Anne DESTROOPER-GEORGIADES

TWO CILICIAN HOARDS OF THE FOURTH CENTURY *

(Plates II-IV)

The similarity of two 4th century B.C. Cilician hoards, one deposited in the American Numismatic Society, the other in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris, attracted my attention (1).

The first one is mentioned in the Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards no. 1263 and in the second edition of the Bibliography of Greek Coin Hoards of Noe, no. 251 (2). It was acquired by E. T. Newell from Jules Rouvier, a French doctor who lived in the Near East at the end of the last century and in the first years of this century (3).

(*) This text has been presented as a paper at the International Numismatic Congress, London, September 1986.

(1) I express my sincere gratitude to Mrs N. Waggoner and H. Nicolet, who gave me permission to study these two hoards.

(2) The coins in the ANS are not numbered so that I have given them conventional numbers.

O. MORKHOLM in M. THOMPSON, O. MORKHOLM, C. M. KRAAY, An Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards, New York, 1973 (IGCH), also mentions under no. 1263 the small hoard from Cyprus collected by W. T. Ready, deposited in the BM in 1901 and published in BMC Cyprus, p. xviii. However, S. P. NOE, A Bibliography of Greek Coin Hoards, in NNM 78, 1937, had listed the Ready hoard under a separate entry, no. 292, and M. J. Price, who kindly looked up the inventory books in the BM, confirmed in a letter of 4/4/1986 that this is a different hoard which came, moreover, from Cyprus. I take the opportunity to thank Dr. Price for this information.

The distinction of these two hoards is confirmed by closer study. Indeed, the Ready hoard, which contains only eight coins, is heterogeneous. Firstly, though most coins are obols or coins of smaller denominations, the hoard includes three larger coins: the two coins from Amathus, a didrachm and a diobol, and the diobol of an uncertain Cypriot mint. Furthermore, the chronology of the eight coins is quite divergent, and finally no coin is struck by the same dies as the coins in IGCH 1263.

(3) My thanks to M. Amandry who kindly gave me this biographical information.
Apart from the two lists which mention the contents of the hoard, no complete study of it has ever been published.

The other hoard was acquired by Jean and Marie Delepierre and is now part of the Paris collection. All but one coin are published in the *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum* volume of this collection (4).

Both hoards are said to come from Cilicia in Southern Asia Minor (North of Cyprus) (fig. 1), though the one in the Delepierre collec-

(4) *SNG Delepierre* nos. 1057, 2819-2823, 2836-2849, 2851-2854, 2857-2859, 2861, 2863-2872, 2890-2898, 2905, 2913, 2919, 2921 and collection Delepierre old no. 2968.
tion comes more precisely from Kelenderis, where the largest amount of coins were also struck (5). More than half of the coins from the Rouvier hoard were also issued in that mint. Unfortunately, more precise information about the place of discovery of both hoards, the way they were discovered, and their context, is not available. Rouvier wrote to Newell that he had acquired the hoard in 1900 and that it was discovered in the same year (6). The Delepierre hoard was bought in 1944-1945 by this gentleman from three dealers, Misters Bourgey, Platt and Battret (7).

The total number of coins in this hoard probably amounts to 51 or 52 pieces (8), and 137 pieces in the Rouvier hoard (9).

The Kelenderis coins are the most numerous in both hoards. Probably they form 53% in the Rouvier hoard and 46% in the Delepierre hoard (fig. 2). In fact, there are some doubts about the attribution to Kelenderis of the coins with Gorgon and horse protome, but in my opinion they fit well into the series of Gorgon with irregular incuse or with horse — or with Pegasos protome on the reverse (pl. II a 14, 2894, 1, 3, 2890, 8). These are followed by many series of the kneeling goat and the Pegasos forepart (pl. II a 48, 2836). The hemiobols with Gorgon and the astragalos are probably also issued in Kelenderis, as attested by the legend KE (pl. II a 76) (10). But the obol with the Gorgon and the helmeted Athena head is rather from Selge (11) (pl. II a 18).

The coins of Soloi with an amazone head and a bunch of grapes are also well represented in the two hoards: 17% in the Rouvier hoard, 21% in the Delepierre hoard (pl. II b).

