

BETWEEN ROMAN CULTURE AND LOCAL TRADITION

Roman Provincial Coinage of Bithynia and
Pontus during the Reign of Trajan (98-117 AD)

Barbara Zając

ARCHAEOPRESS ROMAN ARCHAEOLOGY 100



ARCHAEOPRESS PUBLISHING LTD
Summertown Pavilion
18-24 Middle Way
Summertown
Oxford OX2 7LG
www.archaeopress.com

ISBN 978-1-80327-465-2
ISBN 978-1-80327-466-9 (e-Pdf)

© Barbara Zajac and Archaeopress 2023



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

This book is available direct from Archaeopress or from our website www.archaeopress.com

Contents

Contents	i
List of Maps and Tables	iii
Preface	iv
Acknowledgements	vi
Introduction	viii
The Roman Empire and Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan	1
The Roman Empire and financial policy during the reign of Trajan.....	1
Roman provinces in the Roman Empire.....	2
Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan.....	4
Mints in the province of Bithynia and Pontus	8
Thrace	9
Bithynia	10
Paphlagonia	16
Pontus.....	20
Chronology	24
Metrology and denominations	29
Denominations in the Roman provincial coinage	29
Monetary systems in Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan	34
Iconography and legends of coins of Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan	54
Legends of the provincial coins	54
Iconography of the provincial coins.....	77
Iconography of coins of Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan.....	81
Common motifs and prototypes of some coins of Bithynia and Pontus.....	118
Coins without an ethnic with uncertain attributions	125
Group I: Coins with the name of the proconsul Gaius Julius Bassus.....	128
Group II: coins with the legend ΕΙΡΗΝΗ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΗ/ΕΙΡΗΝΗ CEBACTH.....	131
Group III: Coins with the legend ΟΜΟΝΟΙΑ CEBACTH/ΟΜΟΝΟΙΑ	132
Group IV: Coins with the legend ΝΕΙΚΗ CEBACTOY ΔΑΚ/ΑΡΜΕ	134
Group V: Coins with the legend ΔΗΜΗΤΡΑ CEBACTH.....	135
Group VI: Coins with the legend CEBACTH/ΣΕΒΑΣΤΗ	135
Group VII: Coins with the legend CEBACTOY/ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟY	136
Group VIII: Coins with the legend ΔΙΟC	137
Group IX: Coins with the legend ΚΤΙCΤΗC	139
Group X: Coins with the legend ΔΗΜΗΤΡΟC.....	140
Group XI: Coins with the cornucopia	140
Group XII: Coins with the serpent staff.....	141
Pseudo-autonomous coins of Bithynia and Pontus	143
Amastris: Dionysus and Helios.....	146
Sinope: Diogenes	147

Amisus: Athena	148
Byzantium: Artemis, Poseidon, Hermes, Dionysus.....	149
Production in the provincial centres	151
Production in the centres of Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan.....	161
Countermarks.....	171
Circulation.....	179
The coinage of Bithynia and Pontus and issues of the neighbouring	
Roman provinces.....	188
The coinage of Thrace.....	188
The coinage of Asia.....	190
The coinage of Galatia and Cappadocia.....	192
Summary.....	195
Plates	198
References	204
Historical Sources	204
Abbreviations	205
References.....	207
Appendix 1: Legends on the coins of Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan.	242
APAMEA MYRLEA	242
PRUSA AD OLYMPUS	242
NICAEA.....	242
CALCHEDON	243
BYZANTIUM.....	243
NICOMEDIA	243
IULIOPOLIS.....	244
PRUSIAS AD HYPIUM	244
HERACLEA PONTICA	244
TIUM	245
AMASTRIS	246
ABONOTEICHOS.....	246
SINOPE	246
AMISUS	247
Coins without an ethnic with uncertain attribution	247
Index of Mythological Characters	252
Index of Names	255
Topographical and Geographical Index	258

