

Same Type, Different Legend: Anchiale or Soloi?

Hale GÜNEY*

I. Introduction

This article investigates a coin found in the coin collection at the Istanbul Archaeological Museums that is ascribed to Soloi-Pompeiopolis, a harbour city in Cilicia. Acquired from the private collection of numismatist and collector Osman N. Arıdağ in 1961, the item (Inv. No: KD 650-1787) was recorded as a coin of Soloi whose provenance is not known. The coin was catalogued under Soloi-Pompeiopolis, probably due to its thoroughgoing resemblance to the type on coins of Soloi-Pompeiopolis. These were struck during the second half of the 5th century B.C. and depicted the kneeling Amazon (obverse) and grape bunch (reverse). The legend on the reverse, however, is [A]ΓΧΙΑΛ[A] rather than ΣΟΛΕΩΝ as would be expected. The legend therefore indicates another Cilician city, Anchiale, whose precise location has not yet been determined and whose coins are little known. These facts about Anchiale lead, then, up to the question of whether Anchiale was formerly Soloi.

This issue, formerly discussed over three coins at the British Museum¹ due to their attribution to Soloi and Ingirâ (presumably former Anchiale meaning “near the sea”)², is controversial. Attested in the hoard in Kabul and found in Balkh, these coins use the same type but only with Aramaic letters. Considering the Aramaic letters “GD/RH” on the reverse, Robinson associated them with Soloi³. Later, however, Casabonne, Lemaire and Forlanini opposed Robinson’s reading by suggesting that these letters must have referred to Ingirâ, not Soloi⁴. They have formulated two hypotheses: 1) Forlanini questions whether Ingirâ was another or a former indigenous name of Soloi while 2) Casabonne argues that Ingirâ was a different settlement in Cilicia⁵.

* Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hale Güney, Assist. Prof. Dr. Hale Güney, İpek Üniversitesi, İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Fakültesi, Tarih Bölümü, Turan Güneş Bulvarı, 648. Cadde, 06550 Oran, Çankaya - Ankara. E-mail: hgüney@ipek.edu.tr

I would like to thank T. Gökyıldırım and S. Öztöpaş, the curators at the Istanbul Archaeological Museums, for kindly hosting me and allowing me to look through the coins of Soloi-Pompeiopolis in the museum collection. I am obliged to Prof. Dr. O. Tekin who drew my attention to and provided the picture of another coin of Anchiale that appeared in the Gorny-Mosch Giessener Münzhandlung Auction in 2012. I am indebted to the anonymous reviewer whose substantial comments helped to improve this article. Finally, I would like to thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Z. Yılmaz Kurt for her assistance in improving the language of this article.

¹ Casabonne et al. 2001, 57-58.

² Sayce 1910, 1340: “The Greek l takes the place of the Cilician r, as in Olba for Urwa, which, as Sir W. M. Ramsay has shown, was the native name of the town that stood westward of Tarsus. Assimilation to Ἀγγιάλος has affected the rest of the change from Ingilâ to Anchialê, where the Ionic ê represents, as usual, an earlier â”.

³ Robinson 1948, 43-59.

⁴ Casabonne et al. 2001, 57-66.

⁵ Casabonne et al. 2001, 60-66.

The coin under consideration contributes, however, with its legend of Anchiale, to this debate as well as problematizes it by presenting more questions. Was this coin struck by Anchiale which was formerly Soloi? Or can we accept that there were two different cities which struck this particular type? If so, how do we explain the typological resemblance between the coins of Anchiale and Soloi? This article, while introducing this discovery in context, reconsiders the possibility of this coin's association with the same or two different cities. A detailed discussion of the date, legend and typology on the coin will precede the identification of the possible city to which it might have belonged.

II. Date, Legend and Typology

It is commonly agreed that coins with the type of kneeling Amazon and grapes were generally struck in Soloi between c. 465-410 B.C. Casabonne dates the minting of this type (type II) to 425-410 B.C. (Fig. 1)⁶. The coins with Aramaic legend "GDH" are slightly earlier than the first issue of Soloi⁷.

