 3126-3129 (uniface)
https://www.numisbids.com/n.php?p=sale&sid=4713&cid=145245&pg=2&so=1&search=&s=1 All from different stamps.

36. 13 mm, 2.35 g., uniface. Broken off on the upper edge.
Inv. No.:12/29/80, confiscated.
Three Graces, inscribed around edge: letters at the left edge cut off flan, letters ΠΟΝ or ΠΟΝ at the right edge partially cut off. The inscriptions should probably read ΑΠΟΦΟΡΗΤΟΝ when complete. It should be considered the same as ΑΠΟΦΟΡΗΤΟΝ
Ref: For parallels of the design cf. no. 12 above. For other tokens inscribed ΑΠΟΦΟΡΗΤΟΝ cf. no. 11 above.

37. 13 mm, 3.35 g., uniface. Piece broken off at lower left edge. Worn.
Inv. No.:37/29/80, confiscated.
Three Graces. On the right edge traces of the same inscription as no. 13. Probably of the same stamp as no. 13 above.
Ref: For parallels of the design cf. no. 12 above. For other tokens inscribed ΑΠΟΦΟΡΗΤΟΝ cf. no. 11 above.

38. 17 mm, 2.35 g.
Inv. No.:10/14/86, purchase.
Side A: Athena seated on a rock holding out right arm with Nike figurine standing on the palm of her right hand. The type copies a well-known coin type of Lysimachus.
Side B: Rosette within a rectangle.

39. 18 mm, 3.25 g., uniface. Alexandrian?
Inv. No.:9/29/80, confiscated.
Fortuna (Tyche) standing, facing, cornucopia in left hand, in field right: ΠΙΟΥ (field left corroded).

Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 76 (no. 46 inscribed ΕΥΕΛΠΙΟΥ).

40. 16 mm, 2.70 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 5/29/80, confiscated.
Fortuna (Tyche) in chiton and himation holding cornucopia in left arm and pouring libation with right on altar, inscribed: [ΕΦΕ] C I A C
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 75–77 nos.43–47 (none of them is an exact parallel).

41. 15.5 mm, 1.95 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 17/29/80, confiscated.
Hekate carrying basket on her head, inscribed MH-NO.
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 77(nos. 48 and 49).

42. 16 mm, 3.55 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 14/9/86, purchase.
Nike (Victoria) striding right, presenting wreath in right hand and resting palm branch on left shoulder. Traces of the legend ΜΥ-ΩΝ in the field left.
Ref: For the type of Nike see: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 59 (no. 1 Side A), 62 (no. 11) and 63 (no. 12); Crosby 1964, 89 L34 (IL722, side A of the Late Hellenistic period).

43. 14.5 mm, 1.65 g., uniface. Worn.
Inv. No.: 22/29/80, confiscated.
Nike (Victoria) striding right, presenting wreath in right hand and resting palm branch on left shoulder.
Ref: For the type of Nike see: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 59 (no. 1 Side A), 62 (no. 11), 63 (no. 12); Crosby 1964, 89 L34 (IL722, side A of the Late Hellenistic Period).

44. 15 mm, 2.35 g.
Inv. No.: 197/28/81, purchase.
Side A: Nike (Victoria) striding right, presenting wreath in right hand and resting palm branch on left shoulder, inscribed ΜΥ-ΩΝ around edge

Side B: Right hand

Ref: The Nike type is well attested among Ephesian tokens: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 59 (no. 1 Side A), 62 (no. 11) and 63 (no. 12). On the latter two, the legend is read as VM-NΩ. Leu Numismatik AG, Web Auction 16, 22-24 May 2021, Lot 3133

Cf. the Nike on the Athenian token Crosby 1964, 89 L34 (IL722, side A) of the Late Hellenistic period. Hand as a type is well attested on Roman tokens, e.g. TURS 237 no. 1990, https://coins.warwick.ac.uk/token-types/id/TURS1990 (last accessed 4/1/2022, and also on the small bronze tokens of Athens of Hellenistic date, e.g. Postolakas 1880, 22 (nos. 99–101).

45. 20 mm, 3.80 g., uniface. Worn
Inv. No.:20/29/80, confiscated.
Standing figure (Selene ?) facing, dressed in long garment with polos on head and both hands raised. Inscription illegible.
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 73 (no. 38 inscribed ΓΕΡ).

46. 15 mm, 2.35 g., uniface. Worn
Inv. No.:9/52/80, purchase.
Classical goddess holding unidentified item in extended right arm, resting left arm on grounded sceptre (Demeter, Hera?). Inscription illegible.
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 73 (no. 37).