List of Maps and Tables

Map 1.	Mints in Bithynia and Pontus (© https://rpc.ashmus.ox.ac.uk/map , Accessed: 08.01.2022)	8
Table 1a:	Denominations of coins struck in the cities of Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan.....	30
Table 1b:	Denominations of coins without an ethnic struck in the cities of Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan	31
Table 2a:	List of iconographic types on the coins of Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan.....	56
Table 2b:	List of iconographic types on the coins of Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan, taking into account the general message related to individual traditions.....	57
Table 3:	List of iconographic types on imperial coins probably issued at the Thracian mint between AD 80–82, and on provincial coins of Bithynia and Pontus during the reigns of Domitian and Trajan	58
Table 4:	Coins without an ethnic – possible attributions.....	126
Table 5a:	Numbers of dies used to strike the coins of individual cities in Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan (n – the number of coins; d – the number of obverse dies; r – the number of reverse dies)	152
Table 5b:	Numbers of dies used to strike the coins without an ethnic in Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan (n – the number of coins; d – the number of obverse dies; r – the number of reverse dies)	152
Table 5c:	Numbers of dies used to strike the pseudo-autonomous coins of individual cities in Bithynia and Pontus possibly dated to the reign of Trajan (n – the number of coins; d – the number of obverse dies; r – the number of reverse dies).....	152
Table 6a:	Numbers of coins, obverse and reverse dies, and the estimated numbers of issued coins in individual centres of Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan (markings from the Carter tests and formulas are left to assist easier adjustment or verification of individual data: n – number of coins; d – number of obverse dies; r – number of reverse dies; D – number of original number of dies; – owing to single examples the estimates were abandoned)	153
Table 6b:	Numbers of coins, obverse and reverse dies, and the estimated numbers of issued coins without an ethnic in Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan (markings from the Carter tests and formulas were left to assist easier adjustment or verification of individual data: n – number of coins; d – number of obverse dies; r – number of reverse dies; D – number of the original number of dies).....	155
Table 7a:	Die axes of individual cities of Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan	156
Table 7b:	Die axes of coins without an ethnic of Bithynia and Pontus struck during the reign of Trajan.....	157
Table 8:	Countermarks on coins of Bithynia and Pontus struck during the reign of Trajan.....	158

Preface

Sis felicior Augusto, melior Traiano – ‘be more lucky than Augustus [and] better than Trajan’. This formula, uttered during the inauguration of the new ruler in the late Empire, recall the times of happiness and stability of the Roman state. Trajan was considered as one of the best emperors, who not only expanded the borders of the Empire but also supported society through various monetary donations and founded new architectural structures.¹ Despite this, we have an insufficient number of historical sources to enable us to accurately reflect all the events, policies, or decisions of the ruler within the Empire. Usually, individual aspects of important military events of that period are analysed, i.e. the Dacian wars or the Parthian campaign, and thus the territories related to them.² Less attention is paid to the politics, organisation, and culture of other individual regions. One of the best sources from the time of Trajan is the correspondence of Pliny the Younger, who was the governor of Bithynia and Pontus, concerning the administration and finances of the province.³ However, this is not an adequate source to allow us exhaustively to recreate the financial and monetary policy of the province. Provincial coinage is a very complicated issue, with a number of phenomena, such as the lack of a uniform monetary system or the diversified nature of the coins (e.g. pseudo-autonomous and colonial coinage, coins struck by *koinon* or neocorate). Moreover, together with the local currency, coins issued in the capital’s mint were also circulated.⁴ Thus, a colourful, dynamic and, at first glance, quite chaotic image of provincial coinage appears, which, however, was subject to certain rules, although not necessarily known or recognisable today.

The aim of this work, based on a doctoral dissertation, is a detailed analysis of the Roman provincial coinage of Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan (98–117) based not only on numismatic material, but also on other source categories. It will allow us to recreate as much as possible the coinage policy of individual cities, culture, and religion in various centres during this period, as well as contacts and relations among the local communities.

Determining the coinage policy in a given area is accompanied by a number of questions related to the authorities and decision-making regarding coin production, reasons, possibilities, organisation of the mint, ore, number, metrological parameters, images, circulation, and, ultimately, deposit.⁵ So far, general analyses of all provinces in the Roman period have been mainly made,⁶ but each of them should be viewed as a separate organism in order to try to understand the local nature of individual phenomena. So far, a lot of research has been focused on provinces such as Asia, Syria, Judea, and Egypt. Much less attention, despite its important location, was given to Bithynia and Pontus during the Roman period.

What was the coinage policy in Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan, between 98–117? What was the influence of the central intervention on local production, the status of

¹ Plin. *Pan.* 12–13, 29, 51; Bennett 1997 (2015): 19, 123.

² Cf. Dubicki 2013; Ellithorpe 2017; Lepper 1946 (2013).

³ Plin. *Ep.* X; Dębiński *et al.* 2017.

⁴ Butcher 1988: 9–13; Heuchert 2005: 29–56; Zajac 2017c.

