

Pagkalos, Manolis E.

**The coinage of king Areus i revisited: uses of the past in Spartan coins**

*Graeco-Latina Brunensia*. 2015, vol. 20, iss. 2, pp. [145]-159

ISSN 1803-7402 (print); ISSN 2336-4424 (online)

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/134636>

Access Date: 16. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

MANOLIS E. PAGKALOS  
(UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER)

## THE COINAGE OF KING AREUS I REVISITED: USES OF THE PAST IN SPARTAN COINS<sup>1</sup>

*For many years, scholars describe king Areus I as the monarch who followed the Hellenistic model of ruling. He was the only one of the two Spartan kings mentioned by name at the Chremonidean Decree and he issued Sparta's first silver coins, which bore inscription with his name. These changes are implemented in a period during which Sparta is nowhere near its former glorious self. I will argue that during the early Hellenistic period, an era of major political, cultural and social changes, the past is used as a prominent political instrument more than ever. As new structures of power and political organisation rise, the status quo of the city-states of Classical Greece is transformed. The past always occupied a specific role in the history of the polis throughout the Archaic and Classical periods as civic identity was authenticated by more or less exclusive local myths. However, now the past is urgently needed to be rewritten as it possesses the potential to reshape contemporary worldviews. Areus I initiatives brought Sparta again at the forefront of the Hellenistic world and were the result of the mentality of Hegemony built in Sparta through a long history of hegemonial presence both in Peloponnesos and Greece. This paper aims (a) to assess the use of the past during the reign of Areus I of Sparta (r. 309–265) and (b) to highlight the dynamics of the active manipulation of the past as political tool by evaluating the iconographic choices on the first example of Spartan silver coinage.*

**Key words:** Hellenistic Sparta; Areus; Alexanders; Ptolemaic Dynasty; coinage; use of past; memory

Ancient societies used the past, as modern prominently do, in order to manipulate and reshape their present and future. In the case of the Hellenistic period, where major political, cultural and social changes occurred, the manipulation of the past and memory thrived. Under this scope, specifically the early Hellenistic period seems to match exactly this need; it is the fertile

---

<sup>1</sup> All translations are my own unless otherwise indicated. Where no era is specified the dates should be taken as BC.

ground needed in order to investigate this, already since antiquity, widespread tactic which during this period becomes a necessity. In this context, Sparta's first civic coinage has a lot to offer as its various implications have been largely disregarded. I will argue that the coinage issued by Areus I (r. 309–265) was a guided act, far beyond the obvious aim of representing himself as a Hellenistic king. Not only the main iconographic theme of the coins, Herakles, is a direct link to the divine ancestor of the Spartans, but also this same divinity serves as the point of origin from which the Makedonians and the Ptolemies also claimed descent. Sparta's inaugural silver coinage is inextricably linked to the core of Spartan identity. This is an excellent example of the uses of the past. It was effectively a propaganda tool that promoted, in several co-existent ways, the polis of Sparta as a strong and independent entity.

To set the historical context, in 272, Areus took an active role in the final undoing of Pyrrhos of Epeiros (Plut. *Pyrrh.* 27–29; Paus. 1.13.6.7; Just. 25.4–5). In a final attempt to sit upon the Agiad throne, Kleonymos defected to Pyrrhos of Epeiros (Cartledge, and Spawforth, 2002: pp. 29–30). Kleonymos' claim provided Pyrrhos an excellent opportunity to invade Laconia with the ultimate objective of controlling Peloponnesos; a strategic hit against the Makedonians in the endeavour to stabilize his power after his unsuccessful campaign against the Romans in Italy. Nonetheless, he failed to capture the city of Sparta firstly due to its citizens defence and, immediately afterwards, by Areus' swift and timely return from Crete (Plut. *Pyrrh.* 29.6) and the help of Antigonos Gonatas.<sup>2</sup> In the end, Pyrrhus was defeated and killed at Argos (Shipley, 2000: p. 142; Cartledge, and Spawforth, 2002: p. 31; Walbank, 2006b: p. 224).

Immediately following the events with Pyrrhos, Areus, and the Spartan elite, chose to capitalize this achievement – after all it could be advertised as a success of Spartan arms and, surely, as the kings' personal attainment. The rewards for this policy were immediate. He managed to strike an alliance with Ptolemaios II and a number of Greek states, Athens prominent among them, in a joint front against the Makedonians (cf. Decree of Chremonides, c. 268/7; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 686+687). As Ptolemaios was a diplomat, he was looking for prominent allies in order to set a stronghold in the main Hellenic peninsula. Sparta, and its proactive king fulfilled this role perfectly.

