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BRUXELLES BRUSSEL
In the surviving financial accounts of the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi there are three occasions during the second half of the fourth century B.C. when 'Darics' are mentioned. It has always been taken for granted by commentators that these were gold coins of Persia; it is, however, the contention of this article that they were not.

Two of these inscriptions should be considered together, since they present several interesting problems of text and interpretation, quite apart from the numismatic question which is involved. The first forms part of the accounts for the first session in the archonship of Theon in 323/3 B.C., and the passage in question reads:

[Δομι]μεῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱ[--- up to 25 letters ---].
Δ[α]ρείκοι ἑκατὸν ἑνακόπτοντα ἐν ἑπτὰ στατήρων
[ἡ]δημημένοι.
['Ἀλ]λ' Ἀρακις τριάκοντα ἐν ἕπτα καὶ δραχμῆι
[ἡ]δημημένοι.
[Κ]αὶ δοκιμεῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ περιφαντηρίου [--- up to 10 letters]
[Δ]αρείκος ὁ δοκιμεῖται δὲ ὁ Δαρείκος ἐν ἑπτα καὶ δραχμῆι. (1)

('Sample from the k---. One hundred and ninety Darics, reckoned at seven and a drachma. Also a sample from the lustral bowl---, one Daric. The Daric is reckoned at seven and a drachma'.)

Later in the same inscription (2) the same coins are mentioned again, in the list of sums carried over to the following set of ac-

(1) Fouilles de Delphes. III, 5, 61, col. IIA, 1-8 (republished BCH, 1951, p. 264-306). The readings followed here are based on an important study of this and of FD III, 5, 58 which has recently been published by Patrick Marchetti, A propos des comptes de Delphes sous les archontats de Théon (324/3) et de Caphis (327/6), in BCH, Cl, 1977, p. 133-164.
(2) Lines 31-37.
counts, which were for the spring session of Theon's year. Here we find the entry:

\[
\chi\nu\nu\sigma\nu\imath\iota \delta\iota-
\]
35  ακόσιοι εἴκοσι εἰς τοῦτον [οἱ μὲν ἐκατὸν ἐνενήκο-
ντα ἐν ἑπτά στατήρας λε[λογισμένοι ἡσα]ν οἱ δὲ τρι-
άκοντα εἰς ἑπτά [καὶ δραχμῆ]---

("Two hundred and twenty-one gold (staters), of which one hundred and ninety were reckoned at seven staters, and thirty-one at seven and a drachma").

The second of these entries, it will be clear, explains the restorations to the first which have been included in the text printed above. Before proceeding to the second inscription, let us consider what the meaning of the word 'sample' (dokimeion) in the first passage may have been, and whether we can explain what the lustral bowl (perirhanterion) and the other object, whose name began with a kappa, were. The first question is a difficult one, but there can hardly be any doubt of the correct answer to the second, when we take into consideration the date of the inscription and the place from which it comes. What we have here is a reference to the making of replacements for some of the offerings of Croesus to Delphi which had been lost a generation before. In Herodotus's account of them, there are mentioned two lustral bowls, one gold and the other silver, and two kraters, one again in each metal. In Diodorus's narrative of the seizing of Apollo's treasures during the Third Sacred War, the only offerings of Croesus which are specifically mentioned as having been taken and converted into money by the Phocians are the gold bricks which also appear in Herodotus's list, but since it is clear that at least three, and probably all four of the Phocian generals struck coins, and that the treasures of Delphi were raided on more than one occasion, it is very probable that the kraters and the lustral bowls also disappeared at some time during the war (3). It is also likely that when the war was over, some replacements were made and given to Apollo by one city or another; in fact, Plutarch provides us with evidence that this happened in one case, when he tells us of the hydria which was made by the Opuntians from Phocian coinage which they had collected for this purpose (4).