⁵ Butcher 1988: 23. Cf. Amandry, Burnett *et al.* 1992; 1999; 2015.

⁶ Cf. Butcher 1988; Katsari 2011.

the cities, trade, cult, and the army? Did the neighbouring provinces, such as Thrace, Asia, and Cappadocia, and their cities, have any influence on the coinage in Bithynia and Pontus? Could an imperial branch have functioned in these areas? What was the monetary production in local centres? Have the cities within the provinces entered a kind of monetary union? In which years and from what ores were the individual coins minted? What was their number and how many dies for their production can we distinguish? How important were imperial coins for monetary policy and the provincial market? Were these issues a model of some of the provincial coins minted in Bithynia? What was the meaning of the images on the coins? What do the coin finds say about the circulation in a given region? The aim of this study is to try and answer the above questions, and thus to define the various aspects of the coinage policy in Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan.

The chronological framework of the discussed issue focuses mainly on the period of the emperor's reign, between 98 and 117, however, when completing some aspects, it is necessary to refer also to other periods. In order to more precisely define the reasons and rhythm of production, the denominations minted at that time, or the meaning of the presented effigies, it is necessary to trace previous traditions both in the local areas and in individual centres. Thus there will be reference to provincial issues of Bithynia and Pontus from the Julio-Claudian and Flavian dynasties, and in the case of the cults and beliefs worshiped, to the Hellenistic period, the reign of the Mithridatic dynasty, and even to earlier times related to colonisation. To complete the cultural and religious context reflected to some extent on the coins, other categories of sources were used, including historical, epigraphic and material ones, such as figures, sculptures and architectural remains. Many of these have a broader chronological framework (e.g. terracotta figurines dating from the Hellenistic period), or we are unable to determine their exact dating (e.g. inscriptions from the 2nd or 3rd centuries). To examine the popularity of the motif and its repetition on coins of similar size, the issues also minted in earlier and later periods of the reign of individual emperors were traced.

In terms of territory, the discussed issues concern the areas of Bithynia and Pontus, i.e. the northern part of Anatolia and the southern shores of the Black Sea, as a Roman province in the administrative context. In the time of Trajan, it then included a small part of Thrace, where Byzantium was located, then Bithynia, the northern part of Paphlagonia, and a small, western part of Pontus.⁷ The individual cities are also discussed in this order in the chapter about mints. Other aspects discussed were analysed according to the order adopted in the study of *Roman Provincial Coinage* (2015), with emissions without ethnic with uncertain attribution described at the end of the chapters, after the review of coins from other cities. For the sake of clarity of the issues raised, an exception is made for the coins from Apamea Myrlea and Sinope, analysed in terms of the Latin legends. It is also worth emphasising that the traditions of individual regions and cities were not limited only to the administrative borders of the provinces, which were undergoing changes. Hence, the research material was subjected to comparative analyses with neighbouring centres located within other provinces, such as Thrace, Asia, and Galatia and Cappadocia.

One should pay attention to the name of the province, which in various writings and studies is referred to as Bithynia, Bithynia and Pontus, or Pontus and Bithynia. Epigraphic sources from

⁷ Plin. *Ep.* X; Amandry, Burnett *et al.* 2015: 118–154; Rémy 1986: 65.

the middle and end of the 1st century show that the official form of the name at that time was Pontus and Bithynia, despite the larger part of the province belonging to Bithynia. In several inscriptions, as well as from the historical records of Tacitus and Cassius Dio, a colloquial reference only to Bithynia appeared. In turn, in most epigraphic sources, dated to the end of the 2nd and into the 3rd century, the form of the name used at that time was Bithynia and Pontus.⁸ It is also worth noting that in the correspondence of Pliny there is a reference to the latter.⁹ In modern studies, this form is very often used, with some researchers also referring to the official name of Pontus and Bithynia. In this case, due to the correspondence of Pliny, the name of the province was adopted as Bithynia and Pontus. It should also be emphasised that the work sometimes includes colloquial references to the name of the province or geographic country within which a given town was located. In the case of individual modern Turkish names of cities, provinces or districts, the original spelling was left. The legends placed on the coins in the work, both in Greek and Latin, as well as the individual nicknames of the emperor, remain in the original, with their translation and meaning discussed in a separate chapter.

