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Summary

The date of the earliest coins has never ceased to be a subject of discussion since the introduction, in the early 1950's, of the low chronology for the beginning of Ionian electrum (about 640 B.C.). Recent years have seen both a return to a high chronology for early electrum and proposals to date the first coins within the sixth century, or very shortly before its beginning, and the first silver issues of mainland Greece to about 550 B.C. Central to the new high chronology are arguments based on style. The new low chronology relies on the interpretation of hoards. This paper deals with these two central issues in the debate.

The Date of the First Asia Minor Electrum Coinage

Why coinage began in Asia Minor and soon thereafter in mainland Greece and the Aegean islands is still debated. Payment of mercenaries, payment of taxes and fines, and payment of bonuses have all been proposed as the principal uses of the earliest coins (1). A case for different motives in Asia Minor and in Greece has also been argued: in Asia Minor the need to create a conventional value for electrum (the gold and silver content of which could vary widely) and in Greece the desire to prevent shortage of silver from hamper-

ing trade by issuing coins whose preferential acceptance in the area of origin would tend to keep them on the home market (2). Dates, however, are just as important as motives in studying the birth of coinage, and at present there is little consensus on this matter.

Liselotte Weidauer’s monograph on the early electrum coinage of Asia Minor is now almost ten years old (3). It is important in several ways, not the least being its observation of the linkage of different obverse types through common reverse punches. This proves that different types were struck at one place and at no great interval from each other, perhaps even simultaneously. This information reduces the potential number of early electrum mints and gives the impression of a smaller and briefer series of issues than was once thought to have existed.

The results of the same author’s chronological studies of the early electrum, on the other hand, have not been greeted with enthusiasm (4). She places the first electrum before 670 B.C., and in so doing she disputes the chronology which won general acceptance following the articles published in 1951 by Sir Stanley Robinson and Paul Jacobsthal, the former dealing with the coins, the latter dealing with the other objects, gold, silver, rock crystal, bone, ivory and amber, from the so-called Basis Deposit of the Temple of Artemis at Ephesus (5). Jacobsthal established that the bulk of the objects comprising this treasure belong to the seventh century, but he believed that four tiny electrum female figurines had to be dated at the opening of the sixth (6). Accepting the early sixth

(2) R. R. Holloway, La ricerca attuale sull' origine della moneta, in RIN, 80, 1978, p. 7-14.
(3) Probleme der frühen Elektronprägung (Typos vol. 1), Freiburg, 1975.
(6) D. G. Hogarth, The Archaic Artemisia, London, 1908, pl. 4, no. 4, 13, 14, 15; JHS, 71, 1951, pl. XXXIII, g. The dating of these figurines has been disputed (one objection being that pleated peplo such as worn by Hogarth, pl. 4, no. 4, JHS, 71, 1951, pl. XXXIII, can also be found in rare occurrences in the 7th century). So noted by Weidauer, op. cit., p. 78. A recent discovery of the new Austrian excavations, however, has added important evidence in favor of Jacobsthal's position. This comes in the form of a more detailed electrum figurine, a larger version of the pieces found by Hogarth and a close relative.
century date for the closing of the deposit, Robinson argued that since dumps of precious metal as well as true coins occurred in the deposit, its formation was not more than a generation distant from the birth of coinage itself. It follows, therefore, that the first coin was not struck before ca. 640 B.C.

Weidauer, however, has used stylistic comparison between early electrum coins (none from the Basis Deposit) and other objects of miniature art, vases, ivories, and jewelry, to reach dates for existing coins as early as 670. The beginning of coinage, if her conclusions are correct, would be still earlier.

The first type in question is a group of lions' heads distinguished by prominent knobs or "warts" on their noses (pl. I, 1) (7). These coins, antecedents of the Lydian lions of Croesus' time, though possibly not of Lydian origin themselves, were the subject of extensive commentary by Robinson. The nose wart, an artistic convention with little basis in nature, has a long history in the Near East. It appears commonly on lions' heads around the Aegean in the second half of the seventh century. Weidauer would equate the coins of this variety with their earliest appearance in Greek art, before 650, but this is forcing the date to its upper limit.