(3) Herodotus I, 51; Diodorus 16, 28, 2; 30, 1; 33, 2; 36, 1; 56, 5-7; 61, 3.
(4) De Pyth. Orac. 16.
It is clear that the lustral bowl and the krater mentioned in Theon’s accounts were made at Delphi, and that they were no ordinary offerings, because in several earlier sets of accounts there are references to the making of them, which show that the work must have gone on for some years. In the first of these inscriptions payments are recorded as having been made ‘to the workers on the krater and the lustral bowl, who came from Athens’. The next lists payments made to a Sicyonian who had contracted to work on the silver krater, and to an Athenian, for working ‘on the base of the lustral bowl and the lustral bowl itself’. In the third, the lustral bowl is mentioned again, although the context is unclear; but nearby appears the name of Pancrates of Argos, a stone-mason, from which we may conjecture that a stone plinth was being prepared for it (5). In all of these inscriptions the offerings are mentioned without any further indication of what they were, and the fact that it is taken for granted that such indications were unnecessary is another proof that they were of a very special kind, and so well known that they needed no further description.

The general picture seems to be clear. What then were these ‘samples’ from the lustral bowl and krater, which we may now imagine to have been finished, since no payments were made for work on them during Theon’s archonship? The word which is used here, dokimeion, is not a particularly common one, and there are only three other instances of its use in what appear to be similar contexts, none of them, as it happens, from Delphi. The first and most important is to be found in an inscription from Oropus, on the borders of Attica and Boeotia. This is probably to be dated shortly after the middle of the third century B.C., and records a decision to melt down a number of dedications (including coins) which were to be found in the local shrine of Amphiaras, because they were damaged or had fallen from the places in which they had been fixed (6). The resulting metal was then to be refined until its purity was equal to that of coinage; after this, it was to be used to make repairs to such of the shrine’s sacred utensils as needed them, and several new ones were to be made; in particular, the committee in charge of these operations was to use some of the

(6) IG VII, 303.
coined and uncoined gold for the purpose of making a new golden krater for the god, 'leaving a sample', *kalalipomene dokimeion*.

At Athens, several inventories ranging in date from 384 to 343 B.C. contain references to 'samples'. One entry reads, 'samples, in a box sealed with the public seal', which tells us nothing except that they were probably of no great size (7). The next reads as follows:

'Samples: golden *leiai* . . . . . 23 other golden *leiai*, their weight being 47 drachmas 2 obols; sample of the *oenochoe* of the two goddesses, 1 3/4 obols of gold; sample of the *oenochoe* of Athena, 1 3/4 obols of gold; sample of the gold of the bowls, 1 1/2 obols; sample of the gold of the censers, 1 3/4 obols; sample of the throne, nothing written on it, 1 1/2 obols (8)'.

The third entry is much shorter, and says only, 'Samples: forty-six golden *leiai*, weight 89 drachmas 3 obols' (9). The word *leia* which appears here and in the preceding text is a mystery. If it is the same as the Attic Greek word *laia*, it may mean 'loom-weight', but the average weight of the *leiai* mentioned here is only about two drachmas, which would not be enough to hold the warp threads in an upright loom straight. It is possible that they were so called because they had holes bored through them, and so resembled genuine weights but were on a smaller scale; further speculation on this question does not seem profitable (10). The other *dokimeia*, however, are specifically said to be from various pieces of equipment of a kind appropriate to religious use, which suggests that the same procedure was being followed at Athens as at Oropus.

The third place where we find the word *dokimeion* apparently used in this way is in one of the Delian inscriptions, an inventory of c. 140 B.C., where we find the entry, 'Twenty golden bowls and a sample bearing the inscription « The Delians to Apollo, Artemis and Leto », weight with the sample two thousand (drachmas)' (11). The fact that the weights of the offerings and of the sample together

(7) *IG II² 1443* col. III lines 214-215, repeated in 1455a lines 15-17.
(8) *IG II² 1415* lines 9-14.
(9) *IG II² 1425* col. I lines 35-38, repeated in 1436 line 58.
(10) References may be found in Liddell-Scott-Jones, Greek-English Lexicon. H. Blümner, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern*, vol. 3, Leipzig, 1884, p. 93, also gives the meaning 'chisel', but this is not likely to apply here.
(11) *Inscriptions de Delphes* 1449 Aab II 32-33.
came to a round two thousand drachmas suggests that the original offering consisted of that weight of gold, and that a small piece was put aside during the making for some purpose.