V. Animals of the land and the sea

47. 13 mm, 1.45 g., uniface
Inv. No.:19/22/86, purchase.
Bull, right.
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 93–94 (nos. 89–91). No. 90 is of the same stamp.

48. 18 mm, 4.65 g., uniface
Inv. No.:46/29/80, confiscated
Bull, right, on ground line, inscribed: I K O-XA I I
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 93–94 (nos. 89-91, none is an exact parallel).

49. 19 mm, 4.75 g., uniface. Right edge broken off.
Inv. No.: 48/29/80
Dog attacking stag or hare, all on even base, inscribed above around ΑΙΩΝ, below around ΤΟΥ
Ref: For lion with stag or hare see cat. No. 60 above.

50. 15 mm, 2.95 g., uniface.
Inv. No.: 40/29/80, confiscated
Elephant emerging from shell, all in incuse.
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 74 (no. 40 side A); Dalzell 2021, 89–90 (cat. nos. 8, 9 side a, 10 side a).

51. 14.5 mm, 3.70 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 195/28/81, purchase.
Elephant emerging from shell.
Ref: For parallels see cat. no. 50 above.

52. 15 mm, 1.70 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 4/29/80
Lion catching a smaller animal, probably a hare, to right, on ground line, traces of inscription on circumference with letters cut half off-flan below.
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 80 (nos. 54–55) and 82 (no. 58).

53. 16 mm, 2.75 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 8/29/80
Lion catching a smaller animal, probably a hare, to right, on ground line.
Ref: For parallels see cat. no. 60 above.

54. 14 mm, 1.70 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 195/28/81, purchase.
Lion catching a smaller animal, probably a hare, to right, on ground line.
Ref: For parallels see cat. No. 60 and 61 above.
55. 14 mm, 2.30 g., uniface  
Inv. No.:4/42/86, purchase.  
Lion catching a smaller animal probably a hare, to right, on ground line.  
Ref: For parallels see cat. No. 60 above.

56. 14 mm, 3.25 g.  
Inv. No.:12/14/86, purchase.  
Side A: Lion catching a smaller animal probably a hare, to right, on ground line.  
Side B: Hippopotamus or rhinoceros.  

57. 16.5 mm, 2.80 g., uniface  
Inv. No.:36/29/80,  
Chariot driven by a mouse.  
Ref: No known parallels among the Ephesian lead tesserae.

58. 15 mm, 2.80 g., uniface  
Inv. No.:14/29/80  
Running rabbit, right, letters Α (Α) above and Phi (Φ) below.  
Ref: No known parallels among the Ephesian Tesserae. The tesserae with kantharos in Gülbay & Kireç 2008, 145 (no. 219) is inscribed ΑΦ.

59. 15 mm, 2.20 g., uniface  
Inv. No.:41/29/80, confiscated.  
Stag left, star in upper field, all in round incuse  

60. 16 mm, 2.75 g., uniface. Large piece of upper left edge broken off  
Inv. No.:27/29/80, confiscated.  
Stag right, with big antlers and lowered head, on ground line.

61.  16 mm, 2.25 g., uniface. Lower edge broken off
Inv. No.:126/1/81, purchase.
Horse galloping right with long palm branch in its mouth.
Ref: British Museum, Department of Coins and Medals B.8639,

62.  17 mm, 3.70 g., uniface. Worn
Inv. No.:64/5/86, purchase.
An animal (?) turtle (?) Letter N in the upper left field. The whole in round incuse,
Ref: No known parallels.

63.  15 mm, 2.55 g., uniface
Inv. No.:13/14/86, purchase.
Frog seen from above in round incuse.
Ref: There is an almost exact parallel probably from the same die in the Alpha Bank
Numismatic Collection (inv. no. 517, ex. Meletopoulos). Frogs are not unusual on Athenian
tokens: Crosby 1964, 99 L128 (IL886 and IL887).

64.  14 mm, 3.15 g., uniface
Inv. No.:31/29/80, confiscated.
Two fish one above the other facing opposite directions.

65.  15 mm, 1.60 g., uniface.
Inv. No.:9/45/80, purchase
Crab, claws open, inscribed around: ΒΟΥ[ΛΗΣ] ΓΡΑΜ[ΜΑΤΕΩΣ]
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 95 (no. 94) and 97 (no. 100).