Weidauer's second stylistic comparison places a coin in relation to a much more chronologically circumscribed group of representations. The coin (pl. I, 2) has a male head marked by a low forehead and a heavy sagging nose (8). This distinctive head is compared to the representations on Protoattic vases datable before 650 and in particular to the heads on an amphora formerly in Berlin (pl. I, 3) (9).

of the famous ivory "hawk goddess" figurine, Hogarth, pl. 21, no. 2 and pl. 22. The new figurine is published in the preliminary report of H. Vetter, Ephesos. Vorläufiger Grabungsbericht 1980, in Anzeiger der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 118, no. 4, 1982, p. 137-168, pl. 1. As argued by R. Higgins at the British Museum symposium, The archaic Temple of Artemis at Ephesus: a reconsideration of the earliest finds, held in March, 1984, all the electrum figurines in question are clearly "post Daedalic" and consequently no older than ca. 600 B.C. The same conclusion was advanced, in regard to the hawk goddess, in a paper delivered at the same meeting by J. Carter.


(8) Ibid., no. 171.

(9) Attributed to the Ram Jug Painter, Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae, 1, 1981, p. 376, no. 36 with references. Weidauer illustrates a Proto- corinthian aryballos, pl. 25, no. 2, but compares the heads of its figures with the coin only for "Grundkonzeption". There is in fact no real stylistic compari-
The heads are undoubtedly similar, but Protoattic vases also display heads almost identical to those of the soldiers on the Warrior Vase from Mycenae (pl. I, 4 and 5) (10). The Warrior Vase, dating to the Late Bronze Age, is so far removed from Protoattic that any resemblance between the two must be fortuitous. But the same holds true for comparisons of Protoattic vases and Ionian coins. Protoattic is a provincial style practiced at a time when Corinth was the leading force in Greek vase-painting. Protoattic is hardly seen outside Attica and Aigina and certainly not in Ionia. Why then should the resemblance between Protoattic vase-painting and an electrum coin have any more significance than a comparison of other examples of figural representation from the same school of vase-painting with the art of the late Mycenaean world (11)?

It is a fact that the electrum piece in question, like all early electrum and the first Ionian silver issues, is artistically maladroit. Why early Ionian coinage failed to realize the potentiality of Greek craftsmanship is not a question that can be settled here (12). But its failure is consistent. The scale of representation is not the cause. The later electrum coinage of Phocaea and Mytilene, for example, is an array of tiny masterpieces. Not so the clumsy first coins of Ionia. Despite the beauty of so much Greek coinage, one must admit that there were times and places when artistic values did not count in making coins. Thus, the general phenomenon of recurring ineptitude, conservatism in coin production and the specific failings of the early Ionian electrum caution against unguarded acceptance of stylistic comparisons as a basis of dating the first electrum coins.

It is possible between the two. More recently, Ein geometrisches Ornament auf einer frühen Elektronmünze, in Antike Kunst, 27, 1984, p. 3-9, the same author compares the star pattern of an electrum emission with the ornament of late geometric vases. One may question, however, whether the mere similarity of linear design assures the early date proposed for the coin type in question.


(12) The failure is also evident in the silver, cf. Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, von Auloek, no. 1621 (Cyme), no. 1077 (Miletus), no. 2334, 2340-42 (Caria), no. 2592, 2595 (Cnidus). The importance of the early silver for reconstructing the continuity of coinage in Ionia has been underlined by T. Hackens in L'Antiquité classique, 46, 1977, p. 211.
Robinson and Jacobsthal's dating of the beginning of coinage in Asia Minor to the second half of the seventh century thus appears to maintain its validity. But how much later is the first silver coinage of the Greek mainland and the islands? Perhaps soon after 600 would be a reply consistent with the beginning of Ionian electrum a generation before that date. But arguments drawn from the consideration of hoards have now been advanced to lower the dating of the first silver coins in Greece proper to around 550.