What might this purpose have been? In the circumstances, Boeckh’s interpretation (12) of the phrase in the Oropus inscription is probably still the best one: a dokimeion was a sample which, if need arose, could be tested in order to show the nature of the precious metal from which an offering had been made, without there being any need to damage the object itself. When the metal which was used to make an offering consisted wholly or partly of coins, it is natural to suppose that a coin would have served the purpose, and this explanation will certainly fit the passage from Theon’s accounts at Delphi very well. As has already been shown, there is every likelihood that the vessels mentioned there were a silver krater and a gold lustral bowl which had been made to replace, at least in part, the lost gifts of Croesus; it is also very likely that at least some of the metal which had been collected to make these two objects took the form of coinage, since we have Plutarch’s evidence, quoted above, for the following of a similar procedure by the Opuntians. On this basis it is possible to suggest restorations which will fill the two gaps in the text of this part of the inscription, if we assume that the descriptions of the two ‘samples’ were parallel, each being described as a coin, while the rest of the entry gave the name and the metal of the object of which it was a sample. Since the total of gold coinage in the second passage from Theon’s accounts quoted above is the same as that which is reached by adding together the separate sums in gold listed in the first passage, the dokimeion, if it was a coin, must have been a silver one, and since, as has already been mentioned, the second of the inscriptions which refer to the making of a krater and a lustral bowl states that the former was of silver, it seems reasonable to restore the gap in the first line in such a way that it will include the words ‘krater’.

(12) In his notes to CIG I, 1570. In following Boeckh, I am forced to reject the suggestion made by Marchetti in the article cited in note 1 above, that the dokimeia were ingots of metal produced as the result of the melting down of offerings. His arguments are complex, and cannot be summarised fairly within a brief note such as this one, but they contain two assumptions which are hard to believe: that both of these ingots had a weight which could be expressed in an exact number of Darics, and that the Daric could be used as a unit of weight at Delphi.
'silver' and the name of a coin. In the second gap there is room only for the name of the metal of which the lustral bowl was made, which must be gold, because the dokimeion was a gold coin. We may therefore restore the first line of the passage as follows:

\[ Δουκιμείον ἀπὸ τοῦ κατήχου τοῦ ἄργυρου στατήρ (or δραχμή)].

and the seventh and eighth, following the same principles:

\[ Καὶ δοκιμεῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ περιπανηρίου [τοῦ χρυσοῦ] Δαρεικὸς.

('Sample from the silver krater, a stater (or drachma). — Also a sample from the golden lustral bowl, a Daric.)

In a second inscription from Delphi, three years earlier, some of these Darics also seem to have been mentioned. Here we have an entry:

\[ ... καὶ τῶν Δαρεικῶν [τῶν] εἰς τοὺς στεφάνους ἑκάτων εἰς τῶν πρυτανίων Ὀλυμπίαδι. \]

\[ Καὶ δαρεικῶν ἑκάτων ἑνήκοντα, ἐπικατάλλαγῃ ἑγένετο στατήρες ἐνενήκοντα πέντε. \]

('... and for that part of the Darics for the crowns which we borrowed from the prytanies for Olympias, one hundred and ninety Darics, the fee for changing was ninety-five staters) (13).

These must be the same hundred and ninety coins as the ones which appeared in Theon's accounts, because this earlier inscription shows us why they were converted into silver at a rate different from that which was used for the other thirty-one gold coins. The problem has been satisfactorily solved by Keil and others, and the explanation seems to be clear enough: the treasurers must have borrowed a hundred and ninety Darics to provide part of the metal for crowns, and then reclaimed the price from the donor, Olympias, in silver, at the rate at which the gold would have had to be bought on the open market. This would have been at the rate of seven Aeginetan staters per Daric, with a money-changer's fee of half a stater per Daric. But since they had only borrowed the coins