(5) Cf. SNG Delepierre, index trouvailles.
(6) This letter of J. Rouvier to E. T. Newell is on file in the ANS.
(7) Information from the inventory in the BN.
(8) Cf. infra, p. 33-34.
(9) Cf. supra, n. 2, about the different amount mentioned in IGCH 1263.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINT</th>
<th>ROUVIER HOARD</th>
<th>DELEPIERRE HOARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NUMBER OF COINS</td>
<td>PERCENTAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selge (?)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelenderis</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>53.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagidos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soloi</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarsos</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amathus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kition</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapethos</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salamis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenicia</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2

For the explanation of the numbers, full lines, dotted lines... on the figures and the plates, see note p. 38-39.
From the other South Asia Minor mints the number of coins is less. Indeed those from Nagidos which figure a female head, perhaps Aphrodite, and on the reverse a male head, probably Dionysos, form only 1.5% in the Rouvier hoard and 5.7% in the Delepierre hoard (pl. II c). The last named hoard, which contains more coins from Nagidos, does not, however, include coins from Tarsos, struck between 379 and 372 B.C. by the satrap Pharnabazos or Datames. These coins form 4.4% of the Rouvier hoard. A female and a male head, perhaps Arethousa and Ares, are represented on them (pl. II d).

Coins from Side and Selge, situated respectively in Pamphylia and at the frontier of Pisidia, together form only 6% in the Rouvier hoard but more than 15% in the Delepierre hoard. They cannot easily be distinguished from each other, nor from those of Pamphylian Aspendos.

Sabahat Atlan, in her monography on the coins of Side, attributes to this mint the coins with a pomegranate or a lion head on the obverse and an Athena head on the reverse (pl. II e). On the other hand the obols, which figure a helmeted head of Athena to the right and a frontal lion head in a quadratum incusum, are identified either as from Selge or from Side (12) (pl. II f 2).

In the Delepierre hoard there is a further obol, probably from a Southern Asia Minor mint, of which I could not identify either the obverse type in a border of dots, or the reverse type in an incuse square (13) (pl. II g). Represented in unequal amounts in the hoards are the Cypriot coins, which form 17.5% in the Rouvier hoard, but only about half as much, 9.6% in the Delepierre hoard.

However, in each hoard the coins of Salamis with ram's head or with a young male head (pl. II h 17, 18, 22) are quasi equal in num-

(12) The identification of the obverse and the reverse of SNG Delepierre 2898 with a helmeted head of Athena to the right and a frontal lion head in a quadratum incusum is very distinct on other coins of the hoard. The attribution to Selge is postulated by G. F. Hill, BMC Pisidia, p. LXXIII and by E. Babelon, Traité, II, 2, col. 955 but F. Imhoof-Blumer, op. cit. p. 311 and E. T. Newell, cf. n. 6, and the IGCH list attribute those coins to Side. However, S. Atlan does not include this type in her monography on the coins of Side: Untersuchungen über die sidetischen Münzen des V. und IV. Jahrhunderts v. Chr., Ankara, 1967. I follow her identifications and I attribute the other coins hesitatingly to Selge.

(13) SNG Delepierre 2896.
ber with those of Kition where the head of Herakles is depicted on the obverse and a lion attacking a stag on the reverse (pl. II i). Furthermore, the Rouvier hoard also includes a coin from Amathus with lying lion (pl. II j), and the Delepierre hoard one coin of Lape­thos with standing Athena holding shield and spear at one side and Herakles fighting with bow and club at the other (pl. II k).

An obol of Alexander, struck in Sidon, is also said to belong to this hoard (14) (pl. II l). The Rouvier hoard contained several Phoeni­cian coins which cannot now be identified because Rouvier had mixed them with other coins of his collection after cleaning them. In doing so — remarks Newell — the patches of copper oxide and the hard clay layer of a light brownish-grey color, which covered all the other coins of the hoard, disappeared on these Phoenician coins (15).

All these coins are small denominations, mostly obols (75% in the Rouvier hoard, 84% in the Delepierre hoard), a smaller number of hemiobols (22.5% in the former, 11.5% in the latter) and only in the Rouvier hoard there are a few quarters of obols while in the Dele­pierre hoard there are two Cypriot diobols, denominations which are not present in the Rouvier hoard: one of these is from Kition, a mint which is well represented in the latter hoard, and the other from Lapethos, the only coin of this mint in the hoard (16).