The Date of the First Greek Mainland and Island Coinages

« Only under certain circumstances », Patrick Bruun has recently commented, « can hoards be regarded as evidence for money in circulation » \(^{(13)}\). This statement was made in regard to monetary crisis and preferential hoarding of « good coin ». It is naturally true of savings hoards \(^{(14)}\). And other circumstances may produce hoards with contents very different from the coinage in circulation. The sanctuary hoard is one such case. Such hoards may be made up of dedications as well as current deposits to a sanctuary bank. Equally apparent in them, however, are plated coins removed from circulation by the temple bankers, of which the find of coins from the Temple of Poseidon at the Isthmian Sanctuary gives such vivid evidence \(^{(15)}\). Groups of foreign coins are also to be expected in such contexts. The Gela Hoard of 1956 is reported to have been found in one of the small extramural sanctuaries of the city. Together with Sicilian coinages it contained groups of foreign coins from Athens and Acanthus \(^{(16)}\). One should reflect carefully before assuming that such extraneous lots were contemporary with the local coins represented in such hoards. This is especially the case of coins hoar-


\(^{(14)}\) Although even these mirror the relative size of issues over the period covered by the hoard only if the hoard were collected in the actual area where the coins circulated and is made up only of coins issued under the same monetary system, see B. THORDEMAN, The Lohe Hoard, in NC, ser. 6, no. 8, 1948, p. 188-204.

\(^{(15)}\) Seven staters out of 132 coins in the Temple deposit were plated. I rely for this information on the unpublished manuscript of the late Professor Eunice Work on this material.

\(^{(16)}\) An Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards, New York, 1973, hereafter IGCH no. 2066.
ded in non-coin-using areas such as Egypt and the Near East. Beginning in the sixth century, particularly in Egypt, there appear hoards which contain coins from all parts of the Greek world and often uncoined silver as well. It is only natural to suppose that these hoards were made up from parcels of coins arriving separately from various sources and at different times. There is information about such small lots of early coins from northern Greece in Egypt. One was made up of only four coins, two tetradrachms and two octodrachms (17). From the other only two coins survive, one of Aeneia and one of the Derrones, but it is reported that the find included "other issues of Macedonia (?)" (18). These small parcels are the building blocks out of which the more famous mixed hoards were created. The latter do not mirror conditions of circulation in the Greek world.

Up to the mid-twentieth century hoards played little role in the dating of early Greek coins. Literary testimony linking coinage in Greece with pre-Solonian Athens and Argos under King Pheidon, and thus with the seventh or eighth century, was accepted without question. But in 1949, working under the tutelage of Sir Edward Robinson, David L. Brown turned to the hoards as evidence for the tradition that Pheidon of Argos had issued coins (19). Brown pointed out that the majority of Egyptian hoards, containing such sure chronological guides as the coins attributed to the brief period of occupation of Messana in Sicily by Samian adventurers between 494 and 489 B.C., had been assembled in the early fifth century. There were older Egyptian hoards, especially the large finds from Mit Rahineh (20) and Demanhur (21), but, Brown argued, they belong to the late sixth century at the earliest. Considering that most phases of the earliest coinage of Aigina (where Pheidon was supposed to have operated his mint) were represented in the Egyptian finds, there could be no question of Pheidonian coinage of the eighth or seventh century. Brown did not consider questions of parcelling and so his argument may appear somewhat less conclusive than when it

(17) IGCH no. 1634.
(18) IGCH no. 1635.
(19) Pheidon's Alleged Aeginetal Coinage, in NC, ser. 6, no. 10, 1950, p. 178-204.
(20) IGCH no. 1636.
(21) IGCH no. 1637.
was published. Nonetheless his work shifted the burden of proof to those who would uphold any earlier dates. As a result of this work and Kraay's subsequent study of Athens, the opening of the Greek mints was assigned to the sixth century and the literary testimony assuming coinage in Solonian and pre-Solonian Athens as well as in Pheidon's Argive Empire came to be regarded more and more as the result of conjectures on the part of fourth-century Greek historians and their successors (22). These results fitted with the revision in Ionian chronology arising from the work of Robinson and Jacobsthal and still constitute the accepted view of the majority of numismatists.

