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Zagazig  See Demanhur above.

Concordance of Hoards Cited with *IGCH*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoard</th>
<th><em>IGCH</em> Number</th>
<th>Hoard</th>
<th><em>IGCH</em> Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adana</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Matala</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asyut</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>Mit Rahineh</td>
<td>1636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkh</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>Pontilivado</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


All early Greek coin hoards encountered out of situ must be treated with caution. Reports as to find spot and size are notoriously unreliable (1). Intrusions are the rule not the exception (2). Some can be detected easily and are uncontroversial. Others perhaps can never be known. A further complication is that some finds were accumulated over long periods of time. Archaic coins have been discovered in Afghanistan in hoards buried more than a century after their minting (e.g. at Balkh). Such finds are of limited use for determining the relative chronologies of the early coinage because it is hard to be certain that all the archaic coins arrived together given the distances and time involved. In other situations, a hoard can have substantive chronological value even if its burial date is uncertain. Two Egyptian hoards provide a case in point. Asyut and Zagazig have elements that indicate a burial date of ca. 460 or later; but with the exception of a few coins in Asyut and some Athenian tetradrachms in Zagazig, a convincing case can be made that the bulk of the respective hoards closed in the 470s (3). A single hoard may contain a number of coherent parcels (4).

---

(1) "Man erfährt nie die Wahrheit über solche Münzfunde, am wenigsten über die Ortlichkeit und die genaueren Fundumstände, theils weil die Händler einander misstrauen, dann auch aus Scheu vor den Behörden". Letter from G. Dattari quoted by H. Dressel, *Allgriechischer Münzfund aus Ägypten*, in ZFN, 18, 1900, p. 232.

(2) Asyut, p. 116 with reference to other hoards as well.


IGCH 1185 found today in Brussels may be such a hoard. It is rarely cited in discussions of early Greek silver coinage (5). This may be due in part to the nature of its initial publication — it was integrated into the catalogue of the de Hirsch collection — and in part to difficulties of the group itself. It suffers from all of the problems, cited above, that a hoard purchased in commerce is likely to face. Despite these defects, IGCH 1185 may be of value in understanding archaic Greek coinage at the end of the sixth century and deserves a reexamination in the light of the progress made in the study of this field over the last 30 years.

Initial Publication

Reference to the hoard can be found in the entry for no. 887 in the catalogue of the collection Lucien de Hirsch (6). It warrants quotation in full:

« Chez Hoffmann le 13 mai 1880 en même temps que les nos. 901-908, trois des quatre numéros 969-971 et 973, 976, 989-991, 1006-1008, 1300, 1304, 1305 ou 1306, 1399, 1516, 1547, 1552 (mis-print for 1551), 1555, 1559, 1579, 1581-1583, 1597, 1599, 1608, 1834, 1837-1840, 1857, 1859-1861 et une drachme de Cyrénaique de 3g91 qui ne fait plus partie de la collection, le tout au prix de 2.500 f. Ces 46 pièces auraient fait partie « d'une trouvaille faite apparemment à Rhodes », sauf probablement les nos. 1547, 1555, 1559, 1599 et 1608 ».

Interestingly, we know from Canon Greenwell's description of the 1887 Delta Hoard, that M. Hoffmann, at least in that case, made an effort to keep a hoard of coins together, although that group, like ours, suffers from intrusions and deserves to be restudied (7).

In IGCH the « collection » is cited as Rhodes, 1880, and on Mørkholm's authority given a burial date of 450. The five pieces Naster considered as probable intrusions are not listed. The IGCH

(5) Not mentioned e.g. in the publication of Asyut, Selinus 1985 or in C. Kraay, Hoards, Small Change and the Origin of Coinage, in JHS, 84, 1964, p. 76-91.
(7) Canon Greenwell, On a Find of Archaic Greek Coins in Egypt, in NC, 111rd s., X 1890, p. 1.
editors while correcting Megara to Thera? did not revise two of Naster’s attributions to Abdera (see below) that had become clear in the years between 1959 and IGCH’s publication in 1973. This, in all likelihood, indicates that a detailed study of the hoard was not undertaken as part of their preparation of the invaluable bibliography.

The «collection» can be divided into three groups:

A. The first consists of 30 archaic Greek coins that arguably come from a single hoard closed before ca. 500. One may never know whether this part represents an entire find or a small portion of a major discovery. It is also conceivable that this group is a parcel that while complete in itself was buried with coins of a later period. Hopefully, what a catalogue will show is that these coins because of consistency in date and grouping of mints are unlikely to have been put together from diverse sources by a collector or dealer prior to de Hirsch’s purchase.