To further support his deed and in order to establish the image of a powerful ruler Areus issued Sparta's first coinage plausibly during the same

<sup>2</sup> A site called the 'Camp of Pyrrhos' commemorated the event. Its true location is contested on our primary sources. Polybios (5.19.4) places the Camp of Pyrrhus south of Sparta, while Livy (35.27.14) north of it.

period of the Chremonidean War and in order to finance its needs (Grunauer-von Hoerschelmann, 1978: pp. 1–6; Mørkholm, 1991: p. 149; Walker, 2009: p. 61; Hoover, 2011: p. 139). As already stated, this is an unprecedented, by the standards of Sparta, event. Areus issued silver tetradrachms on the Attic standard (c. 17.2g), based on the Alexandrine type, and obols on the Aeginetan standard (c. 0.95g). Minting and circulating coins was contrary to the city's ancient customs and the Lykourgan restrictions (Hodkinson, 2000: pp. 35–37; Shipley, 2000: p. 141; Cartledge, and Spawforth, 2002: pp. 31–32) although the use of money by the *polis* was nothing new (cf. Lévy, 2008: pp. 392ff.).

Only four silver tetradrachms of Areus have been found and they originate from three different obverse dies, sharing a common reverse (Troxell, 1971: p. 70, Plates IX, XI; Grunauer-von Hoerschelmann, 1978: pp. 1–4, group I; Walker, 2009: p. 61). The tetradrachms (Fig. 1) carry the head of Herakles wearing a lion's skin headdress on the obverse and Zeus enthroned on the reverse with the legend ΒΑΣΙΛΕΟΣ ΑΡΕΟΣ [of King Areus]. Their poor survival may be explained by the melting down of the king's money by his later successors (Troxell, 1971: p. 70).

Next to Areus' tetradrachms, several silver obols survive (Fig. 2; Grunauer-von Hoerschelmann, 1978: pp. 4–6, group II). They carry a bearded head of Herakles in lion skin headdress on the obverse and Herakles' club with knots flanked by six-ray stars on the anepigraphic reverse.

The introduction of silver coinage in Sparta must be identified as a targeted action of Areus, as it is a focal point of his policy of civic renewal. Coinage is the most intended means of representation (Skinner, 2010: p. 137). In terms of 'intentional history',<sup>3</sup> minting coins is an act of self-definition on behalf of the issuing authority, which aims to communicate messages, or 'knowledge', to an audience of people. Coinage clearly provides a solid basis for the construction of a collective *imaginaire*. By using the Alexanders, Areus was represented in a powerful yet also symbolic and eloquent way as this typology was the most acceptable currency of the period (Meadows, and Shipton, 2001: pp. 56–57; Kontes, 2007; Walker, 2009: p. 77).

The main iconographical theme on the obverse of the coins is Herakles. He was the mythic progenitor of the royal houses of Sparta, the *Agiadai* and the *Eurypontidai* (Hdt. 6.52) and was recurrently used in Sparta (cf. Palagia, 2006: pp. 213–215, especially the uses of the soldier king by Kleomenes III). Several other city-states and royal houses in Peloponnesos and

<sup>3</sup> The term "intentional history" was coined by H. J. Gehrke in order "to understand the function of the past in the self-definition of Greek communities" (Gehrke, 2001: pp. 286ff.; Foxhall et al., 2010).

elsewhere used the same myth and origins to support their superiority and their inalienable right to rule. They could be identified by originating from the *Herakleidai* (Ἡρακλεΐδαι) who had conquered Peloponnesos and divided the land by lot (Apollod. 2.8). The myth of the ‘Return of the Herakleidai’ was used to describe how an invading force claimed Peloponnesos – the exiled descendants of Herakles returned after three generations to reclaim the land that he had held –, but its political uses prominently affected the social structures of the region (for a thorough discussion on the myth and its connotations see Luraghi, 2008: pp. 46–67; Stafford, 2014: pp. 137–142). The Heraklid connection to Sparta was first attested in the poetry of Tyrtaios (fr. 2.12–15W). In classical and later sources the most prominent role was to provide the foundation of the Spartan kings’ lineage and to proclaim their superiority against the other aristocratic families, not limited only to Sparta but extended to Peloponnesos (Cartledge, 2002: p. 295; Stafford, 2014: p. 140). As Olga Palagia (1986: p. 137) accurately describes: the association to any god, Herakles in this case, made possible the participation of the different rulers to his divine nature and immortality and thus establishing themselves in the centre of civic life.