All dates quoted in the work referring to times before Christ are abbreviated 'BC'. The exceptions in this case are the dates in parentheses relating to the reigns of rulers or historical events. The rest of the dates written without marking are Anno Domini (AD).

Acknowledgements

This work, based on my doctoral dissertation, is the result of several years of research carried out with the help of many people and institutions. First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor, Jarosław Bodzek, Prof. Jagiellonian University (Kraków, Poland), for help, valuable tips and comments on this work, and, above all, for instilling a passion for numismatics during my studies.

I would like to thank the National Science Centre, for the opportunity to implement the project under the grant Preludium 15, realised between 2019–2023 (UMO-2018/29/N/HS3/01434). Thanks to the funds granted, it was possible to conduct many queries in various institutions, both museums and libraries, enabling the acquisition and verification of individual information necessary for the analysis of the Roman provincial coinage of Bithynia and Pontus during the reign of Trajan. I would like to thank Paul Belien, Martin Damsma (De Nederlandsche Bank, Amsterdam), Evangeline Markou, Yannis Stoyas (National Hellenic Research Foundation, Athens), Eva Apostolou, Georg Kakavas (Numismatic Museum in Athens), Miroslava Dotkova (National Museum in Belgrade), Bernhard Weisser, Julius Roch (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin), Amelia Dowler, Lucia Rinolfi (British Museum, London), Klaus Vondrovec (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), Fanni Fodor, István Vida (Budapest History Museum), Haim Gitler, Yaniv Schauer (The Israel Museum, Jerusalem), Donald Ariel (Israel Antiquities Authority), Cecilia Meir (Eretz Israel Museum), Peter van Alfen, Lucia Carbone (American Numismatic Society), Andrzej Romanowski (National Museum in Warsaw), Piotr Jaworski, Kiriyo Myzgin (Institute of Archaeology, University of Warsaw), Tom Mullally and Dane Kurth. I would like to thank also the Ministry of Culture and Tourism in Ankara for the requisite permit issued (no. 64298988-155.02-E.283214; *Yabancı Araştırmacılar* (2019.13.ZAJAC)) to assist with research and queries in Edirne, Izmit, Istanbul, Karadeniz Ereğli, Amasra, Sinope, Konuralp and Iznik. I would like

⁸ Wesch-Klein 2001: tab. 1–2.

⁹ Dębiński *et al.* 2017: 426, 444.

to thank all involved for the opportunities I had to visit many museum collections, and for all the help received from the management and employees of these institutions, especially: Şahan Kırçın, Rıdvan Gölcük, Özyay Titiz, Zuhâl İdin Uykâl, Onur Arslan, Nuri Yazgan, Murat Yüce, and Ayşe Kaya. I would also like to thank those who helped me during my stay in Turkey, Prof. Zeynep Kuban, Dr Verda Lögnib, Sümeyye Kaymak, Merve Salihoğlu, and Ege Polat. My thanks go, too, to Elżbieta Fidler-Żrałka for her help in obtaining individual bibliographic items and her patience.

Next, I would like to thank Wojciech Ostrowski, Paulina Konarzewska, and Łukasz Wilk from the Warsaw University of Technology, who, as part of the project, worked on the software for finding similarities in coin images that so facilitated my work on the die study, which was also required for my doctoral dissertation and thus became part of this present work.

I would like very much to thank Jarosław Bodzek, Szymon Jellonek, and Tom Mullally for the many discussions and comments on specific research aspects. Bartosz Awianowicz (Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń) must be mentioned for all the valuable corrections and comments in the chapter on coin legends.

My doctoral dissertation and this ensuing publication would not have been possible without the help and support of my closest friends, especially Agnieszka Pokrywka and Weronika Winiarska, as well as my sister Katarzyna Górka. I must thank, too, those very important people in my life who so believed in me at the very beginning of my adventure with archaeology. Finally here I must mention Iwona Polok, Ewa Paszek, and Małgorzata Dobisz, who were bright lights for me in the dark.