(13) FD III, 5, 58 lines 5-8. In line 6, Keil's brilliant suggestion (Hermes, 1902, p.511-529) that the gap at the end of the line could be filled with the name of Olympias seems now to be confirmed by Marchetti's re-examination of the stone, which has shown that the remains of the third letter of her name are in fact visible.
from the prytanies, and had not actually had to buy them, they credited themselves in a separate entry with that part of the total sum which would have been kept by a money-changer, one hundred and ninety drachmas or ninety-five staters \(^{(14)}\). The reason for converting the other gold coins into silver at the higher rate of seven and a half staters, i.e. fifteen Aeginetan drachmas to one gold stater, or one drachma per stater more than the regular rate, must have been that they had actually been purchased from a money-changer who had charged his usual fee. The thirty-one gold staters would therefore have cost \(232\frac{1}{2}\) silver staters, which could have been brought into the accounts either as a single item, or as two separate ones consisting of a figure of 217 staters to represent the value of the gold coins, together with a fee for changing of fifteen and a half staters. The former method must have been chosen, and therefore it was necessary to record two different values for the different groups of gold coins \(^{(15)}\).

Such is the background, and we now come to the question of the identity of the coins concerned. It has always been taken for granted that they were in fact Persian Darics, and if they were, since seven of the Aeginetan-weight staters which formed the official currency of Delphi are equal to twenty Attic drachmas, and the price of gold in terms of silver had by this time dropped to 10:1, a Persian Daric must have circulated in Greece on equal terms with an Attic


\(^{(15)}\) If these coins entered the treasury of Apollo by being purchased, a conclusion of some numismatic interest may follow. Diodorus and Plutarch, in the passages to which reference has already been made, both say that the Phocians struck coins from the silver and the gold which they took from the sanctuary; but no gold coinage of the Phocians is now known. New finds may settle the matter, either of gold or electrum coins (for as R. T. Williams pointed out in his study *The Silver Coinage of the Phokians*, London, 1972, p. 51-58, the greater number of the gold bricks of Croesus were in fact of electrum), but it seems to the present writer unlikely that coins were struck in any metal but silver, since up to this time gold had been used by the states of mainland Greece only in an emergency, and there is no evidence for any shortage of silver in this area at this time. The new golden lustral bowl which was being made at Delphi would surely have been made, at least in part, from Phocian gold coins if any existed; and one of these would then have been the most natural one to choose as a *dokimeion*; but the fact that the gold *dokimeion* was valued at a rate which suggests that it had been acquired by purchase rather than by confiscation or as booty, suggests that it was not Phocian.
weight gold stater or didrachm (16). This point of view finds some apparent support in the literary sources. In the first place, there appears to be an equation between Darics and Attic didrachms in a passage of Xenophon's *Anabasis* which is often quoted in this context, where the soothsayer Silanus of Ambracia is said to have been promised ten talents (i.e., 60,000 drachmas in silver), if his prediction that the Great King would not give battle within ten days proved correct; in due course, we are told, he received three thousand Darics (17). Secondly, in Lysias's oration *Against Erastos-thenes*, Lysias claims that when he tried to buy his safety from the Thirty Tyrants, he had as part of his personal wealth a certain sum in Darics; and Harpocratios's *Lexicon* to the Attic Orators (followed by Suidas) refers to this passage in explaining that a Daric was equivalent to the gold coin called a *chrysous* by the Athenians, which was worth twenty drachmas or one-fifth of a silver mina (18). A similar statement appears in the work of an anonymous Alexandrian writer of the first century A.D., who tells us that the Homeric talent was equal to a Daric, which in turn was equal to two Attic drachmas (19). None of these texts, however, gives us the record of an actual financial transaction, and since no one would deny that an Attic weight gold stater and a Daric were approximately equivalent to one another, the literary evidence cannot be used to prove that a money-changer would have accepted them at exactly the same rate, any more than it can be said that because the Greek historians used 'drachma' and 'obol' from time to time as equivalents of the Roman denarius, sestertius and as, they must have been exactly equal in value.

(16) The exchange rate of seven Aeginetan staters for one ‘Philip’ is recorded once at Delphi, in the accounts of Dion (336/5 B.C.). Here we have an entry, ‘To the temple builders, for cypress wood, 150 gold Philips, each reckoned at seven staters, making in old coinage thirty minas.’ The reason why these coins were reckoned at seven staters, not seven and a half, must be that they had not been bought from a money-changer, but had come into the treasurers’ hands by some other means.


(18) Lysias XII, 11 (the Δαγεικός printed in modern texts is a good emendation of the ms. Κακικός which is most unlikely to have been the name of any kind of money); Harpocratios and Suidas s.v. Δαγεικός.