Before examining the more recent use of the same hoard evidence to advance still lower dates for early Greek silver, it is important to recognize that Kraay's evidence for the chronology of the Athenian coinage was not entirely derived from hoards. Indeed, his fundamental argument came from the observation of the similarity in fabric between one group of owls (H) and the tetradrachms belonging to the Athenian issues called Wappenmünzen because of their changing types (23). Since, once inaugurated, the Athena head and owl became the unvarying types of Athens and since hoards from Attica exist with only Wappenmünzen, presumably belonging to a time when owl coins did not exist, there is no doubt that the Wappenmünzen come first in the sequence (24). Group H owls, however, display a profile head of Athena which belongs stylistically to the later decades of the sixth century. This group is the beginning of the owls and consequently the owls do not start before about 525 B.C. It is important to stress that this date is a terminus post quem, a date before which heads such as those of the Group H owls do not exist. This same kind of statement can also be made regarding the more

(22) C. M. Kraay, The Archaic Owls of Athens, in NC, ser. 6, no. 16, 1956, p. 43-68; An Interpretation of Ath. Pol. Ch. 10, in C. M. Kraay and G. K. Jenkins eds., Essays in Greek Coinage Presented to Stanley Robinson, Oxford, 1968, p. 5-9; most recently J. Kroll and N. Waggoner, Dating the Earliest Coins of Athens, Corinth, and Aigina, in AJA, 88, 1984, p. 325-340. I am grateful to these authors for the opportunity to read their paper before publication. Regarding their use of hoard evidence, the same caution may be urged as I suggest in the use of Waggoner and Price's treatment of the Asyut hoard.

(23) A corpus of early Athenian coinage was published by C. Seltman, Athens, its History and Coinage before the Persian Invasion, Cambridge, 1924.

(24) ICGH, no. 2 and 5.
archaic appearing owls of Seltman's groups G and E which on the basis of Kraay's analysis seem certain to have been issued after Group H. Even for these coins style still gives an upper limit, the validity of which may be lost sight of because their actual date of manufacture is so much later.

The first series of Corinthian coins is known to be contemporary with the first Athenian issues, since a Corinthian pegasus is overstruck on an Athenian Wappenmünze, and thus these two mints of mainland Greece have chronological support quite independent of hoards (25). In the case of Aigina, we have the good fortune to have a hoard that is more than a hoard — a deposit with a precise documentary date. This group of coins was placed in two foundation deposits of the Persian Palace at Persepolis at a date between 517 and 514 B.C. (26). Present were four Greek coins, one each of Aigina, Abdera, two coins of Cyprus and four light weight Croeseid gold pieces (probably of Persian issue). The Aiginetan piece belongs to a large-scale coinage which stands at some distance from the opening issues of the island's mint (27). The Aiginetan issues are thus at least as early as the Wappenmünzen and the Corinthian pegasoi. Perhaps, as maintained by tradition, Aigina was the first mint to strike silver in Greece.

The studies of the first major Greek mints just summarized do not offer a precise date for the beginning of the series in question. Their authors, however, believed that the inauguration of these mints took place in the first half of the sixth century, and considering the intermittent nature of the first issues, at least at Athens and Aigina, they also believed that the date at which coins were first struck in Athens, Corinth and Aigina was nearer 600 than 550. This chronology has also been questioned in recent years. The alternative put forward is that the beginning of these first mainland Greek silver issues should be lowered to about 550. The argument is made largely on the basis of hoard evidence.

(25) The coin, now in Paris, was brought to my attention by Kroll and Waggoner, op. cit. in note 21, p. 333 note 57.
(26) IGCH no. 1789, for the related problems see M. Price and N. Waggoner, Archaic Greek Silver Coinage, the « Asyut » Hoard, London, 1975, p. 129.
The 1970's brought a most important addition to the group of known hoards, a find of at least 867 Greek silver coins from Asyut in Upper Egypt. The coins from the hoard were tracked down from material in commerce with admirable speed by Dr. Nancy Waggoner and Dr. Martin Price, who took the occasion to discuss the chronological implications of the new find in their publication of the hoard (28).