Most coin types are represented in both hoards and many dies too. Thus in the case of the coins of Kelenderis I identified more than 20 obverse and at least 21 reverse dies in the Rouvier hoard, and more than 10 obverse and 13 reverse dies in the Delepierre hoard.

In the series with Gorgon several obverse dies have been used for coins within the same hoards but not for coins belonging to both hoards (17), while two reverse dies are indeed used in both hoards: one with horse protome (die 3) for three coins in the Rouvier hoard.

(14) Cf. infra, p. 33-34.
(15) Cf. note in the ANS, see supra, n. 6.
(16) BN collection Delepierre, old no. 2968 (the coin is not included in the SNG Delepierre) and SNG Delepierre 2913. On the obverse of this latter coin I could not identify a Π as does the editor of the collection. It is possibly a die flaw.
(17) The obverses of IGCH 1263 nos. 13-16 and of SNG Delepierre 2890-2894 are very worn which makes their precise identification difficult.
and for four coins in the other hoard (pl. III a 14, 2894), the other with Pegasos protome (die 5) for six coins in the first mentioned hoard and for one coin in the second hoard (pl. III a 10, 2852/3). The other reverses are quite similar to these two dies (fig. 3).

Moreover, in the Rouvier hoard some reverses are irregular incuses (pl. III a 3) and later types figure an astragalos (pl. III a 74).

In addition to these types, the Delepierre hoard includes a series with helmeted Athena head and Pegasos (3 obols from which at least two are from the same obverse die and the third, a double struck, is difficult to identify; all 3 are from the same reverse die; also a hemiobol has these types) (pl. III a 2847).

The most common series from Kelenderis, which shows a Pegasos protome and a kneeling goat, is present in both hoards (pl. III b 1). The type however occurs more frequently in the Rouvier hoard. But the five reverse dies used for the coins in the Delepierre hoard are also used for the coins in the Rouvier hoard for which another eight dies are used as well. In the same way, three obverse dies are common for coins of each hoard but a fourth die is only used for two coins in the Delepierre hoard; but this obverse die is linked with two reverse dies which are common on both hoards; moreover, ten obverse dies are only used for the Rouvier hoard (fig. 4).

The coins of Soloi show the same picture, many dies are common for the obols of both hoards and other dies are common for the hemiobols of the two hoards. Other dies are linked to a common die. Only one obverse die, used for only one coin in the Rouvier hoard is different — 'barbarian' — in style (18) (fig. 5 and pl. III c).

Though the coins of the other South Asia Minor mints are less numerous in each hoard, again the same dies are often used for the coins of both hoards.

Thus the coins attributed to Side by Atlan (19) are struck by the same dies or are linked to the same dies in both hoards: but several other dies are used for the more numerous coins of the Delepierre hoard (fig. 6 and pl. III d).

With the possible exception of one, the four obols of Nagidos, two in each hoard, are issued from the same reverse die but their obverse

(18) ANS Soloi no. 10.
(19) Cf. n. 12.
KELENDERIS. Obols

\[\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
a & b & c & d & e & f & g & h & i & j & k & l & m & n & o & p \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 3b & 3c & 4 & 5 & 5b & 5c & 5d & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9
\end{array}\]

\text{Fig. 3}

KELENDERIS. Obols

\[\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
A & B & C & D & E & F & G & H & X & I & J & K & L & M \\
\end{array}\]

\text{Fig. 4}
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Fig. 6
is very worn and disfigured and therefore difficult to compare (fig. 7 and pl. IV a).

Among the dies used for the three coins which are usually attributed to Selge (20), two obverses may be from the same die, even though the dies are so worn that comparison is difficult (21) (fig. 8 and pl. II f).

I have already mentioned that there are no satrapal coins from Tarsos in the Delepierre hoard but the two groups of the four hemiobols and of the two quarter obols in the Rouvier hoard are each struck from the same pair of dies (pl. IV f).