In the context of currency, this is not the first case where the image of Herakles is associated to the Spartan political propaganda. Herakliskos Drakonopnigon (infant Herakles strangling serpents) adorns the coins struck to celebrate the alliance between cities in Western Asia Minor and the Aegean Islands after the Athenian defeat at Aigos Potamoi (404) and their successive liberation by the Spartans (Fig. 3). More interestingly, this theme has been associated with Lysandros (Karwiese, 1980). Lysandros enjoyed an exceptionally high profile for his deeds during the end of the Peloponnesian War. It is the first case where a general was granted divine honours (Duris of Samos, *FGrH* 76F 26, 71). The Samians renamed the religious festival of the *Herea* to *Lysandreia* in order to honour him (Badian, 1981: pp. 37–38; Walbank, 2006a: p. 89).<sup>4</sup> The numismatic manifestation of Herakliskos Drakonopnigon had not only political and economic reasons but ideological as well. By similar fashion, Areus’ coinage should not be interpreted only in economic or military terms, political and ideological dimensions were certain. It is by such an interpretation that we can trace more similarities between Lysandros and Areus: personal ambitions operated side-by-side with civic success and could be linked to ideas of greater political reforms.

<sup>4</sup> Although Duris does not state that the altars were in use during the lifetime of Lysandros, Plutarch describes it as a fact (*Lys.* 18). The *Lysandreia* mentioned on the same passage have been confirmed by epigraphical evidence (IG XII,6 1.334): [–c.6–7–] ἰ παγκρατίῳ τετράκις Λυσάνδρεια ἐνίκη [had won the pankration four times at the Lysandreia].

To return to the topic of ancestry, the Makedonian royal house of the Argeadai draws upon the same legendary origins through the Heraklid Temenus of Argos. We have numerous references of this ancestry on the literary evidence, for example Plutarch (*Alex.* 2.1) describes Alexander's descent from Herakles. However, this is but only one of several literary references to link the House of the Argeadai to Herakles (cf. Diod. 7. 17; Hdt. 8.137–8; Just. 7.1; Vell. Pat. 1.6). Philippos II had diligently cultivated this connection to Herakles but it was already disseminated to a certain extent (Engels, 2010: p. 90; Kremydi, 2011: pp. 163–164; Stafford, 2014: pp. 140–143). The connection was effectively demonstrated in the royal palace at Aigai by the inscription to Ἡρακλῆ Πατρῶν [Paternal Herakles] (Bakalakis and Andronikos, 1970: p. 394; Robert and Robert, 1974: p. 238; Andronikos, 2004: p. 38) and by the coinage minted in Makedonia and introduced by King Archelaos I (r. 413–399): the head of Herakles Patroos was placed on the obverse of Makedonian coins issued for political reasons (Fig. 4; Psoma, 2002: p. 29; Kontes, 2007; Anson, 2010: p. 18; Engels, 2010: p. 96; Kremydi, 2011: pp. 163–164). The same iconography was used by the kings Amyntas III (393–370) and Perdikkas III (359–336).

During Philippos II's reign, especially from 356, and increasingly during Alexander III's reign onwards the figure of Herakles experienced extensive use as part of a broader programme of enhancing this *imaginaire*. There are several references to the active cultivation of the king's link to Herakles in the *Anabasis*: from various rituals at critical junctures of his campaign (Arr. *Anab.* 1.4.5; 1.117.7, 6.3.2) to dreams (ibid. 2.15) and acts of emulation (ibid. 3.2; 4.28–30; 5.26.6). Except the textual evidence, there is a range of examples of Heraklean iconography on artistic media ranging from sculpture – Lysippos' works<sup>5</sup> – to coins minted during Alexander III's lifetime. Price (1991: pp. 31–32) has compiled four groups of bronze coinage that circulated in Makedonia; the most prominent theme of these hemiobols (6.5g) was the head of beardless Herakles wearing a lion's skin headdress on the obverse and the legend ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ framed by a club and a quiver placed on bow on the reverse (Fig. 5; for a full list see Price, 1991: pp. 31–32). Silver tetradrachms of the very popular Alexandrine type (head of Herakles/Zeus enthroned) with the legend ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ (Fig. 6) were minted on twenty-five different mints (Kontes, 2007; Price, 1991: pp. 71–78). Thus, their circulation was international, disseminating the message of their iconography to the corners of the new empire. After

<sup>5</sup> There are many examples of Heraklean sculptures by Lysippos (cf. Herakles of Sparta; Boston 52.1741). He was the court sculptor to Alexander the Great and his themes were certainly affected by the king's views and propaganda (for more see Pollitt, 1986: pp. 20–26).

Alexander's death, Herakles was used as the main image of self-presentation of the king and his *Diadokhoi* as well, due to the growth of mercenary soldiering (Miller, 1984: p. 157; Dahmen, 2007: p. 6; Davies, 2007: p. 80; Asirvatham, 2010: p. 101). However, this could not be the only reason behind the great power of this specific iconography; the answer lies in the combination of the extent and needs for financing mercenaries in this highly active period and politics reasons: the specific weight of Alexander the Great's image and his already widely prevalent legacy.