The Asyut Hoard is a thoroughly heterogeneous treasure in which 79 Greek mints are represented (and 4 unattributed coins in addition). The geographical distribution of mints reaches from far western Greek cities to Cyprus. The burial date of the hoard was placed about 475 by Price and Waggoner (29). They also concluded that it was made up of coins which reached Egypt over a period of not more than fifteen years.

The authors recognized that the large heterogeneous hoards in Egypt contained individual parcels of Greek coins which undoubtedly reached Egypt separately. In particular, they conceded that the western Greek issues at Asyut represented a distinct and somewhat early parcel in the hoard. But in general they wished to minimize the influence of parcelling. The effect of their reasoning is to move substantial issues of Athens and of Aigina and Corinth as well (and with them series of Mende, Potidaea, Miletus, Chios, Samos, Rhodes, and Cyrene) from the later sixth into the first two decades of the fifth century. Consequently, there remains less coinage to be attributed to the period before 500, and the authors feel justified in claiming that there was no Greek silver before 550 B.C.

What is the justification for such compression, especially when the character of the Egyptian hoards reviewed above would lead one to expect less consistency in their composition? First, there can be no objection to a date within the fifth century for the final burial of the Asyut Hoard. Its formation after 491 is certain since it contained a coin of the Samian exiles at Messana issued in that year. Therefore, it is later than the first large Egyptian hoards such as


(29) The issues controlling the closing date are not, however, securely fixed. See my comments in Gnomon, 50, 1978, p. 597-600, where I argue that no issue in the hoard, including the single octodrachm of Alexander I of Macedonia, need necessarily be dated after 490. This should not be taken to mean that I hold that the burial of the hoard must be so early.
Demanhur. But Price and Waggoner also believe that it is significantly later than the Taranto Hoard from southern Italy the burial of which is placed in the 490's because the south Italian issues represented in it show a distinct development beyond the type of fabric used for the last issues of Sybaris, where the archaic coinage ceased after the disaster of 509 (30). The Taranto Hoard, which was reported to have contained over 1000 coins, is among the largest hoards known from any part of the Greek world before the Persian Wars. It also resembles the Egyptian hoards under discussion because its major nucleus of south Italian coins was joined by a considerable component of Greek issues, including coins from north Greece and the Aegean islands, 8 coins of Athens, 15 of Aigina and 13 of Corinth. Because of the variety of its contents it is unlike other large archaic hoards from the Greek world which tend to represent the coinage normally in circulation in the area where they are found. Apart from the question of its origin (Paolo Orsi investigating the discovery on the spot believed that two different finds were involved) (31) the Taranto Hoard has all the marks of a sanctuary deposit and the mainland Greek material it contained should not be automatically considered contemporary with the south Italian pieces of the hoard. It is only by holding that the Taranto Hoard is a sample of circulation at the time of burial that a distinction can be made between Asyut and Taranto and the further position be taken that the generally later coins of Athens, Mende, Acanthus and Corinth in the Asyut find must be pieces belonging to issues which had not yet been coined when the Taranto Hoard was buried.

The authors of the Asyut publication also hold that "No hoard seriously contradicts the new chronology" (32), but this statement is open to question. To contradict Asyut a hoard would have to