A brief review of Cilicia's history involving its invasion by the Persians might provide a more insightful perspective on the dating of the coin under consideration. The region attracted many invaders due to its rich resources of silver, iron and tin⁸. Cilicia was first captured by Babylonia, and then ruled by the Lydians until the Persian invasion in the mid-6th century B.C. From the middle of the 6th century to the last quarter of the 4th century B.C., Cilicia remained under Persian domination⁹. A local dynasty - whose rulers were called Syennesis¹⁰, resided in Tarsus and paid the highest tribute in Anatolia - appeared under the Persians in Cilicia. Xenophon's account reveals that the Syennesis of his time was a vassal of Persia¹¹. Cilicia, therefore, was a tribute-paying and probably semi-autonomous province during the 5th century B.C. However, Syennesis III supported the revolt of Cyrus the Younger against Artaxerxes II. After Cyrus' defeat at Cunaxa in 401 B.C., Artaxerxes II removed Syennesis from power, and Cilicia became one of the Persian satrapies in Anatolia¹². As a result, Cilicia started minting coins in the names of or with the types of the Persian satraps, e.g. Tiribazos, Pharnabazos, and Datames¹³. The probable period during which this coin might have been minted coincides with the rule of the Syennesis dynasty.

The denomination of the coin is equivalent to one third of a stater, and Soloi coins of this type are rarely issued in this denomination (third stater). As for the legend, the lower part of the first letter and the left side of the last letter, both of which seem to be A, are barely visible whereas the other letters are completely identifiable (Fig. 2). Another coin of Anchiale with the same type and legend, which appeared in an auction catalogue in 2012, helps, in fact, to provide a better reading of this coin (Fig. 3). This coin shows that the first and last letters are

⁶ SNG France 129; SNG Levante 41; SNG von Aulock 5860; Casabonne 2000, 40.

⁷ Casabonne et al. 2001, 65.

⁸ Dusinberre 2013, 46-47.

⁹ Gladiss 1973-74, 175-181.

¹⁰ Cf. Casabonne 1995; Salmeri 2004, 191.

¹¹ Xenophon, *Hellenica* III.1.1. *Anabasis* I.2.12.21-27, VI.8.25.

¹² Dandamaev 1989, 12; Dusinberre 2013, 46-47.

¹³ For satrapal coins of Soloi, see SNG France 159-163.

A. Therefore, the legend is completed as ΑΓΧΙΑΑΑ¹⁴. It also helps to identify the unrecognizable symbol at the lower right on the reverse, which happens to be a satyr head. It is important to note that the legend of these two coins does not bear the ethnicon (Anchialeon) or the ktetikon (Anchialikon). It gives the name of the city in its Doric form (Ἀγχιάλα = Ἀγχιάλη)¹⁵ in the nominative singular or as a nominative plural form (τὰ Ἀγχιάλα). The appearance of the city name in its Doric form is not surprising in this region since ancient written sources as well as archaeological and epigraphic evidence support the tradition that beside the Achaeans, the Rhodians from Lindos founded Soloi¹⁶.

The figure of the kneeling archer/Amazon on this type has been subject to constant debate since the early twentieth century¹⁷. After extended discussion whether the figure represents a male archer or an Amazon warrior, some consensus has been achieved about its identification as an Amazon warrior. This agreement associates it, in fact, with the Cimmerian invasion of Cilicia as mentioned by Strabo¹⁸. Grapes on the reverse were interpreted as reminiscent of vines available in abundance in the Cilician plain, as described by Xenophon¹⁹.

III. Interpretation and Conclusion

Considering the question why the coin presented here carries a Soloi type with different legend, as posed at the beginning of this study, it is possible to develop two hypotheses.

Considering the usual practice of changing city names in the ancient world²⁰, it can first be suggested that Soloi and Anchiale were different names for the same city. If these were the same cities, then sharing the same coin type would be understandable as it accords with Forlanini's suggestion that the coins with Aramaic legend refer to the same city. Furthermore, Soloi apparently was an Achaean and Rhodian foundation, and the city used the Doric dialect²¹. The legend, Anchiala in the Doric form, here may also indicate the same city of Doric origin. In this case, the coinage at Soloi during the mid-5th century B.C. should have been as follows: the city might have first been called Ingirâ and have minted coins with the Aramaic legend. Its name then might have converted to the Greek Anchiale, and it struck coins with the Greek legend, which explains the minting of the coin under consideration. Finally, the same city might have taken the name Soloi and begun minting with the ethnicon of Soloi, as exemplified by many samples so far (i.e. Fig. 1).