Alexander the Great's successors continued to build on the strategic propagation of messages through coinage. The depictions of divine ancestors became the norm<sup>6</sup>. In relation to Areus' coinage, the most interesting case is that of the Ptolemaic dynasty. Ptolemaios I Soter, first as a satrap (323–305), issued normal issues of the Alexandrine type in the name of Alexander (Fig. 7). By associating himself with Alexander, Ptolemaios tried to gain his divine status and inherit his legacy. In addition to his efforts to bring the body of Alexander to Egypt, he promoted the links to Ammon (as Alexander has already done) and went a step further by propagandising links to the same Herakleidai ancestry (Hölbl, 2001: pp. 92–98). Theokritos (*Idyll.* 17) presents Ptolemaios I enthroned in the halls of Zeus alongside Alexander and Herakles, who rejoices in his descendants' deification.

Despite such symbolisms, Ptolemaios I, by 320/19 and his defeat of Perdikkas, had changed the familiar representation of Herakles/Zeus coin. He inaugurated new obverse on the silver coins, with Alexander wearing an elephant-skin headdress, while the reverse remained the same. By 314, the mints in Egypt moved to replace the figure of Zeus seated on his throne with a rather archaic representation of the goddess Athena in fighting stance (Fig. 8; Dahmen, 2007: pp. 10–12; Walker, 2009: p. 90). By 298/7–295/4, Alexander's representation on the obverse had been totally eclipsed, even from Egypt's golden coins despite the fact that the Ptolemaic dynasty also claimed descent from Herakles (Palagia, 1986: p. 143; Hölbl, 2001: pp. 79–80; for a concise chronological presentation see Lorber, 2005).

Sparta had strong diplomatic relations with the Ptolemies as attested by the epigraphic evidence at Olympia (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 433), which indicates the relations between Areus I and King Ptolemaios, and in the Decree of Chremonides, which records the ratification of the alliance between the Athenians, the Spartans and King Ptolemaios against Antigonos Gonatas in the infamous Chremonidean War. Nonetheless, the Spartan choice of images stands

<sup>6</sup> For example, the Seleucids minted coins depicting at first Zeus (Seleukos I) and then Apollo. Apollo's iconography became the canon during Antiochus I's reign, whilst the god became the divine ancestor of the dynasty (for the dynamics of Seleukid iconography see Erickson, 2009).

in direct contrast to the evolution of coinage in Egypt. One could imagine that Ptolemaic influence, a key factor in the dynamic resurgence of Sparta during Areus' reign, would be stronger. Still, the Spartans used the Alexandrine type. Why so?

It may be that the already, by 305, different and reduced standard used by the Ptolemies somewhat limited the ability to fund mercenaries. By 290, the Ptolemaic standard was even lower and reached the fixed value of c.14.2g (Mørkholm, 1991: pp. 10–11). Yet, this cannot be the only reason behind the Spartan decision. The Ptolemaic kingdom had been transformed in a closed, regulated and strong economy (Manning, 2005; Thompson, 2014). The formation of a great trade and communications network – Southern and Northern Aegean and its coasts – was governed by economic imperialism (Marquaille, 2014: p. 43) and could have mitigated against these Spartan concerns.

Mørkholm (1991: pp. 149, 200–201) argues that Areus, or Ptolemaios, issued the coins only for financial reasons (mercenaries). Even if it was Ptolemaios II's act and the coins were not directly issued by the Spartans, two possibilities seem plausible. Either, the use of the specific typology was in agreement to Areus. Or it could be the case that Ptolemaios advocated and supported a type more openly recognized in order not to reveal his involvement and connections to the general unrest in Southern Greece.

Sparta wanted to grow its power and King Areus had the momentum. These confirm that the Spartans offered Egypt a great opportunity: they were a promising ally with great potential in carrying out any plans in Southern Greece. This should have provided a good influence point for the Spartans in the negotiations and could eventually lead to the promotion of their own agenda. It is highly likely that the Spartans (or Areus) were able to suggest and debate on these matters. For Ptolemaios could not hide his plans: evidence of relations and later of a formal alliance were present. The Makedonians were not favored in these parts of Greece and Egypt openly opposed them in pursue of controlling South Greece and thereafter, the Aegean. More interestingly, the chosen iconographic type completely contradicts the numismatic history of the Egyptian kingdom. By all means, the first case is more plausible even in the event that some of the coins were minted outside Spartan territory during one of King Areus' military expeditions as Mørkholm (1991: p. 149) suggested. It is highly probable that the great reliance of Spartans upon mercenary forces and the wide recognition that this coin had directed the Spartans to adopt this version (Palagia, 2006: p. 206). However, in conjunction with the aforementioned connotations it is plausible that Areus had plans of his own. Aside the functionality of coinage, the coins conveyed messages and their typology was intended:

a representation policy founded simultaneously on ‘innovations’ and ‘new’ principles but which also created links to the mythical and recent past and present and used traditional Spartan symbols.