(30) IGCH no. 1874.
(31) In Atti e Memorie dell'Istituto Italiano di Numismatica, 1919, p. 29. I regard Orsi's opinion as more reliable than that of the Marseilles dealer who handled the hoard. It represents, I believe, two or more hoards found within a few days' time in a sanctuary during building operations. However, for the purposes of the present discussion, I treat this material as if it were a single hoard. Most recently, A. Stazio, Considerazioni sulle prime forme di tesaurizzazione monetaria nell' Italia meridionale, in Actes du 9e congrès international de Numismatique, Louvain-la-Neuve - Luxembourg, 1982, p. 53-69.
be found which put a clearly defined group of coins in a significantly earlier context. But at this point common sense takes over, as it does in eliminating the two fourth century coins that were mixed with the Asyut material during its passage through commercial channels, and similar intrusions in other Egyptian hoards (33). The opposite case in which a group of earlier coins becomes part of a later deposit is generally accepted without question. In Egypt one may compare the hoard from Naucratis (34) with its group of three Sicilian tetradrachms of the fifth century in a hoard buried possibly about 360, and the hoard from the Fayum (35) of about 460 but containing an Athenian Wappenmünze. This is the situation which is more likely to be reflected in the Asyut Hoard.

Finally, Price and Waggone note that a number of series represented at Asyut are subject to changes in type or style, or even cease, shortly after the point reached at Asyut. The implication that these separate phenomena were somehow part of a general rearrangement of Greek coinage at one time is a proposition that should not be accepted without reflection and consideration case by case.

All in all, it seems that the suggestion that large Greek coin series be compressed into reduced periods of time at the opening of the

(33) It is common practice among numismatists to exclude such coins, clearly later than the main body of a hoard, as additions to the true hoard made during the passage of the coins through commerce. Pieces of the sort may represent the substitution of less valuable for more valuable coins at a moment when the number of coins in a lot needs to be kept constant or the attempt to increase the size (and so the price) of a group offered for sale. There are cases, however, in which the applicability of such reasoning seems questionable. The hoard in Syracuse from Scoglitti IGCH no. 2185 is a deposit of 261 coins of the fourth century, largely pegasoi of Corinth and Corinthian colonies. Delivered to the museum with them were a Roman Republican denarius of the second century B.C., coins of Philip II of Macedonia, Athens, a coin of Ariarathes IV of Cappadocia, and one of the Thracian Chersonese. In a hoard which has never left Sicily the addition of a denarius, a coin of Philip or of Athens, all of which circulated in the island, is not impossible. That a coin of the Kingdom of Cappadocia or another of the Thracian Chersonese should have been substituted by a modern intermediary in Sicily seems extremely dubious. Therefore one must not lose sight of the possibility that hoards may have been discovered and reburied with additions in antiquity. And this circumstance may make discussion of the definitive closing date of a hoard more difficult than it may appear.

(34) IGCH no. 1652.
(35) IGCH no. 1646.
fifth century has been made without due attention to the parcelling effect in the Asyut and other Egyptian hoards.

In conclusion we may offer a further observation to Bruun's statement quoted above. Monetary circulation is documented only in hoards made up of coins from within common boundaries of circulation. Otherwise, one must be watchful for special circumstances, notably sanctuary or bankers' hoards, and the possibility of encountering extraneous parcels of earlier material. The Taranto Hoard is the most notable example of this kind within the Greek world. Outside the area of circulation, for our present discussion notably in Egypt, the potential association of chronologically distinct parcels of coins in one hoard increases.

It still seems prudent to date the earliest electrum, as Robinson did, in the later seventh century, understanding that Weidauer's demonstration of the compact nature of the earlier issues may warrant a slightly lower date than 640. And in the case of the earliest Greek silver, it still seems preferable to follow Brown and Kraay with dates in the first half of the century rather than accepting Price and Waggoner's attempt to compress numerous major issues into the decades after 500, thereby opening the way for a beginning of Greek silver about 550 (36). By the same token, any attempt to revive the theory of Solon's or Pheidon's coinage is excluded (37).

(36) In the specific case of Athens a beginning date of 550 may have some validity. It is obtained by working back from the beginning of the owls to a point around mid-century. This is done by J. H. Kroll, *From Wappenmünzen to Gorgoneia to Owls*, in *American Numismatic Society, Museum Notes*, 26, 1981, p. 1-32, summarizing arguments made on grounds of historical probability for an initial date of the owls a decade after Kraay's estimate of 525. This argument was originally made by W. P. Wallace, *The Early Coinages of Athens and Euboea*, in *NC*, ser. 7, 2, 1962, p. 23-42.