However, this assumption about the change of the name Anchiale to Soloi is problematic, as it leads to a series of chronological and geographical problems which need to be clarified. First, archaeological evidence, especially architectural remains which were uncovered at Soli Höyük, reveals that the colonization of Soli by the Greeks covers the period from 650 to

¹⁴ Gorny-Mosch Giessener Münzhandlung Auction 208, 16 October 2012, lot 1608, Stater 10.22 g.

¹⁵ Sayce notes that the name of the city changes from Ingirâ to Ingilâ and then to Anchialê, where the Ionic ê represents, an earlier â. Sayce 1910, 1340.

¹⁶ Strabo X.IV.5.8; Polybius XXI.24.10; Livy XXXVII.56.7; Bulletin Épigraphique 1971, 71.467, Inschriften Griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 38, 1991, 269 p. 83; Yağcı 2013, 6-15.

¹⁷ Babelon 1910; Imhoof-Blumer 1901-1902; Robinson 1923; Bovon 1963; Casabonne 1997, 2000.

¹⁸ Strabo I.3.21; Babelon 1910; Imhoof-Blumer 1901-1902; Robinson 1923, 355-357; Bovon 1963; Casabonne 1997, 2000.

¹⁹ Xenophon, Anabasis I.2.22.

²⁰ Myrleia-Apameia (Bithynia), Kelainai-Apameia (Phrygia), Byzantium-Constantinople.

²¹ Özbayoğlu 1999, 210.

550 B.C.²². There is also written evidence referring to the name Soloi among ancient sources. Hesiod (c. 700 B.C.) is the earliest known written source mentioning the city of Soloi²³. Diogenes Laertius, a biographer of the Greek philosophers, claims that the name of the city was derived from Solon (630-560 B.C.) who had once served as the ruler of Soli²⁴. Hecataeus of Miletus mentions four cities in Cilicia in the second half of the 6th century B.C. – Charadros, Nagidos, Soloi and Corycus²⁵. The name Soloi, therefore, was known and used long before the mid-5th century. Archaeological evidence and written sources indicate that the city had apparently been colonized and called Soloi long before the mid-5th century B.C., the time during which the coin under consideration was minted. There has so far been, however, no further archaeological evidence or ancient written sources identifying Soloi and Anchiale as the same city. On the contrary, ancient written sources differentiate between Soloi and Anchiale. Therefore, a series of geographical problems that necessitate the investigation of the location and history of Anchiale appear.

It is not clear whether Anchiale already existed in 834 B.C., when Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, overcame Pikhirim, the king of Chilakku, and recut the tribute of gold and silver of its inhabitants²⁶. According to Aristobulus, Anchiale was built by Sardanapalus (Ashurbanipal, 668-c. 627 B.C.), king of Assyria, in a single day²⁷. In fact, Eusebius reports the statement of Alexander Polyhistor that Sennacherib, king of Nineveh (705/704-681 B.C.), captured Ingirâ and rebuilt Tarsus and Ingirâ. He ascribes to Ingirâ an Assyrian origin²⁸. The fragments of Hellanicus suggest that Anchiale existed since at least the 5th century B.C.²⁹. Towards the end of the 5th century Anchiale seems to have lost its importance because Xenophon (c. 400 B.C.) does not name it among the cities on the coast³⁰. Hellanicus and Callisthenes report that Anchiale was later renamed Zephyrium, which would mean that Anchiale could have been a former settlement of the latter place³¹. Pliny, however, mentions Zephyrium and Anchiale as two different cities³². Besides Pliny, Anchiale is also mentioned in later sources, e.g. Strabo and Stephanus of Byzantium³³. Strabo locates Anchiale between Zephyrium and Soloi, slightly above the sea front³⁴. Arrian gives important information about the appearance of the city. In 333 B.C. Alexander reached Tarsus by the Taurus pass and proceeded to Anchiale in a day's march, and then from Anchiale to Soli³⁵. An article published by Hatice Kalkan investigates the location of Anchiale and reconsiders the information given about this city in ancient written

²² Yağcı - Kaya 2013, 142-143.