Introduction

Roman provincial coinage differed from units issued in Rome (the so-called imperial coinage). Due to the lack of a uniform system, the nominal, typological and iconographic diversity, it still requires detailed research that can provide much information on the economy, politics, or tradition in a given region. Research on Roman provincial coinage is developing very dynamically, among others, thanks to the international project *The Roman Provincial Coinage* (RPC), coordinated by the University of Oxford. The project is aimed at creating a complete catalogue of provincial issues minted in the area of the Roman Empire.¹

Provincial coins initially co-existed in some catalogues with Roman imperial issues.² They were also partly the subject of studies in the Greek coinage from individual regions and cities, published in the *Die antiken Münzen Nordgriechenlands* series (1898–1935), then its re-issued version *Griechisches Münzwerk* (from 1956), or as part of the *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum* project (from 1930). Provincial emissions were also included in articles and studies, inter alia those of F. de Saucy,³ J. Rouvier,⁴ N.A. Moushmov,⁵ and F. Imhoof-Blümer.⁶

So far, several different issues related to provincial coinage have been addressed. Among them, we can distinguish monographic studies of some mints, such as Caesarea in Cappadocia,⁷ Antioch in Syria,⁸ or Byzantium in Thrace.⁹ Various categories of coins were analysed, such as cystophores or pseudo-autonomous coins,¹⁰ as well as the monetary structure in the provinces.¹¹ Provincial issues were also published as part of developed museum collections and finds from archaeological sites, thus drawing attention to possible aspects of coin circulation.¹² Moreover, in many cases individual features of the issues have been analysed, such as denominations and iconography.¹³

Due to the chronology of the issue under consideration, the state of research on the period of Trajan's rule should be mentioned. As much as possible, some events are recreated, however, there are still many gaps and blank spots. This is due to the small number of historical sources, including the *Panegyric* and the correspondence of Pliny the Younger, book 68 of *Roman History* of Cassius Dio, and the speeches written by Dio Chrysostom.¹⁴ Some of the activities related to the Parthian campaign are described in a fragmentary work, *Parthica*, by Arrian

¹ Cf. Roman Provincial Coinage online – <https://rpc.ashmus.ox.ac.uk/project/> Access: from May 2018 to January 2022.

² Cf. Imhoof-Blümer 1908; Mionnet 1807; series *Roman Imperial Coinage* (RIC), from 1926.

³ de Saucy 1874.

⁴ Rouvier 1900a; 1900b; 1901a; 1901b; 1902.

⁵ Moushmov 1912.

⁶ Imhoof-Blümer 1913.

⁷ Metcalf 1996; Sydenham 1933.

⁸ Butcher 2004.

⁹ Schönert-Geiss 1972.

¹⁰ Johnston 1985; Metcalf 1980.

¹¹ Johnston 2007; Katsari 2011.

¹² Bellinger 1961; Bodzek 2020; Corsten 1996; Evans 2018; Schachinger 2014.

¹³ Bennett 2014; Elkins 2015; Howgego 2005a; Johnston 1997; 2007.

¹⁴ Dio Chrys. Or.; Plin. Pan.; Plin. Ep. Cf. Bennett 1997 (2015): 13–14, 363–368, there a more detailed characteristic of the works is given, as well as a reference to the entries in the Byzantine chronicles.

of Nicomedia.¹⁵ Tacitus only mentions the prosperity and security of the Nerva and Trajan epochs, without giving more specific information about the periods concerned.¹⁶ Because of this lack of information in historical works, archaeological research, and epigraphic and numismatic materials are becoming an inseparable source of reconstruction.

The times of Trajan have, of course, been the subject of research, e.g. R. Paribeni, J. Bennett, and K. Strobel.¹⁷ They are general and basic studies that compile, characterise, and organise individual events and activities during the emperor's reign. Trajan's war campaigns and military successes are of great interest to scholars. The wars with the Dacians have been analysed by many, e.g. A.S. Stefan, M. Schmitz, A. Dubicki, and W. Kelso.¹⁸ In turn, the Parthian campaign was discussed by F.A. Lepper and J.M. Schlude.¹⁹ Of course, it should be emphasised that the above aspects have also been referenced many times as, inter alia, analogies or objects of analysis in other studies concerning, for example, politics, propaganda, architecture, or art, which, due to the topic in hand, cannot be listed here.²⁰

In publications relating to the reign of Trajan, or provincial administration during this period, an inseparable and widely quoted source is the correspondence between Pliny the Younger and the emperor, regarding the needs and finances of the provinces of Bithynia and Pontus. It is one of the few and very valuable accounts that is the basis for further research on the life and functioning of this region, or on Trajan's policy itself. There have been many studies on the correspondence itself,²¹ including analyses that undermine the authenticity of the work.²² The interpretation of the work remains another issue. G. Woolf emphasised that Pliny's correspondence reflects the views of the Latin-speaking audience and the elites managing the provinces, thus reflecting 'the outline of the ideology of Roman power'. Letters were a propaganda tool, creating the positions of the ideal ruler and governor, caring for society.²³ Bearing in mind the given aspects, it was limited only to providing information on individual projects in the centres, as well as to the phenomenon itself, related in this case to central intervention, which was considered, among others, by G. Salmeri.²⁴ The credibility of the source and the various views of Pliny have also not been analysed in this present study.