The Cypriot coins included in both hoards are few in number and are quite worn. Consequently, comparison of the coins of both hoards is quite difficult. In the Delepierre hoard most are of different types and denominations, while in the Rouvier hoard several are of the same type and denomination but only a few are struck from the same dies: for example, among the seven obols of Kition one obverse die seems to be used at least twice for coins of this hoard and one reverse die four times (22). A different die was used for the obol of the Delepierre hoard (fig. 9 and pl. IV c 2, 4, 1, 3).

The hemiobols, which only occur in the Rouvier hoard, are even more difficult to compare because of their small size and their worn condition. Therefore, it is questionable if two obverse dies are used twice and if two reverse dies are used twice and three times respectively (fig. 9 and pl. IV c 9, 8, 12, 10, 11) (23).

Furthermore, for the six obverses with ram’s head of the obols from Salamis only one die is used twice (pl. IV d 15, 16), and all the others are different, as are the dies of the hemiobols (24).

(20) Cf. n. 12.
(21) SNG Delepierre 2905 and ANS 2.
(22) The obverses of nos. 2 and 4 and perhaps of no. 3 are from the same die and the reverses of nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 are also from the same dies. The other obverses and reverses are struck from different dies.
(23) The obverses of nos. 8 and 12 are perhaps struck from the same die, those of nos. 10 and 11 possibly from another similar die; the reverses of nos. 8 and 9 on the one side, of nos. 10, 11 and perhaps 12 on the other side may be the same too.
(24) ANS Salamis 15 and 16.
NAGIDOS. Obols

1:1 — 2:2 — 3: 2857 — 4: 2858

Fig. 7

SELGE

1:1 — 2:2 — 3: 2895

Fig. 8
Fig. 9

However, the quite unusual young head facing left on the Salamis obols appears in both these Cilician hoards (26). Unfortunately, the dies of the coins are difficult to distinguish because of the worn condition of the Delepierre example (pl. IV d 2921, 24).

The Rouvier hoard also includes a remarkable hemiobol which is attributed to Salamis because of the reverse type, a ram's head while on the obverse there is an archaic female helmeted head. Up to now I have not found a close parallel to this coin and the style of the ram's head does not closely resemble that on the Salamis coins (26) (pl. IV d 23).

Most of the coins of these two hoards are dated from 450 to 390/370 B.C. and more than half of them in the first decades of the 4th century B.C. (27). Of the same date must be the majority of the

(25) ANS Salamis 24 and SNG Delepierre 2921. The type of the young head to left is not included in the Meniko hoard (IGCH 1279) though 35 coins of this type, but looking right, are included in the hoard and 24 others are listed in J. and V. KARAGEORGHIS, The Meniko Hoard of Silver Coins, in Opusc. Ath., 5, 1964, p. 10-16. I know only one other example of the left looking male's head. It was acquired by the BM in 1920 from the Weber Collection but it came originally from W. T. Ready in June 1897. This obverse was struck with the same die as the one in the Rouvier hoard. The Delepierre coin is too worn to compare its die with the other two.

(26) A silver tetrobol with helmeted female head and a ram's head to right in a Southern Asia Minor hoard, IGCH 1252: J. Hirsch, Sale 32, Munich 14-15 November 1912, no. 546, is tentatively attributed by Regling in H. DRESSLER, K. REGLING, Zwei ägyptische Funde allgriechischer Silbermünzen, in ZfN, 37, 1927, p. 5 n. 1b, to a Cypriot, a Carian, an Ionian or a Lycian mint. This coin is dated in the first half of the 5th century (the hoard, IGCH 1252, in which it is included is dated c. 430 B.C.). See further the late 5th- beginning 4th century bronze coins from Clazomenae, BMC Ionia, pl. VI, 6, which are also different in style.