²³ Strabo XIV.5.17.

²⁴ Diogenes Laertius, Solon I.51.

²⁵ Hecataeus, *Periegesis*, FGrHist I.268.

²⁶ Six 1894, 322.

²⁷ Aristobulus, FGrHist IIB.772, Nr. 9.

²⁸ Eusebius, *Chronicle* I.27.

²⁹ Hellanicus, FGrHist I.123, Nr. 63.

³⁰ Xenophon, *Anabasis* I.2.24.

³¹ Hellanicus, FGrHist I.123, Nr. 63; Callisthenes, FGrHist IIB.650.34.

³² Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis Historia* V.91.

³³ Under "Anchiale" Stephanus of Byzantium, however, quotes another foundation legend mentioned by Athenodorus of Tarsus. According to this legend, Anchiale, the Titan goddess, founded the city of Anchiale.

³⁴ Strabo XIV.5.9-10.

³⁵ Arrian, *Anabasis* II.5.

sources³⁶. In this study Kalkan draws attention to two features of Anchiale: its location by a river distant from the sea rather than on the sea, and its defence walls mentioned by Arrian³⁷. Utilizing new archaeological evidence from the region, she claims that the most likely location of Anchiale is modern Karacailyas, a town located 7-8 km. east of Mersin, which is also 20 km. away from Soloi-Pompeipolis, today's Viranşehir in Mersin province³⁸.

On the other hand, the second hypothesis - supposing that Soloi and Anchiale were two different cities, i.e. Anchiale was not the former Soloi - explains why both cities minted coins with their own names almost at the same period. The only possible answer to the question why this coin bears a type of Soloi could be related to Anchiale's geographical proximity to Soloi, and the relationship between the two cities, especially because of a Doric origin. It is possible that obverse dies of this type might have been shared between two cities. It is also probable that the mint at Soloi struck the coins of Anchiale, which presumably was a smaller inland city, in order to bring down the cost of minting. Even if this had not been the case, the coinages of these cities might have at least been compatible or even interchangeable. Yet, being limited to only two samples of the type suspends the reliability of any one of these suggestions.

Casabonne contributes to the second hypothesis - Ingirâ (Anchiale) and Soloi were two different cities - by suggesting that Ingirâ stopped minting in favour of Soloi after a period of minting coins with Aramaic legend³⁹. In fact, there were other cities in Cilicia which issued coins only during a short time period. Ura in Cilicia Trachea, which issued only a small number of coins between c. 450-420 B.C., suddenly stopped minting while the nearby port city of Holmoi started minting in 370. If the development of Cilician coinage is linked with the Achaemenid military expenses, on which construction of the navy played a significant role, the sudden disappearance of the Ingirâ and Ura mints can be explained by the fact that these two cities were not naval bases⁴⁰. The discovery of these two coins casts doubt, however, on Casabonne's claim, as Ingirâ continued to mint coins with the Greek legend, *Αρχιαλα*, almost at the same period when Soloi minted. The coinage of Anchiale possibly ended later.

In conclusion, utilizing the two known coin examples of Anchiale that bear a Greek legend, this study discusses two possibilities of whether these two names refer to two different cities or to one city with two different names. Due to the impossibility of taking only two coins as evidence enough to support either of the hypotheses suggested in this study, it is concluded that more specimens are needed to achieve a more concise identification and interpretation of the coin at hand. Consequently, contributions and criticism both from public and private collectors as well as academicians will help to advance the debate to further certainties.

³⁶ Kalkan 2002, 160-164.

³⁷ Arrian, *Anabasis* II.5.

³⁸ Kalkan 2002, 163.

³⁹ Casabonne et al. 2001, 65.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

The Coin of Soloi:

Obv.: Amazon kneeling left, quiver and bowcase at her side, holding bow; to right, facing head of satyr.