(19) Fr. HULTSCH, *Metrologicorum Scriptorum Reliquiae*. I, Leipzig, 1864, p. 301 (for some reason this passage is omitted in the Latin version of Calvus).
Is it in fact likely that these two gold coins were tariffed at exactly the same rate? The Daric weighed between 8.3 and 8.4 grams, while the Attic gold stater had a theoretical weight of at least 8.7 grams (20). The difference between these weights may seem a small one, but when expressed in terms of silver it is the equivalent of three grams or more of the less valuable metal, in other words of at least four Attic obols, and it is hard to imagine a money-changer or anyone else being indifferent to such an amount, particularly when more than one coin had to be exchanged. We must therefore consider whether any other kind of money might have been described in this way at this time.

The only gold coins which circulated in any numbers in mainland Greece at this time were the Attic-weight gold staters of Macedon; it should be noted that although literary sources suggest that Persian gold crossed the Aegean in large quantities from time to time, finds of Persian coins in Greece itself are in fact rare (21). Darics must, however, have been more common than any Greek gold coins up to the middle of the fourth century, since silver had always been the normal metal of coinage there. Is it then possible

(20) For the metrology of the Daric, see K. Reblng, Dareikos und Kroiseios, in Klio, 14, 1915, p. 91-112. A weight of 4.36 grams for the Attic drachma may be established not only from the coins, but from the fact that a late second century inscription from Athens (IG II2 1013), announces the introduction of a new mina for market produce of 150 coin drachmas. This can hardly be explained otherwise than as an adjustment to bring it in line with the Roman weight system; an Attic mina of 654 grams would then equal two Roman pounds of 327.5 grams.

(21) There are in fact only three such hoards from central and southern Greece listed in M. Thompson, O. Morkholm and C. M. Kraay, Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards, New York, 1973: in 1929 a 5th century hoard of several hundred Darics was discovered at Athens (IGCH 32); a hoard from Elis, buried about 400 B.C., contained a dozen Darics and four electrum staters of Cyzicus (IGCH 43); and a hoard of the mid-fourth century from the neighbourhood of Eretria (IGCH 63) consisted of thirty-six Darics, together with twelve gold staters of Philip II and Philippi. There is also the famous hoard from Mt Athos of three hundred Darics and about a hundred Attic tetradrachms, which is not, apparently, to be connected with Xerxes's passage in 480 B.C., since there was at least one fourth century Athenian coin there (IGCH 362). The composition of these hoards makes it clear that they were completely imported, rather than representing selections from coinage in general use in these neighbourhoods; there is no reason to suppose that the Daric circulated in trade, and we should assume that those who acquired them would sell them as bullion, as the need arose, or melt them down.
that before Philip II began to strike large numbers of gold coins from the metal produced by his Pangaean mines, the word 'Daric' had come to be used as a general term, which might sometimes be used to describe any gold coin?

We do in fact meet the word 'Daric' in Ausonius in this same sense (22), although the completely different context and the great gap in time make it impossible to claim that this latter example is of any great relevance to the question. There is, however, one certain instance of its being used in this very way from a text much closer at hand, an Athenian inventory of 337/6 B.C., which mentions among other valuables ten 'Darics of Philip', *Dareikoi Philippeoi* (23), and it can hardly be doubted that this phrase was meant to describe Philip's Attic-weight gold staters, and not Persian coins. There is, therefore, at least some epigraphic evidence of the same period to support the hypothesis suggested above.

At this point we should examine the last of the three inscriptions from Delphi which mention 'Darics', an inventory which records among other objects of value two golden crowns offered to the sanctuary by the Athenian cleruchs on Samos shortly after 334 B.C. (24). The recorded weights of these crowns were approximately the same, the first being described as weighing 'twenty Darics, a half-Daric and half an obol', and the second 'twenty Darics and one and a half obols'. This is not quite such a strange way of recording weights as it might at first glance seem to be, since it was sometimes the convention in the compiling of temple inventories to weigh silver objects against silver coins, and gold objects against gold ones (25). But it would be very odd indeed if the weight of an object were to be expressed in terms of coins belonging to two

(22) XVI, 19-23. In this passage, coins which must have been Roman Imperial solidi are first called 'Philips' and then 'Darlcs'. By this time there had already been Roman Emperors bearing the name of Philip, a circumstance which had led to the fictitious use of the name in the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* (Claudius 14, Aurelian 9 and 12, Probus 4). For references to the use of the word in Plautus and Livy, not relevant to the present discussion, see E. Babe-lon, *Traité*, Part 1, p. 480.