Areus intentionally used the coins to denote his figure as a modern king and on par with the Successors, and to advance his connections to the divine ancestors (Palagia, 2006: p. 216); this is a constant and consistent practice of contemporary rulers (Dahmen, 2007: p. 6). In Areus’ case, the sometimes problematic ability of people to recognize the image on the coin – either Alexander or Herakles – could prove advantageous (Dahmen, 2007: pp. 40–41). The iconography on the obols bore direct connotations to the mythic past, with the clearly identifiable Herakles and the signs of the Dioskouroi, which is the only iconographic representation of dual kingship (the Dioskouroi represent the two royal houses of Sparta). The denominations should be thought as an intermediary medium between the fully iconographic and inscribed tetradrachms and Spartan everyday life (Hoover, 2011: p. 139).

Furthermore, by underlining the common ancestry of Spartans and Makedonians, Areus could imply his inspirations in a rather direct way, and he could establish strong links to the greatness of Alexander’s legacy; this was the message directed to external audiences and based upon the communicative memory of Spartan society (Assmann, 1995: pp. 126–127; 2011: pp. 48–49). In fact, he used a similar style of coinage to the widely used Makedonian model despite the enmity of Sparta towards Makedonia (Shipley, 2000: p. 142; Cartledge and Spawforth, 2002: p. 32; Kremydi, 2011: pp. 168–169). Herakles was prominent in Spartan royal ideology long before the Makedonians came to the fore and, as we have already seen, arguably this was not the first instance of coinage with similar iconography connected to Sparta.

The main question deriving from Areus’ monetary policy is how wider Spartan society perceived the new coins. Despite the prevailing scholarly opinion that the coins did not meet wide dissemination in Spartan society, since their principal focus was external transactions and trade, as well as the projection of the king (and Sparta), they surely had an impact on society (contra Palagia, 2006: pp. 206). Questions about the introduction of coins by Areus have long been posed. What about the internal impact of their use? The coinage, as much as it was a political tool, it had also some practical implementation. Even if the coins were solely used for financing mercenaries, their circulation is certain at least on the fringes of Spartan society. Surely the coins were not a secret and must have known some spread, something partly demonstrated by the Peloponnesos hoard of 1962 (Troxell, 1971: pp. 66–67; Price, 1991: p. 191), where an example of Areus’ silver coin was found. Even without actual transactions, for we do not know of any documented incident, orality was certainly enough to spread the word.

It is exactly through communication that memories are shaped and collective memories re-shape (Halbwachs, 1980: p. 59). Coins acted not only as objects, but as social agents as they carry socially constructed notions (Gell, 1998: pp. 16–19). They convey messages and enable the confirmation of the figurative or verbal slogans inscribed on them (Tsouratsoglou, 2002: p. 11). Coins fit into a greater network of people and objects and can be understood as means of social change. Even unseen objects can guide and determine expectations and behaviour (Gell, 1998: pp. 221–223) and this is exactly the objective. In order to retell a narrative, constructed though it may be, you need to support it with tangible evidence, to be able to support your aim both externally and internally (Vygotsky, 1978: p. 55; Engeström, 2009: pp. 54–57). Thus, coins function as devices to represent the identity of the issuing authorities and point of origin. Something achieved via a combination of iconography and inscriptions which are “intelligible” and “recognisable”. Once a coin is minted a larger audience has the liberty to construct its own understanding from the images displayed. The further that coin travelled from its point of origin, the more varied the readings it would get; the factors being regional, political, cultural, religious or ethnic, audience and context (Skinner, 2010: pp. 138–141). In effect, the Lakadaimonians could receive different messages from the close-by poleis and perioikic establishments. Likewise, other Greek cities or Hellenistic kings would most certainly receive different messages – the message of another *Successor* emerging, a most appealing message for mercenaries.

Spartan policy was characterised by selectivity: some aspects of the past were highlighted while others were rejected. On one hand, the basic core of the manipulation of the past was based on the distant past and the long-term cultural memory. The direct links to hegemony, not only over Peloponnesos, are clearly attested in the Chremonidean Decree. Moreover, again in the context of Spartan cultural memory, the mythic past was stressed through the connection to the Heraklidai, instead of the Dioskouroi – Herakles symbolised monarchy rather than diarchy (Palagia, 2006: p. 208). Areus’ reign falls within the pattern of what I define as the Spartan ‘mentality of Hegemony’ – an integrated part of their cultural memory formed through generations of hegemonial presence in Peloponnesos and contests throughout the Hellenic world.