In the case of research on the numismatics of this period, Trajan's imperial coinage was very well developed,²⁵ being characterised by a systematised structure, continuation of nominal units from the years of the previous rulers, and diligence in titles and images related to the emperor's ideological trends. As for Trajan's provincial coins, they have been included in the catalogues of major publications.²⁶ Currently, the most up-to-date study of the issue from this period is the third volume of *Roman Provincial Coinage*.²⁷ Due to the amount of material and

¹⁵ Arr. Parth. Cf. Bennett 1997 (2015): 327–328.

¹⁶ Tac. Hist. Cf. Bennett 1997 (2015): 227–229.

¹⁷ Bennett 1997 (2015); Paribeni 1926 (1975); Strobel 2010.

¹⁸ Dubicki 2013; Kelso 2017; Schmitz 2005; Stefan 2005.

¹⁹ Lepper 1946 (2013); Schlude 2020.

²⁰ Individual works are listed by i.a. Bennett 1997 (2015); Lepper 1946 (2013); Strobel 2010.

²¹ Cf. Dębiński *et al.* 2017; Winniczuk 1987b (2015); Woolf 2006 (2017).

²² Bennett 1997 (2015): 59.

²³ Woolf 2006 (2017): 125–126, 131–142.

²⁴ Salmeri 2005.

²⁵ Allen 2007; Beckmann 2000; 2007; Mattingly 1926; 1936; Mattingly and Sydenham 1926; Metcalf 1975; Strack 1931; Woytek 2010.

²⁶ Imhoof-Blümer 1908; Mionnet 1807; Waddington, Reinach and Babelon 1904–1912.

²⁷ Amandry, Burnett *et al.* 2015; Supplement IV (2017).

type of publication, the analysis of the coinage in individual cities and provinces is a general study that highlights the main and most important aspects. Moreover, compared to the reign of the next emperor, Hadrian (117–138), the minting activity in Trajan's time is sometimes marginalised. The provincial coins of Bithynia and Pontus were included in the catalogues of older studies, however, no more detailed regional analyses were undertaken. One of the basic publications on this issue is the work of W.H. Waddington, T. Reinach and E. Babelon,²⁸ which was one of the first catalogues on the areas of Bithynia and Pontus, compiling coins from different centres and periods. Each town's history is briefly given. Coins of Bithynia and Pontus were also found in various museum inventories.²⁹ Monetary activity associated with some of them was also the subject of several monographs (Byzantium, Sinope³⁰) and articles (Apamea Myrlea, Prusias, Nicomedia, Amisus³¹). The attribution of some coins or countermarks was also considered.³² Coins from museum collections in northern Turkey, issues related to numismatics and epigraphy in the Roman period or individual iconographic motifs were developed as part of several Bachelor's, Master's and Doctoral dissertations.³³

Until now, Bithynia has been the subject of several analyses in terms of organisation and administration, urbanisation, and the economy of the province,³⁴ however these are general studies of the entire Roman period or a selected city. There was also interest in the society within the region and local elites.³⁵ Tradition, geography, and individual artefacts from the provinces have been the subject of much research by Ch. Marek,³⁶ in turn, the economy of Nicomedia, but also the coinage of the region, was considered in the works of H. Güney.³⁷ It should also be emphasised that the areas of Pontus have often been far more discussed than the areas of Bithynia.³⁸ No detailed research has been undertaken so far analysing various aspects of the coinage of this region, such as, e.g., production or iconography, for the period of Trajan's reign. Moreover, the discussed issues were supplemented by other source categories, including inscriptions; these have made it possible to obtain a broader perspective, allowing for the explanation of individual phenomena.

A very important stage of this current research involved museum and library queries, enabling the collection of material used for analyses. Mainly collections in Europe and Turkey were visited. Individual issues from various studies, archaeological research reports and auctions were also collected. On this basis, fourteen mints, issuing bronze coins, were distinguished during the reign of Trajan. The individual centres and their emissions have been elaborated in terms of chronology, production, denominations, placed images, legends, and circulation. The coins without ethnic and with uncertain attribution, prototypes of some Bithynia and Pontus issues, and pseudo-autonomous coins were also studied. The next step was to take into

²⁸ Waddington, Reinach and Babelon 1904–1912.