(27) The coins of Side, ANS 3-5 and SNG Delepierre 2897 and 2819 are dated 430-400 B.C., ANS 6-7 and SNG Delepierre 2898, 2820-2823: 400-380 B.C. by S. ATLAN, op. cit. n. 12; those attributed to Selge (cf. supra n. 11-12), ANS 1-2 and SNG Delepierre 2895 are dated in the 5th century by E. BABELON, op. cit. et loc. cit. n. 11, and ANS 18 to the end of the 5th century or at the beginning of the 4th century: E. BABELON, loc. cit. n. 11, BMC Pisidia, SNG Cap and SNG von Aulock (cf. supra, n.11); the Kelenderis coins ANS 1-17 and SNG Delepierre 2890-2894, 2896, 2851-2854, 2846-2849 are dated from 465/450 to 400 B.C. and ANS 19-74, SNG Delepierre 2836-2845 from 400 to 350 B.C.: E. BABELON, op. cit. n. 11, BMC Cilicia, SNG Cap and SNG von Aulock; all the coins of Nagidos, ANS 1-2 and SNG Delepierre 2857-2859: 400-380 B.C.: BMC Cilicia, E. BABELON, op. cit. n. 11, SNG Cap and SNG von Aulock; the coins of Soloi ANS 1-23 and SNG Delepierre 2861, 2863-2872 are not very accurately dated: 465-
Kelenderis coins, following the 5th century B.C. Gorgon series, though the Pegasos/goat type is roughly dated in the whole first half of the 4th century B.C. Indeed, they must have been struck during a somewhat short period because several are issued by both the same dies or are linked to each other by the same obverse or reverse dies. Therefore, they may fit well with the satrapal coins which are included in the Rouvier hoard and which are dated from 379 to 372 B.C.

The presence in both hoards of several coins from the same mints struck with common dies brings us to the conclusion that many coins in the two hoards are contemporaneous.

The Alexander obol, which is said to belong to the Delepierre hoard (28), thus presents a problem, because it is several decades


(28) SNG Delepierre 1057.
later than the other coins. However, because the hoard was not found in systematic excavations but was bought from dealers, it is probable that this coin is intrusive and consequently that both hoards were concealed during the same period in the third decade of the 4th century B.C.

It is even tempting to suggest that these hoards, which came to us through commerce, formed one and the same hoard, because the coins are all of small denominations which are not so numerous or at least are not so well known. However, there is a gap of forty years between the time when the two hoards became known to numismatists, since the first came into Rouviers' collection in 1900, and the second into the Delepierre collection in 1944-1945. Nevertheless, the small coins of Kelenderis do not seem to be so uncommon in the area in the beginning of the 4th century B.C. Indeed, a third hoard from the same region, discovered in 1966/67, at Karataş, ancient Mallos, and which dates from the same period, also includes many coin fractions of Kelenderis — apart from others from Mallos which are not in the two hoards under discussion (29). Unfortunately, however, these Kelenderis fragments cannot be compared to those of our two hoards to see whether the coin types in the hoards are complementary because the Karataş hoard was not fully published before it was dispersed.

So, our conclusion remains that there is no absolute evidence that our two hoards once formed a single hoard.

The other hoards found in Cilicia of the same period, of the beginning of the 4th century B.C., are made up of bigger coins, generally staters (30). Beside local coins, they frequently contain several coins from abroad and quite often from Cyprus, as in our two hoards (31). The amount of Cypriot coins in these cases does not usually exceed a small percentage of the total, but in one hoard and in our two hoards they make up more than 10% and in one case they form the majority of the coins (32).

(29) IGCH 1264.
(30) IGCH 1254-1264, CH 2 no. 36, CH 6 no. 11.
(31) IGCH 1254, 1255, 1259, 1260 and CH 2 no. 36, IGCH 1261.
(32) Cypriot coins form 4% in IGCH 1254; 1,31% in IGCH 1255; 2,68% to 4,25% in IGCH 1259; 12,50% in IGCH 1261; 10% in the Delepierre hoard; 17,5% in IGCH 1263 (Rouvier hoard); c.70% in IGCH 1260 + CH 2 no. 36.
No isolated Cypriot coins found so far in Cilicia are contemporaneous with the coins of our hoards but some are overstruck by local ones (33).

On the other hand, coins from Cilicia and from regions nearby (Pamphylia and Lycia), dating from the same period, are found in Cyprus both in hoards (34) as singly (35), and others are overstruck (36).


(34) One Cypriot hoard, dating from the beginning of the 4th century, IGCH 1278, includes a coin from Aspendos in Pamphylia (for Aspendos coins overstruck in Cyprus, cf. infra, n. 36); another hoard, IGCH 1277, might also include a Lycian coin from Kheriga (c. 410 B.C.), though the composition of this hoard is problematic and it is not certain that this coin belongs to it.