VI. Birds

66.  13 mm, 2.65 g., uniface
67. 14 mm, 1.60 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 20/22/86, purchase.
Bird right on ground line, inscribed ΟΟΛ above bird, C below, the design and the inscription in incuse.
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 87 (no. 69, not an exact parallel).

68. 14 mm, 3.10 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 23/29/80, confiscated.
Eagle right with head turned left

69. 18 mm, 2.15 g., uniface Athenian?
Inv. No.: 50/29/80, confiscated.
Eagle right with head turned left, holding wreath in beak

VII. Insects

70. 15 mm, 2.00 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 202/28/81, purchase.
Bee, traces of inscription on circumference
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 100 (nos. 108 and 109a); ibid. 102 (no. 112a); ibid. 103 (no. 113), but none of them with an inscription. In online auctions, Ephesian tesserae have appeared inscribed on one side, with a bee and the inscription ΚΗΡΙΛΙΣ ΩΔΕ ΠΡΟΣ ΠΑΛΥΡΙΝ around the edge and on the other, a sitting stag facing left with head reverted and Ε-Φ across fields and the inscription ΚΟΠΙ in exergue, e.g. Roma Numismatics Ltd. E-Sale 79 Lot 217
A bee forms also the type of an Athenian token: Crosby 1964, 100 L138 (IL1015).

71. 14 mm, 2.90 g., uniface
    Inv. No.:14/14/86, purchase.
    Bee, palm branch below, inscribed ΓΡΑΒΟΥΕΥΑΡΜΙΙ
    Ref: For parallels see cat.no. 56 above.

72. 15 mm, 3.35 g., uniface
    Inv. No.:4/17/85, purchase.
    Bee, inscribed: P A B…..M I. on the circumference. Palm branch below.
    Ref: For parallels see cat.no. 56 above.

VII. Mythological creatures

73. 19 mm, 2.30 g., uniface
    Inv. No.:63/5/ho86, purchase.
    Capricorn, cornucopia above. Inspired by the Augustan coin iconography.
    Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 93 (no. 88) and 98 (no. 103).

74. 13 mm, 1.30 g., uniface
    Inv. No.:5/27/80, purchase
    Centaur right

75. 14 mm, 3.30 g., uniface
    Inv. No.:42/29/80, confiscated.
    Centaur Chiron playing lyre, right
    Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 107 nos. 122–24 (none of them is an exact parallel).

76. 23 mm, 5.60 g., uniface. Worn
    Inv. No.:25/29/80, confiscated.
Centaur Chiron playing lyre to the left, in the field left: ΓΕΡ, abbreviation of ΓΕΡΟΥΣΙΑ countermark (deer?) in the field below.
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 106 nos. 122–23 (none of them is an exact parallel).

77. 11 mm, 1 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 11/41/80, purchase
Griffin right.
Ref: No known parallels. Cf. C77.

78. 13 mm, 1.20 g., uniface.
Inv. No.: 38/29/80, confiscated
Griffin advancing right, with left front-leg raised.
Ref: No known parallels. For parallels among the Athenian tokens: Crosby 1964, 99 L129 (IL890 and IL891)

VIII. Varia

79. 15 mm, 2.20 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 19/29/80
Aries head altar with [ΒΟΥ] inscribed around left and [ΓΡΑ] inscribed around right
Inscription: illegible
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 95 (no. 95).

80. 16 mm, 3.75 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 7/45/80, purchase.
Mask of male bearded head facing, with legend [.]BOY[.]C
Ref: No known parallels.

81. 13 mm, 2.30 g., uniface
Inv. No.: 137/18/84, purchase.
Six-spoked wheel or rosette inscribed in lined circle

82. 14 mm, 2.30 g., uniface
Inv. No.:339/15/82, purchase.

Two-handed drinking cup on high foot (kantharos).


83. 15 mm, 2.20 g., uniface, left edge broken off in two places
Inv. No.:9/41/80, purchase.

Kantharos

84. 13 mm, 1.70 g., uniface
Inv. No.:10/41/80, purchase.

Basket of plenty, all in round incuse.

85. 14 mm, 1.75 g., uniface
Inv. No.:11/29/80,

Basket of plenty among leafy branches, all in border of dots
Ref: For parallels see cat. no. 72 above.

86. 17 mm, 2.45 g., uniface
Inv. No.:15/29/80

Basket of plenty in circle of dots, around which the letters VTNT are inscribed, the whole in circle of dots.
Ref: Gülbay and Kireç 2008, 160 nos. 255–56 (none of them is an exact parallel).
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