²⁹ Cf. Corsten 1996; Williams 2009.

³⁰ Casey *et al.* 2010; Manisse 2015; Schönert-Geiss 1972.

³¹ Cf. Blanco Pérez 2015a; 2015b; Bilir *et al.* 2015; Güney 2014; Nordbø 1988; Price 1967; Woytek 2011.

³² Price 1967; Sommer 1996; Zając 2019a.

³³ Bilici 2002; Demirkök 1999; Doğanç 2001; Erol-Özdizbay 2011; Lenger 1996; Tekdemir 2016.

³⁴ Cf. Bekker-Nielsen 2008; Güney 2012; Harris 1964; Langer 1986; Lorient 2011; Mikael 2016; Torchia 1970; Salmeri 2005; Storey 1998; Weissová 2017.

³⁵ Fernoux 2004; Nicols 1990; Rémy 1989; Tsetskhaldze 2012; Vitale 2014.

³⁶ Marek 1985; 1993b; 2003; 2009.

³⁷ Güney 2012; 2014; 2015b; 2015c; 2015d; 2016.

³⁸ Amandry, Rémy and Özcan 1994; de Callatay 2007; 2011b; Dalaison 2017b.

account other source categories, i.e. epigraphy, iconography or historiography, which shed more light on the possible monetary situation in the province.

In terms of the contents of this present study, the first chapters briefly describe the times of Trajan and the financial policy pursued, as well as the organisation of the province and the delegation of Pliny the Younger to Bithynia and Pontus. Then, the history of the region and individual cities are discussed, along with annotations to Pliny the Younger and the problems he raised. In addition, due to other issues, such as the tradition present in a given area, or circulation, and thus finds and possible analogies, the state of the archaeological research in individual cities was also briefly discussed.

One of the problematic issues in provincial coinage is the chronology of individual coins. It was typical and frequent to place portraits of a ruling emperor on the obverses, which allows for fairly wide dating of the given issues. One should also remember those pseudo-autonomous emissions that lack any portrait of the emperor.³⁹ Roman imperial coins were probably the prototypes of some of the images of the ruler placed on the obverse of the coins of Bithynia and Pontus in the time of Trajan. For the times of interest to us, four chronological periods can be distinguished in connection with the nicknames given to the emperor. However, to define the chronology of Trajan's emission a little more precisely, Strack, and then Woytek, developed a method of more precise dating based on the changes of the portrait.⁴⁰ So far, this method has not been used for a slightly more precise dating of provincial coins, due to the different style of engravers and the individual character of the images. However, a more detailed analysis of the issue from this period shows regularities that may confirm the copying of portraits from imperial coins (underlined and distinct physiognomic elements corresponding to possible prototypes or elements of clothing). On this basis, attempts were made to determine the individual issues struck a little more precisely, as well as to specify the period of the mint's operation.

Other issues discussed were the denominations of individual coins, and their recognition and assignment to the values adopted in the general provincial system. Possible adaptations of the imperial system were also considered, as well as certain traditions related to placing a given image on coins of a certain size.

An important subject of the work involves the legends and effigies on coins of Bithynia and Pontus in the times of Trajan. The first issue was analysed in terms of the content posted and its record. In turn, attempts were made to look at the issues of images as much as possible, both from the point of Roman and local tradition, indicating more civic motifs, related to the propaganda of the Empire, or reflecting the regional character associated with the current cult. For this purpose, other categories of artefacts have also been compiled, which may prove the presence of a given tradition in the centre or its nearby areas. It is worth paying attention to the epigraphic and historical-geographical researches within these regions, which were

³⁹ Amandry, Burnett *et al.* 2015: 857–858; Heuchert 2005: 47–48.