On the other hand, the Spartans seemed to reject the majority of the short-term, communicative memory – or their most recent past: their defeats after Leuktra (371) and the successive territorial losses and military humiliations are silenced. Instead, they only keep that part of memory which overlaps with its cultural counterpart. Again, from this recent past, they overlooked their aversion towards Alexander and they intentionally chose the Alexandrine

type for their tetradrachms. Finally yet importantly, with the introduction of coinage they rejected parts of the “traditional” Lykourgan regime, something that could be connected with more innovative political reforms, of which, alas, we have no word.

All in all, Areus was consistent in his use of coinage, alliances and specific means of representation of the historical past of his *polis*. During his reign and through the objectification of certain notions, not only was the Spartan reality reshaped but the evolving consciousness of the Spartan society was also actively supported. The Spartan collective consciousness was reshaped by the introduction of coinage and the representations of a Hellenistic-type monarch but still abided to the hegemonic past and the social institutions that structured Spartan society.

### Figures



FIGURE 1: Silver tetradrachm of King Areus I; struck c. 267–265. *Obv.* Head of Herakles/Alexander wearing a lion’s skin headdress. *Rev.* [BAΣΙΛΕΟΣ ΑΡΕΟΣ] Zeus seated in his throne, with eagle standing on his right hand and a sceptre in his left. SOURCE: Walker (2009: p. 61); L.77.



FIGURE 2: Silver obol of King Areus I. *Obv.* Bearded head of Herakles with lion skin. *Rev.* Club with knots and six-ray stars. SOURCE: Grunauer (1978: Group II).



FIGURE 3: Samian Silver Tridrachm; struck c. 404–394. *Obv.* The infant Herakles, nude, with a baldric over his left shoulder in kneeling stance and strangling with two serpents, ΣΥΝ[ΜΑΧΙΚΟΝ] *Rev.* Lion's mask, ΣΑ[ΜΟΣ] below. SOURCE: Baron (1966: p. 1b).



FIGURE 4: Archelaos I's silver diobol (0.90g); struck c. 413–399. Aigai mint. *Obv.* Bearded Herakles wearing a lion's skin headdress. *Rev.* [ΑΡΧ-Ε] Forepart of wolf right, devouring prey and club above. SOURCE: *SNG ANS* 72.



FIGURE 5: Alexander the Great's lifetime bronze four chalkoi/hemiobol (6.5g); struck c. 336–323. Amphipolis mint. *Obv.* Head of beardless Herakles wearing a lion's skin headdress. *Rev.* [ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ] framed by a club and a quiver placed on bow. SOURCE: Price (1991: no 296).



FIGURE 6: Alexander the Great's lifetime silver tetradrachm (17.2g); struck c. 336–323. *Obv.* Head of beardless Herakles wearing a lion's skin headdress. *Rev.* [ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ] Zeus seated in his throne, with eagle standing on his right hand and a sceptre in his left. Herm in field to left. SOURCE: Price (1991: no 78).



FIGURE 7: Ptolemaios I Soter, as Satrap. Silver tetradrachm (16.76g) in the name of Alexander III; struck c. 323/2–317/1. Mephis or Alexandria Mint. *Obv.* Head of beardless Herakles wearing a lion's skin headdress. *Rev.* [ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ] Zeus seated in his throne, with eagle standing on his right hand and a sceptre in his left. Ram's head wearing crown of Isis (Khnun) in  $\Delta$  field to left; monogram below the throne. SOURCE: Price (1991: no 3964).



FIGURE 8: Silver tetradrachm of Ptolemaios I Soter from Alexandria (c. 313/2). *Obv.* Head of Alexander II wearing elephant's skin headdress (right/front). *Rev.* [ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ] Athena in fighting stance, hurling the spear on the right hand and lifting the shield on the left, with an eagle standing on thunderbolt to her right. Below the eagle letters [ΔΙ] SOURCE: Walker (2009: p. 90); L.126.