Rev.: ΣΟΛΕΩΝ.

Grape bunch on vine; fly to lower right; all within incuse square.

AR Third Stater 3.47 g, 13 mm., ↓ (Fig. 1).

The image taken from (19/03/2014): <http://www.cngcoins.com/Coin.aspx?CoinID=231076>

Reference: SNG France 129; SNG Levante 41 = SNG von Aulock 5860.



Fig. 1 The Coin of Soloi.
The image was taken from (19/03/2014):
“<http://www.cngcoins.com/Coin.aspx?CoinID=231076>”

The Coin of Anchiale:

Obv.: Amazon kneeling left, quiver and bow case at her side, holding bow.

Rev.: [A]ΓΧΙΑΑ[A].

Grape bunch on vine; facing head of satyr to lower right; all within incuse square.

1. IAM Inv. No.: K.D. 650-1787, AR Third Stater 3.16 g. 12/13 mm., ↑ (Fig. 2).

2. Gorny-Mosch Giessener Münzhandlung Auction 208, 16 Oct. 2012, lot. 1608.

Obv.: Frog to upper right (?). Rev. ΑΓΧΙΑΑΑ, AR Stater 10.22 g., roughly 22/23 mm. (Fig. 3).



Fig. 2 The Coin of Anchiale
(Istanbul Archaeological Museum).



Fig. 3 The Coin of Anchiale
(Gorny-Mosch Giessener Münzhandlung Auction 208, 16 Oct. 2012, lot 1608).

Bibliography and Abbreviations

Ancient Sources

- Aristobulus F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (1950-1963).
- Arrian, *Anabasis* *Anabasis Alexandri, The Campaigns of Alexander*. P. A. Brunt (trans.) (1976).
- Callisthenes F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (1950-1963).
- Diogenes Laertius, *Solon* *De Clarorum Philosophorum Vitis*. R. D. Hicks (trans.) (1925).
- Eusebius, *Chronicle* *Eusebii Chronicorum Liber prior*. A. Schoene (ed.) (1875).
- Hecataeus, *Periegesis* F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (1950-1963).
- Hellanicus F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (1950-1963).
- Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis Historia* *Natural History*, H. Rackham (trans.) (1938).
- Polybius *Historiæ, The Histories*. W. R. Paton (trans.), Loeb, Cambridge, Mass. London (1978).
- Stephanus of Byzantium *Stephani Byzantini Ethnica, recensuit, Germanice vertit, adnotationibus indicibusque instruxit*. M. Billerbeck (2006).
- Strabo *Geographika. Geography of Strabo*. H. L. Jones (trans.) (1917-1949).
- Xenophon, *Anabasis* *Hellenica; Anabasis; Symposium; Apology*. C. L. Brownson – O. J. Todd (trans.) (1918-1922).

Modern Sources

- Babelon 1910 J. Babelon, *Traité des monnaies grecques et romaines, Deuxième partie: Description historique*, vol. II (1910).
- Bovon 1963 A. Bovon, “La représentation des guerriers perses et la notion de Barbare dans la première moitié du V^e siècle”, *BCH* 87, 1963, 579-602.
- Brindley 1994 J. C. Brindley, “A note on the Amazon coins of Soli in Cilicia”, *NCirc* 102.6, 1994, 264-265.
- Casabonne 1995 O. Casabonne, “Le Syennésis cilicien et Cyrus: l’apport des sources numismatiques”, *Pallas* 43, 1995, 147-172.
- Casabonne 1997 O. Casabonne, “Notes ciliciennes 3-4”, *Anatolia Antiqua* 5, 1997, 35-43.
- Casabonne 2000 O. Casabonne, “Conquête Perse et Phénomène Monétaire: L’exemple Cilicien”, *Varia Anatolica XII: Mécanismes et innovations monétaires dans l’Anatolie achéménide. Numismatique et Histoire* 2000, 21-91.
- Casabonne et al. 2001 O. Casabonne – M. Forlanini – A. Lemaire, “Ingirâ (Cilicie). Numismatique et géographie historique”, *RBN* 147, 2001, 57-66.
- Dandamaev 1989 M. A. Dandamaev, *A Political History of the Achaemenid Empire* (1989).
- Davesne 1989 A. Davesne, “La circulation monétaire en Cilicie à l’époque achéménide”, *REA* 91, 1989, 157-168.
- Dusinberre 2013 E. R. M. Dusinberre, *Authority, and Autonomy in Achaemenid Anatolia* (2013).
- Gladiss 1973-1974 A. V. Gladiss, “Ein Denkmal aus Soloi”, *IstMitt* 23-24, 1973-1974, 175-181.
- Imhoof-Blumer 1901-1902 F. Imhoof-Blumer, *Kleinasiatische Münzen* (1901-1902).
- Kalkan 2002 H. Kalkan, “AnchiALE in Kilikien”, *EpigrAnat* 34, 2002, 160-164.