(23) IG II2 1526, lines 22-23.

(24) SIG3 276 A, lines 11-15; B, lines 11-15.

(25) Clear evidence comes from Miletus, where the records of the sanctuary at Didyma provide many examples of this practice; see A. Rehm, *Didyma*. II, *Die Inschriften*, nos. 427, 431, 439, 442, 445, 446, 463-464 and 476. (no. 424, however, gives the weight of both gold and silver objects simply in drachmas).
different weight systems. If the weighing and ticketing of the crowns was done on Samos (in which case, it must be assumed that the administrators of the sanctuary at Delphi simply repeated, with or without checking them, the weights as they had been written down by the Athenian who had previously weighed them), the 'Darics' would certainly have been of Attic weight. If, on the other hand, the weighing was done at Delphi, the same would be true, because of the convention just mentioned, since no Greek mint ever issued gold coins on the Aeginetan standard which was used there. We therefore appear to have one more example of the use of the term 'Daric' at Delphi to describe an Attic-weight gold stater.

Is there any evidence from other sources for the use of the term 'Daric' to describe Greek gold staters, apart from the Athenian inventory already mentioned? In the case of the orator Lysias which has been previously mentioned, it is far more likely that at the end of the Peloponnesian War he had Athenian rather than Persian gold coins in his possession. In nearly every other case, however, in which Darics are mentioned in other inventories or similar official documents of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., it is certain that they were actually Persian coins. When an unknown donor gave eight hundred Darics to the Spartans during the Archidamian War, (26) there is no other gold coinage in which the payment is likely to have been made at this time. The hundred and five Darics reported by the Treasurers of the Other Gods at Athens in 429/8 B.C. (27) must for the same reason have been Persian, and the forty-three Darics which appear in the accounts of the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis for 409/8 B.C. (28) cannot have been Athenian coins, since the emergency issue of gold which Athens produced at the end of the Peloponnesian War is securely dated to 407/6 (29). In two other cases, the origin of the coins was in Asia, so no room is left for doubt; in 357 B.C., or in one of the two following years, Erythrae in Ionia honoured Mausolus and Artemisia of Caria with crowns of fifty and thirty Darics respective-

(26) IG V, 1, line 1.
(27) IG I² 310, lines 103-104.
(28) IG I² 313, line 48, repeated in 314, line 55 (the following year).
(29) The scholiast on line 720 of Aristophanes's Frogs, produced in 405 B.C., dates it to the archonship of Antigenes in the preceding year.
ly (30), and at about the same time the Magnesians of Ionia sent a gift of three hundred Darics as a contribution to the building of walls for the newly-founded city of Megalopolis in Arcadia (31). But there is one other example from mainland Greece which may lead us to suspect that the word was again being used to describe Greek gold staters. An inscription from Lebadeia (32) of the middle of the fourth century B.C. gives a list of persons who had made gifts to the oracle of Trophonius there. Most of these gifts were made in silver coinage, but one Telemachus, a Dorian from Cytinium, gave two ‘Darics’, and Euanthidas, a Locrian, gave one. No certainty is possible, but when we try to estimate the likelihood of two Greeks from different cities in this part of Greece both making payments in Persian money at this time, it does not seem unreasonable to suggest that these were in fact also some of the new gold coins of Philip of Macedon, as seems to have been the case with the slightly later inscriptions from Delphi, and that here once more the word was being used as a general description for any gold coin.

(30) SIG 168, lines 14-18.
(31) O. Kern, Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander, 38, lines 27-28. The inscription itself is of 207/6 B.C., but clearly refers to the event as having taken place at an earlier time; the date most likely is obviously soon after the founding of Megalopolis.
(32) IG VII 3055, lines 13-14 and 17-18.