(35) Cesnola found one stater from Kelenderis, dated c. 420 B.C., and one from Soloi, dated c. 380 B.C., in not specified places of Cyprus: A. Palma di Cesnola, Salaminia (Cyprus), London, 1884*, p. 265 resp. fig. 349 and 351; a silver plated stater, struck by Pharnabazos in Tarsos (379-374 B.C.) was found during excavations in the necropolis of Tsambres, tomb 16: E. Dray, J. du Plat Taylor, Tsambres and Aphendrika. Two Classical and Hellenistic Cemeteries, in Report Dept. Antiq. of Cyprus, 1937-1939, [1951], p. 46, 48 no. 63; two bronzes, one from Soloi and another from Mallos (?), both not accurately dated in the 4th century, were found in the necropolis of Cellarka, Salamis: B. Helly, op. cit., n. 27, p. 263, resp. nos. 59 and 60; another bronze coin from Soloi, also dated in the 4th century, was found during excavations in Kourion: D. H. Cox, Coins from the Excavations at Curium, 1932-1953, in NNM, 145, 1959, p. 22 no. 167; a satrapal coin found in Trikomo (Cyprus) now in the Cyprus Museum: CM1934/11-12/23, one stater of Datames, CM, O.C. 337 and three fourth century bronzes of Soloi, CM, O.C., 341, 342, 344, which are in the old collection of the Cyprus Museum without any reference to their provenance, were probably found in the island, but without any proof.

(36) Staters from Aspendos, dating c. 410-385 B.C. (types as BMC Pamphylia, p. 95, nos. 14-17 and N. Olçay, O. Mørkholm, op. cit. n. 33, p. 18-21 espec. nos. 529-531) are overstruck in Marion by coins of Stasioikos (second half of the 5th century): W. Schwabacher, op. cit., n. 27, p. 88 and 92, nos. 6, 13, and of Timo-
This shows that our two Cilician hoards, which include Cypriot coins, are not isolated. They must therefore be put in their historical context so that their nature may be understood. Indeed, in the third decade of the 4th century B.C., Pharnabazos and Datames made preparations for a Persian expedition against Egypt (378-374 B.C.) (37). They accordingly struck coins in the region to pay their soldiers and mercenaries (38), among whom there were probably some Cypriots (39).

Earlier, in the beginning of the 4th century, when Pharnabazos and Conon had organized an expedition against the Spartiates (399/8-394 B.C.) (40) and during the Cypriot war (391-380 B.C.) (41),

charis (beginning of the 4th century): W. Schwabacher, op. cit, p. 94, nos. 40 (?), 41, 49 (?), and BMC Cyprus, p. 33, no. 3 = C. H. V. Sutherland, Overstrokes and Hoards: the Movement of Greek Coinage down to 400 B.C., in NC, 6th ser., 2, 1942, p. 4.


(40) In 399/98 the Persian satrap Pharnabazos comes to Cyprus to raise a fleet wherefore he received the help of Evagoras of Salamis: Diod. XIV 39.2-3; Just. VI 1.4-9; Isocr. IX 56, 67, 68; this force was sent to Caria via Cilicia, where it got other recruitments (Diod. XIV, 39.4-6; 79.8; Xenoph. Hell. III, 4.1) and fought at the side of the Athenian Conon against the Spartiates and their king Agesilaos whom they defeated at Knidos in 394 B.C.: Xenoph. Hell. IV, 3.11-12; Diod. XIV, 83.6-7.

Cyprus and Cilicia were also closely linked, both countries being under Achaemenid domination (42).

In addition, their geographical proximity (43) had encouraged mythological links (44) and commercial relations for a long time (45), and in the classical period they were connected by personal (46) and artistic relations (47). To judge from the latest coins in the Rouvier p. 399; G. F. Hill, *A History of Cyprus*. Vol. I. *To the Conquest of Richard Lion Heart*, Cambridge, 1940, p. 135) when, after the King's Peace (386) Tiribazos and Orontes set up, from 383 B.C., an effective expedition against Evagoras, passing from Cilicia which became their operation base. There, Evagoras should have brought to revolt some Greek cities, some years earlier: Isocr. IX 62; XV 161; cf. A. Erzen, *op. cit.*, n. 37, p. 121; G. F. Hill, *op. cit.* p. 136. However, after some success, Evagoras had finally to submit himself to his vassal, Artaxerxes, in 380/79 B.C.: Isocr. IX 64; XV 134-135, 141; Theop. FrGH 103 § 9-10 Diod. XV 8-10; XII 20; Polyen. VII 20.