- Özbayoğlu 1999 E. Özbayoğlu, "Soloï (Cilicia) ve 'Soloekismus'", *Olba II*, 1999, 209-219.
- Robinson 1923 E. S. G. Robinson, "The Archer of Soli in Cilicia", in: W. H. Buckler – W. M. Calder (eds.), *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay (1923)* 355-357.
- Robinson 1948 E. S. G. Robinson, *Greek Coins Acquired by the British Museum 1938-1948*, NC 6.8, 1948, 43-59.
- Salmeri 2004 G. Salmeri, "Hellenism on the Periphery: the Case of Cilicia and an Etymology of Soloikismos", in: S. Colvin (ed.), *The Greco-Roman East. Politics, Culture, Society (2004)* 181-206.
- Sayce 1910 A. H. Sayce, "The Cilician Cities of Anchiäle and Illubri", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 1910, 1339-1343.
- Six 1894 J. P. Six, "Monnaies grecques, inédites et incertaines", NC 14, 1894, 297-338.
- SNG von Aulock SNG Deutschland. Sammlung H. von Aulock. Kilikien 13. Heft, Nr. 5413-6098 (1966).
- SNG France SNG France 2. Cabinet des Médailles Cilicie (1993).
- SNG Levante Cilicia SNG Switzerland I. Levante-Cilicia, E. Levante, P. Weiss, I. Vecchi (1986).
- SNG Turkey 2 SNG Turkey 2. Anamur Museum, vol 1. Roman Provincial Coins. O. Tekin – S. Altınoluk (2007).
- Yağcı 2013 R. Yağcı, "Problematising Greek Colonization in the Eastern Mediterranean in the Seventh and Sixth Centuries BC: The Case of Soli", in: M. C. Hoff – R. F. Townsend (eds.), *Rough Cilicia. New Historical and Archaeological Approaches (2013)* 6-15.
- Yağcı – Kaya 2013 R. Yağcı – F. H. Kaya, "Soloï-Pompeiopolis 2012 Yılı Kazıları", *Anmed* 11, 2013, 138-143.

Özet

Aynı tip, farklı lejand: Ankhialos mu Soloi mu?

Bu makale İstanbul Arkeoloji Müzeleri Sikkeler Koleksiyonu'ndaki Kilikia Bölgesi liman kentlerinden Soloi-Pompeiopolis'e ait sikkeler grubu arasında tespit edilen bir sikkeden inceler. O. N. Arıdağ özel koleksiyonundan satın alınarak müzeye kazandırılmış olan sikkeden, buluntu yerine ilişkin bir bilgi bulunmamaktadır. Tipoloji açısından Soloi-Pompeiopolis'in M.Ö. V. yy.'in ikinci yarısında bastığı ön yüzde Amazon, arka yüzde üzüm salkımı bulunan sikkelerle birebir benzerlik gösterdiğinden, muhtemelen bu nedenle Soloi-Pompeiopolis sikkeleri altında kataloglanmıştır. Ancak arka yüzde lejand ΣΟΛΕΩΝ olarak beklenirken [A]ΓΧΙΑΛ[A] olarak okunmaktadır. Böylece lejand lokasyonu kesin olarak tespit edilememiş ve sikkeleri fazla bilinmeyen bir başka Kilikia kenti, Ankhialos'u (Ankhiale) işaret etmektedir. Diğer taraftan Ankhialos, Soloi'un daha önceki adı olabileceğinden, bu sikkeler iki kentin aynı kent olup olmadığı sorusunu da beraberinde getirir.