⁴⁰ Strack 1931: 26–29; Woytek 2010: 55–73. The imperial portrait considered also by Besombes 2008; Etienne and Rachet 1984; Hill 1970.

undertaken from the mid 19th century,⁴¹ and which are still prominent in the work leading Turkish specialists.⁴²

Chapter 2 looks at possible prototypes of motifs placed on coins, which could indicate a certain degree of city integration. Kraay has suggested the presence of a coinage centralisation system in the province, which could be reflected in a similar denomination structure, ore structure, images, legends, and die-links, and the existence of a specific currency in circulation. The individual coins in Bithynia and Pontus show some similarities, but not in all respects, thus contradicting a strict system of centralisation, and pointing to some kind of integration between the centres.⁴³ It should be borne in mind that cities often competed for status to gain benefits (in Bithynia and Pontus, the rivalry between Apamea and Prusa, or Nicaea and Nicomedia).⁴⁴ So where does the integration in a given period come from? It can be noticed that some of the images placed on the coins, reproduced in various places, reflected a certain character of the Roman tradition rather than the local culture. The source of some effigies on the reverse of the coins issued locally in Bithynian centres during the Trajan period, indicating a certain integration, are Roman imperial issues minted between 80–82 in the imperial mint located in Thrace or Bithynia.⁴⁵

One of the more interesting categories of coins struck in Bithynia and Pontus in the time of Trajan are the coins without the ethnic identifying the mint. Based on, inter alia, effigies, denominations, legends, traditions of various centres, or countermarks, attempts were made to assign individual coins to possible cities.

Pseudo-autonomous coins are also discussed separately, which, due, inter alia, to the lack of a portrait of the emperor, it is not known whether they were minted precisely in this period, and which can be attributed to the times of Trajan due to the similar style of execution or the repetition of motifs. In this case, it is mainly the issues struck at Amastris, Sinope, and Amisus.

An important stage of the research was the analysis of production in various localities, during which the earlier periods of coin production and the ore used were indicated. The number of dies and possible links are specified. On this basis, attempts were also made to estimate, for some centres, as much as possible, the number of minted coins of a given issue. For this purpose, the Carter method was used to estimate the presumed original number of dies. The obtained result was compared with the possible number of coins from one die, that is c. 15,000, assumed by the author. It should be emphasised, however, that there is currently no certain position on this issue.⁴⁶ Different scientists take a different number, depending on various factors. This topic is discussed in more detail in Chapter 8. Moreover, on some coins various countermarks were placed, the possible provenance and the reasons for which were tried to be determined.

⁴¹ Ainsworth 1842; 1855: 235–241; Dörner 1941; Hirschfeld 1883; 1888; Kalinka 1933; Mendel 1900; Mordtmann 1887: 168–183; Perrot, Guillaume and Delbet 1872; Robert 1937. Cf. Weissová 2017: 56–65, tab. 7.

⁴² Akyürek Şahin 2012a; 2012b; Avcu and Doğan 2014; Onur 2014; Öztürk 2010a; 2010b; 2013b; 2013c; 2016a; Öztürk, Aktaş and Demirhan-Öztürk 2020; Öztürk *et al.* 2012; Şahin 1987; 1999. In addition, some volumes of the collected inscriptions, i.a., INicaea, TAM IV.

⁴³ Amandry, Burnett *et al.* 1999: 92.

⁴⁴ Salmeri 2005: 196; Winniczuk 1987b (2015): 79.

⁴⁵ Amandry, Burnett *et al.* 1999: 87–91; Burnett 1999; Cahn 1984/1985; Carradice and Cowell 1987.

⁴⁶ Crawford 1974; Kinns 1983: 18–19; Walker 1988: 301–305. Cf. de Callataj 1995: 290–291, 296–298.

The subject of circulation in the areas of Bithynia and Pontus was also discussed, but it should be looked at a bit wider than just the Trajan period, due to the possible longer circulation and use than the times analysed. On the basis of various finds and coins from the local museum collections, attempts were made to present the possible functioning of individual issues in the province.

The research problem undertaken is an important subject of scientific consideration regarding the monetary policy in the territories of Bithynia and Pontus during the Roman Empire, and has not been analysed in detail so far. Due to the large variety of both denominations and types of coins, it is very difficult to specify or capture certain phenomena that are obvious to the inhabitants of a given region, but not so clear in the modern world. The provincial coinage is not a simple issue, therefore scientific theses should be formulated very carefully. Research on this issue is developing quite dynamically; previously they were not undertaken on such a large scale. It should be emphasised that the discussed issue is not only a local view on the mint production of a given region, but also a broader view on the importance of imperial coins in the monetary circulation of the province and the impact on local units, which has not been analysed in detail before. Considering all the above aspects, confronting and supplementing them with other source categories will allow us, as much as possible, to reflect the coinage policy in Bithynia and Pontus of the Trajan period.