## Primary Sources

- Apollodorus (1921). *Library*. Trans. J. G. Frazer. London: William Heinemann.
- Arrian (1907). *Anabasis Alexandri*. Trans. A. G. Roos. Lipsiae: B. G. Teubner.
- Diodorus (1939). *Bibliotheca Historica*. Trans. C. H. Oldfather (Loeb Classical Library 340). Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Herodotus (1920). *Histories*. Trans. A. D. Godley. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Justin (1853). *Historiarum Philippicarum libri XLIV*. Trans. J. S. Watson. London: Henry G. Bohn.
- Livy (1935). *Ab Urbe Condita*. Trans. E. T. Sage. London: William Heinemann.
- Pausanias (1933). *Description of Greece*. Trans. W. H. S. Jones (Loeb Classical Library 272). London: William Heinemann.
- Polybius (1962). *Historiae*. Trans. E. S. Shuckburgh. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Plutarch (1916–1920). *Lives*. Trans. B. Perrin. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Theocritus (1901). *Idylls*. Trans. R. J. Cholmeley. London: George Bell & Sons.
- Velleius Paterculus (1924). *Historiae Romanae*. Trans. F. W. Shipley (Loeb Classical Library 152). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

## Secondary Sources

- Andronikos, M. (2004). *Vergina: The Royal Tombs and the Ancient City*. Athens: Ekdotike Athenon.
- Anson, E. M. (2010). Why Study Ancient Macedonia and What this Companion is About. In J. Roisman, & I. Worthington (Eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia* (pp. 3–20). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Asirvatham, S., R. (2010). Perspectives on the Macedonians from Greece, Rome, and Beyond. In J. Roisman, & I. Worthington (Eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia* (pp. 99–124). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Assmann, J. (1995). Collective Memory and Cultural Identity. *New German Critique*, 65, 125–133.
- Badian, E. (1981). The Deification of Alexander the Great. In H. J. Dell (Ed.), *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson* (pp. 27–71). Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies.
- Bakalakis, G., & Andronikos, M. (1970). Χρονικά. Ανασκαφή Βεργίνης. *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον [Archaeologikon Deltion]*, 25(2), 390–396.
- Barron, J. P. (1966). *The Silver Coins of Samos*. London: Athlone Press.
- Cartledge, P. (2002). *Sparta and Lakonia: A Regional History 1300 to 362 BC*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Cartledge, P., & Spawforth, A. (2002). *Hellenistic and Roman Sparta: A Tale of Two Cities*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Dahmen, K. (2007). *The Legend of Alexander the Great on Greek and Roman Coins*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Davies, J. K. (2007). Hellenistic Economies. In G. R. Bugh (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Hellenistic World* (pp. 73–93). Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Engels, J. (2010). Macedonians and Greeks. In J. Roisman, & I. Worthington (Eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia* (pp. 81–98). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Engeström, Y. (2009). Expansive Learning: Toward an Activity-Theoretical Reconceptualization. In K. Illeris (Ed.), *Contemporary Theories of Learning: Learning Theorists... in their Own Words* (pp. 53–73). London and New York: Routledge.
- Erickson, K. G. (2009). *The Early Seleucids, their Gods and their Coins*. PhD Thesis, University of Exeter.
- Gehrke, H.-J. (2001). Myth, History, and Collective Identity: Uses of the Past in Ancient Greece and Beyond. In N. Luraghi (Ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (pp. 286–314). Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gell, A. (1998). *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Grunaeur-von Hoerschelmann, S. (1978). *Die Münzprägung der Lakedaimonier* (Antike Münzen und geschnittene Steine, Vol. 7). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Halbwachs, M. (1980). *The Collective Memory*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Hölbl, G. (2001). *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*. London: Routledge.
- Hodkinson, S. (2000). Οικονομία και Εμπόριο. *Ιστορικά*, 61, 31–37.
- Hoover, O. D. (2011). *Handbook of Coins of the Peloponnesos: Achaia, Phleiasia, Sikyonia, Elis, Triphylia, Messenia, Laconia, Argolis, and Arkadia: Sixth to First Centuries BC* (Handbook of Greek Coinage, Vol. 5). Lancaster, Pa. and London: Classical Numismatics Group, Inc. (CNG).
- Karwiese, S. (1980). Lysander as Herakliskos Dakonopnigon: Heracles the snake-strangler. *The Numismatic Chronicle*, 20, 1–27.
- Kontes, Z. S. (2007). *The Dating of the Coinage of Alexander the Great*. Joukowsky Institute Publications. Retrieved from: [http://www.brown.edu/Departments/Joukowsky\\_Institute/publications/papers/alexander\\_coinage/alexander.html](http://www.brown.edu/Departments/Joukowsky_Institute/publications/papers/alexander_coinage/alexander.html).
- Kremydi, S. (2011). Coinage and Finance. In R. J. Lane Fox (Ed.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Macedon: Studies in the Archaeology and History of Macedon, 650 BC–300 AD* (pp. 159–178). Leiden: Brill.
- Lévy, E. (2008). *Σπάρτη: Κοινωνική και πολιτική ιστορία έως τη ρωμαϊκή κατάκτηση*. Athens: Patakis.
- Lorber, C. C. (2005). A Revised Chronology for the Coinage of Ptolemy I. *Numismatic Chronicle*, 165, 45–64.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2008). *The Ancient Messenians: Constructions of Ethnicity and Memory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Manning, J. G. (2005). *The Ptolemaic Economy, Institution, Economic Integration, and the Limits of Centralized Political Power* (pp. 1–15). Princeton / Stanford Working Papers in Classics.
- Marquaille, C. (2014). The Foreign Policy of Ptolemy II. In P. McKechnie, & P. Guillame (Eds.), *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World* (Mnemosyne Supplements 300, pp. 39–64). Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Meadows, A., & Shipton, K. (Eds.). (2001). *Money and its Uses in the Ancient Greek World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, H. F. (1984). The Practical and Economic Background to the Greek Mercenary Explosion. *Greece & Rome, Second Series*, 31(2), 153–160.
- Mørkholm, O. (1991). *Early Hellenistic Coinage from the Accession of Alexander to the Peace of Apamea (336–186 B.C.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Neil, J. L. (2008). A Re-Examination of the Chremonidean War. In P. McKechnie, & P. Guillame (Eds.), *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and His World* (Mnemosyne Supplements 300, pp. 65–90). Leiden and Boston: Brill.