(45) Commercial links are quite obvious from the Bronze Age and later; Cypriot ceramics are found and are imitated in Cilicia: E. Gjerstad, *The Cypro-Geometric, Cypro-Archaic and Cypro-Classical Periods*, in *SCE*, IV 2, Stockholm, 1948, p. 258, 313, 413-414, 463.; V. Karageorghis, *Cyprus. From the Stone Age to the Romans*, London, 1982, p. 41, 43, 60. During the Classical Period these links are not so clear but excavations of sites of this period are less numerous and the material evidence was perhaps of a perishable kind.


hoard, which are dated to Pharnabazos, it is quite likely that this hoard was buried during this period. The similarity of the Delepierre hoard points to a similar date or perhaps to just a few years earlier since no Pharnabazos' pieces were included in it.

All the Cypriot coins are perhaps a few decades earlier (48). However, the similarity of the dies used for the coins of Kition should be noted because it may mean that they were struck within a short period.

The lack of coins of the traditional types of Evagoras I should also be mentioned. These coins are, however, of larger denominations (staters and tetrobols) than those which are present in the two Cilician hoards. It is thus possible that the types with ram's head and smooth reverse were still struck at the end of the 5th century, as the few well preserved coins struck by the same die indicate, and that they were still in circulation at the very end of the century and even in the beginning of the 4th century B.C.

This Cypriot lot was possibly brought to Cilicia by Cilicians who were in Cyprus during the first decades of the 4th century B.C., possibly during the Cypriot war, or by Cypriots who were in Cilicia probably during Pharnabazos' preparations for the expedition against Sparta or for the Egyptian expedition.

Thus, these two Cilician hoards provide most valuable information, not only for numismatics, for which they are essential to classify the small denominations of Cilician mints, but also for the historical implications which may be deduced from them.

**Note**

On the figures and the plates, numbers below hundred refer to coins in the Ronvier hoard *(cf. n. 2)*, those above thousand to the coins in the Delepierre hoard as they are referred in the *SNG* *(cf. n. 4)*.

On the figures the full lines refer to the coins in the Ronvier hoard, the dotted lines to those in the Delepierre hoard; the dies in a square refer to those used in both hoards. The dies and coin numbers in bold do only occur in the Delepierre hoard. The place names in a square on the map refer to mints represented in the two hoards.

On figure 3 the obverse dies are indicated with Roman numbers I to IX, the reverse dies with Arab numbers 1 to 9; the letters a to p next to the lines joining the obverses I to IX and the reverses 1 to 9 refer to the coins using these obverses and reverses.

The letters a to p correspond to coin numbers of the Rouvier hoard and the Delepierre hoard which are indicated below.

On figure 4, the obverse dies are indicated with capital letters A to M, the reverse dies with small letters a to m; the numbers 1 to 22 next to the lines joining the obverses A to M and the reverses a to m refer to coins using these obverses and reverses.

The numbers 1 to 22 correspond to coin numbers of the Rouvier hoard and the Delepierre hoard which are indicated below.
a. Kelenderis

b. Soloï

c. Nagidos

d. Tarsos

e. Side

f. Selge

g. Unidentified

h. Salemis

i. Kition

j. Anathus

k. Lapethos

l. Alexander

**Two Cilician Hoards of the Fourth Century**
a. Nagidos

Aa?  Ba  B'a  Ca

1  2  2857  2858

b. Tarsos

1  2  3  4  5  6

c. Kition

Aa  Aa  Ba  Ca  A'a'  B'a'?  B'?b'  C'b'  C'b'

2  4  1  3  9  8  12  10  11

d. Salamis

15  16  23  2921  24

TWO CHLICAN HOARDS OF THE FOURTH CENTURY