Bu konuyla bağlantılı bir başka tartışma Belh'de bulunan bir definede ele geçen aynı tipte ancak Aramice lejandlı üç sikkeler ve bunların Soloi'a mı yoksa İngirâ (muhtemelen Ankhialos'un önceki adı) kentine mi ait olup olmadığı üzerinedir. Bu nedenle, tespit edilen söz konusu sikkeler, mevcut tartışmalara katkı yaparken pek çok soruyu da beraberinde getirmektedir: Daha önce adı Ankhialos olan Soloi tarafından mı basılmıştır? Ya da aynı tipte basan iki ayrı kent mi söz konusudur? Eğer böyle ise tipolojik benzerlik nasıl açıklanabilir? Bu makale, söz konusu sikkeleri tanıtarak farklı isimleri olan aynı kenti ya da iki ayrı kenti işaret edip etmediğini inceler.

Genellikle Soloi'un bu tip sikkelerinin M.Ö. yak. 465-410 yıllarında bastığı kabul edilir. Aynı tipteki Aramice lejandlı sikkeler Soloi'un bu ilk bilinen sikkelerinden biraz daha önce basılmış olmalıdır. Arka yüzdeki lejandda ilk harf ve son harf çok zor okunurken, diğer harfler belirgindir. Sondaki ve baştaki bu iki harfin, bir müzayede katalogunda yer alan ve lejandı net bir şekilde okunan ikinci bir sikkeden örneğine dayanılarak A olduğu anlaşılmaktadır. Dolayısıyla lejand ΑΓΧΙΑΛΑ olarak tamamlanmakta ve kentin adını ethnikon ya da ktetikon formunda değil, Dor lehçesindeki nominatif halinde vermektedir. Ön yüzdeki diz çökmüş okçu/Amazon ikonografyası uzun süre tartışma konusu olmuştur. Varılan son nokta bunun bir Amazon savaşçısı olduğu ve Kilikia'nın maruz kaldığı Kimmer istilası ile ilintisi yönündedir. Arka yüzdeki üzüm salkımı ise Kilikia ovasında bol miktarda yetişen üzümün bir göstergesi olarak yorumlanmıştır.

Bu sikkeden Soloi tipinde basılmasına rağmen neden farklı bir lejand taşıdığı konusunda iki hipotez ileri sürülebilir. Antik Çağ'da kentlerin isim değiştirmeleri genellikle rastlanan bir durumdur. Dolayısıyla ileri sürülebilecek ilk hipotez Soloi ve Ankhialos'un aynı kent olduğudur. Bu durum sikkeler tipinin neden aynı olduğunu açıkladığı gibi Forlanini'nin İngirâ ve Soloi'un aynı kent olduğu yönündeki önerisini de destekler. Şu durumda M.Ö. V. yy.'da Soloi'da sikkeler darbinin şöyle bir kronoloji izlediği ileri sürülebilir: Soloi'un eski adı Aramice İngirâ idi ve kent Aramice lejandlı sikkeler bastı, bu isim daha sonra Hellence Ankhialos'a dönüştü ve kent Hellence lejandlı, bu makalede tanıtılan sikkeden bastı. Son olarak kent Soloi adını alarak