- Palagia, O. (1986). Imitation of Herakles in Ruler Portraiture: A Survey, from Alexander to Maximinus Daza. *Boreas*, 9, 137–151.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2006). Art and Royalty in Sparta of the 3rd Century B.C. *Hesperia*, 75, 205–217.
- Pollitt, J. J. (1986). *Art in the Hellenistic Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Price, M. J. (1991). *The Coinage in the Name of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaeus: A British Museum Catalogue* (Volumes 1, 2). Zurich and London: The Swiss Numismatic Society; British Museum Press.
- Psoma, S. E. (2002). Το βασίλειο των Μακεδόνων πριν από τον Φίλιππο Β': Νομισματική και ιστορική προσέγγιση. In E. Grammatikopoulou (Ed.), *Η ιστορική διαδρομή της νομισματικής μονάδας στην Ελλάδα* (pp. 25–47). Athens: National Research Foundation (EIE).
- Robert, J., & Robert L. (1974). *Bulletin épigraphique in Revue des études grecques*, 87, 186–340.
- Shipley, D. G. J. (2000). *The Greek World after Alexander, 323–330 B.C.* London and New York: Routledge.
- Skinner, J. (2010). Fish heads and mussel-shells: visualizing Greek identity. In L. Foxhall, H.-J. Gehrke, & N. Luraghi (Eds.), *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Skinner, Q. (2002). *Visions of Politics: Regarding Method* (Volume 1). Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- SNG ANS (1994). *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. Part 8: Macedonia 2 (Alexander I–Philip II)*. New York: The American Numismatic Society.
- Stafford, E. (2014). *Herakles*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Thompson, D. (2014). Economic Reform in the Mid-Reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. In McKechnie, P., & Guillame, P. (Eds.), *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World* (Mnemosyne Supplements 300, pp. 27–38). Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Troxell, H. A. (1971). The Peloponnesian Alexanders. *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes*, 17, 41–94.
- Tsouratsoglou, I. (2002). Νομισματική και Αρχαιολογία. In E. Grammatikopoulou (Ed.), *Η ιστορική διαδρομή της νομισματικής μονάδας στην Ελλάδα* (pp. 11–23). Athens: National Research Foundation (EIE).
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Walbank, F. W. (2006a). Monarchies and Monarchic Ideas. In W. F. Walbank, A. E. Astin, M. W. Frederiksen, & R. M. Ogilvie (Eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History (CAH)* (Volume VII; Part 1: *The Hellenistic World*, pp. 62–100). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2006b). Macedonia and Greece. In W. F. Walbank, A. E. Astin, M. W. Frederiksen, & R. M. Ogilvie (Eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History (CAH)* (Volume VII; Part 1: *The Hellenistic World*, pp. 221–256). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walker, A. S. (2006). *Coins of Peloponnesos: The BCD Collection (May 8–9, 2006, Hotel Savoy-Baur en Ville)* (Auction LHS 96). Zurich: LHS Numismatics.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2009). *Nomos 1: Auction Catalog of Greek, Roman, Early Medieval and Early Modern Coins and Medals*. Zurich: Nomos AG.

Manolis E. Pagkalos BA, MA, PhD Candidate  
 School of Archaeology and Ancient History  
 University of Leicester  
 University Road, Leicester, LE 1 7RH, United Kingdom  
 mp482@le.ac.uk