(37) Most recently by D. Kagan, *The Dates of the Earliest Coins*, in *AJA*, 86, 1982, p. 343-360. Kagan argues that the contents of the Basis Deposit at Ephesus could have been assembled in the second or third quarter of the seventh century. He also argues that the additions to the original central Basis before the entire construction was covered by the mid-sixth century temple must have been made over a lengthy period of time. The way is thus opened to hold that the treasure in the Basis was in place before the Cimmerian raid on Ephesus and the burning of the Temple of Artemis, an event which, despite some difficulties in the precision of the ancient tradition, emphasized by A. Kuhrt in her paper on the Mesopotamian written evidence at the British Museum conference, Kagan believes is historical and can be dated around 645. Kagan therefore approves Weidauer's arguments for the date of the early Ionian electrum, although he is cautious.
On 23-24 March 1984, on the initiative of Dr. Martin Price, a colloquium entitled *The archaic Temple of Artemis at Ephesus: a reconsideration of the earliest finds* was held at the British Museum. The discussion, particularly papers on the jewelry and ivories from Hogarth's excavations by R. Higgins and J. Carter, confirmed the date of the Basis Deposit proposed by Jacobsthal. The same general conclusion results from A. Brammer's presentation of the results of the latest Austrian excavations. In the excavations to the east of the Croesus Temple, the Austrian Team has been able to date the life of Hogarth's structure « B » (which succeeded the « Basis », structure « A ») to the time when late Protocorinthian, Transitional and Early Corinthian pottery were in use. This period is ca. 620-580 B.C. The « B » period, however, did not begin quite as early as 620. This is shown by the fragments of an East Greek aryballos with plastic handle now identified by D. Williams as coming from the interior fill of the western basis. This piece dates to the last quarter of the seventh century and its find spot means that the structures of the « A » period were not completed until the last quarter of the century.

*In toto*, therefore, it seems that the evidence suggests a closing date for the Basis Deposit within the last quarter of the seventh century.

Up to the present, the hoard of 17 electrum coins found in a pot buried between the « A » basis and the enclosing wall of the « B » platform has played a less central role than the finds from the Basis in discussion of early electrum coinage at Ephesus. The pot, however, bearing Hogarth's penciled annotation, has now been identified by D. Williams in the British Museum. It is a plain ware, oval-mouthed juglet, lacking its handle, and covered with a dilute glaze save for a about the independent value of stylistic evidence. Finally, Phedon's coinage returns as a plausible historical reality since coinage in Ionia would have existed early enough for the Argive tyrant to have adopted the invention of coinage in Greece.

Kagan's case against Robinson and Jacobsthal is seriously damaged by the evidence of the electrum figurine from the new Austrian excavations and Higgins' reconsideration of the chronology of the Ephesus electrum statuettes cited above, note 6. One may also note that the central Basis and its appendages may not be the early temple of Artemis since foundations for a 100 foot long building, and so apparently a *hecatompedon*, have now come to light outside the area of the mid-sixth century temple. If the identification of these foundations proves correct, it will mean that even if one accepts the tradition of the Cimmerian sack, he will not be forced to hypothesize the existence of a shrine on the site of the later Artemision to be destroyed by the raiders. Cf. *Anzeiger der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 117, no. 1-10, 1981, p. 252.
reserved band on the lower body and the area just above the foot. Such jugs are known on Samos where they are dated to the first three quarters of the seventh century but occur in deposits into the last quarter of the century (38). Describing the find spot of the hoard, B. V. Head wrote «This earth seems to have been rammed in at the time when the B foundations were laid, and the jar itself must, in that case, have been deposited at the end of the A period» (39). This is unlikely to have been the earliest in the long series of these common ware juglets and the burial of the hoard should belong to the last quarter of the seventh century.

(39) In D. G. Hogarth, The Archaic Arlemisia, p. 75.
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