ΣΟΛΕΩΝ ethnikonlu sikkeler bastı. Ancak bu hipotezde kent adının Ankhialos'tan Soloi'a dönüşmesi bir dizi coğrafi ve kronolojik problemi beraberinde getirmektedir. Öncelikle arkeolojik veriler Soli Höyük'te Hellen kolonizasyonunun M.Ö. 650-550 yılları arasında gerçekleştiğini ortaya koymaktadır. Strabon'un aktardığına göre Soloi'dan bahseden en erken antik kaynak Hesiodos'tur (M.Ö. yak. 700). Böylece arkeolojik veriler ve yazılı kaynaklar, kentin burada tanıtılan sikkenin basıldığı M.Ö. V. yy.'dan çok önceleri kolonize edildiğine ve Soloi adını kullandığına işaret etmektedir. Ayrıca Soloi ile Ankhialos'un aynı kent olduğuna dair başka bir veri bulunmadığı gibi mevcut antik yazılı kaynaklar Soloi ve Ankhialos'tan iki ayrı kent olarak bahsederek bu kentleri ayırt etmektedir. H. Kalkan Ankhialos'un yerinin tespiti konusunda kaleme aldığı makalesinde kentin lokasyonunu antik kaynaklar ve bölgede ele geçen yeni arkeolojik veriler ışığında değerlendirir. Ankhialos'un denizden biraz daha içerideki konumuna dikkat çeken Kalkan'ın sonucuna göre kentin bugün Mersin'in 7-8 km. doğusunda ve Soloi-Pompeiopolis'in 20 km. uzağında bulunan Karacailyas Kasabası'nda bulunması kuvvetle muhtemeldir.

İkinci hipotez Soloi ve Ankhialos'un iki ayrı kent olabileceğidir. Bu da neden iki kentin farklı lejand ile sikkeler bastıklarını açıklar. Ortak tip kullanılmasının nedeni belki de Ankhialos'un Soloi'a olan yakın mesafesi ve iki kent arasındaki yakın ilişkilerdir. Belki de iç kesimde nispeten daha küçük bir kent olan Ankhialos'un sikkeleri, sikke basım masrafını azaltmak için Soloi darphanesinde basılıyordu. En azından bu iki kentin bastığı sikkelerin ortak bir dolaşım havuzu oluşturarak iki kent arasındaki alışverişlerde kullanıldığı ileri sürülebilir. Ancak Ankhialos'un burada tanıtılan Hellen lejandlı bilinen sadece iki sikkelinin bulunması ve destekleyici başka bir kaynağın olmaması bu önerilerden herhangi birini kabul etmeyi güçleştirir.

Sonuç olarak, bu makalede Ankhialos'un şimdiye kadar tespit edilen Hellen lejandlı iki sikkesine dayanılarak bu kentlerin aynı kent ya da iki ayrı kent olup olmadığı konusunda iki hipotez ileri sürülmüştür. Ancak karşılaştırma ve analiz yapabilecek kadar çok sikkenin bulunmaması ve konuyla ilgili doğrudan kaynakların eksikliği nedeniyle yukarıda öne sürülen hipotezlerden birini kabul etmek zordur. Daha kesin sonuçlara varmak için daha fazla sikke örneğine ihtiyaç vardır. Bu nedenle gerek müze koleksiyonlarından ve özel koleksiyonlardan, gerekse akademik çevreden gelecek katkı ve eleştiriler burada ortaya koyulan tartışmayı daha da ileriye taşıyarak problemin çözümüne yardım edecektir.

Soloi Sikkesi:

Ö.y.: Sola doğru diz çökmüş iki eliyle yay tutan Amazon, yanında sadağı, sağ boşlukta cepheden Satyr başı.

A.y.: ΣΟΛΕΩΝ.

Üzüm salkımı; sağ boşlukta sinek. Kare incus, noktalı bordür.

AR 1/3 Stater 3.47 g, 13 mm, ↓ (Res. 1).

Referans: SNG France 129; SNG Levante 41 = SNG von Aulock 5860.

Ankhialos Sikkesi:

Ö.y.: Sola doğru diz çökmüş iki eliyle yay tutan Amazon, yanında sadağı.

A.y.: [A]ΓΧΙΑΑ[A].

Üzüm salkımı; sağ boşlukta satyr başı. Kare incus, noktalı bordür.

1. İstanbul Arkeoloji Müzeleri Env. No.: K.D. 650-1787, AR 1/3 Stater 3.16 g., 12/13 mm, ↗ (Res. 2).

2. Gorny-Mosch Giessener Münzhandlung Auction 208, 16 Oct. 2012, lot. 1608.

Ö.y.: Sağ boşlukta, kurbağa (?). A.y.: ΑΓΧΙΑΑΑ, AR Stater, kabaca 22-23 mm, 10.22 g. (Res. 3).