B. The second part consists of intrusions. There is admittedly something arbitrary about the process of identifying such coins. The list proposed here is not in complete agreement with that suggested by Naster. What hopefully gives the selection some merit is that with one exception all of the rejected coins are likely to have been struck more than 50 years after Group A; the exception (no. 31a) is some 30 years later.

C. Group C is reserved for the coins from Cyrenaica which are more problematic (8).

Summary Catalogue

Group A

ABDERA


Obv. Griffin to l.

Rev. Four part incuse square.

Tetradrachm.

(8) The following catalogue is not meant to supersede Naster’s 1959 publication. His descriptions of the individual coins are exacting and deserve consultation. Numbers prefixed by H refer to this original catalogue. In format, for convenience sake, many of the conventions of the Asyut publication have been adopted. In the commentary, numbers highlighted in bold refer to entries in this article. Numbers for coins in other hoards refer to their respective publications listed in the Abbreviations after the hoard’s name.
1 (H1516 attributed to Phocaea) 14.71 Obv. symbol flying bird.
Obv. die of May 9-10.

May was not aware of this coin. May 9a was the only coin of Abdera found in the Ras Shamra Hoard (no. 28). May 10a comes from the Demanhur find (no. 153).

2 (H1006 attributed to Uncertain Thraco-Macedonian) 14.75

The coin is closely related if not linked to May 15-17. May again was not aware of this coin. Four of the five specimens of 15-16 listed by May come again from the Demanhur find (nos. 155-58). May 23 also came from Demanhur, which, according to his publication, belongs to a slightly later group than our no. 2.

DICAEOA


Obv. Head of Heracles r.

Rev. Quadripartite incuse, the surfaces rough and uneven.

Stater.

3 (H887) 9.69 May 7a (this coin).

A coin of the same dies was found in the Demanhur Hoard (no. 3). That hoard also contained two other staters from the mint with the slightly earlier diagonally-divided reverse. Adana, Mit Rahineh and Sakha each contained a single stater of this early type.

THASOS

Obv. Satyr r. holding nymph l.

Rev. Rough quadripartite incuse square.

Stater.

4 (H901) 9.70 Rev. appears to be diagonally divided.

5 (H902) 9.77 Rev. die badly broken but appears similar to no. 4.

6 (H903) 9.40 Rev. divided by cross into four squares.

7 (H904) 9.63

8 (H905) 9.43

9 (H906) 9.69

10 (H907) 9.62

11 (H908) 9.68 Obv. very corroded or struck from worn dies.

It is possible that some die links exist between nos. 6-11, but it is hard to be certain because of worn and broken dies or corrosion.
The one illustrated stater of Thasos from Demanhur of the twelve found (no. 4) is very close in style to coins 6-11 listed above. The diagonal division of the reverse of no. 4 is exceptional and points to the beginning of the series.

«LETE»

(For an attribution to Western Thrace, see KRAAY, ACGC, p. 148).

*Obv.* On l. satyr holding nymph on r. by arm.

*Rev.* Rough incuse square showing signs of diagonal division.

**12** (H969) 9.82 Satyr holds branch in r. hand. The nymph *dextrā* _veretrūm tenet._

**13** (H971) 9.69

**14** (H970) 9.73

These three coins are amongst the earliest strikings of this mint. Stucky in his republication of the Ras Shamra hoard has studied the dies of this series. Our three coins link with examples from both Ras Shamra and Demanhur. Demanhur, however, contained several staters of «Lete» that are clearly later (e.g. nos. 33 and 35) than those found in Ras Shamra or here. On those coins, the satyr grabs at the nymph with not one but two hands and the folds of the nymph's chiton shift from the slightly parallel to fully vertical (cf. ACGC, p. 148). (According to Naster's note on this hoard, quoted above, three of the four coins numbered 969-71, 973 (Plate II, A) belong to the group de Hirsch purchased in 1880. It seems an easy matter to reject H973 which is of a much later type with the larger, bolder figures and a neatly divided quadripartite square. H969-71 are not only from a closely linked group found together in two other hoards, but show a similar state of preservation and surface corrosion lacking in H973. H973 is not properly speaking even an intrusion and should be treated separately). There is a statement in *Asyut*, p. 17, that needs comment: «... only one of the twelve examples (in Ras Shamra) shows the developed, larger, knobby figures (of the later issues)». The authors do not specify the coin, but one can speculate that Ras Shamra no. 16 (Plate V, B) was intended. That is a die duplicate of no. 12 above. It is true that the figures are more corpulent but the care taken with the die, the amount of detail, the positioning of the nymph's hand, the exceptional presence of a branch in the satyr's right hand makes this more likely to
be the earliest coin from the mint in the Ras Shamra hoard not the latest. A coin from this die also appeared in Demanhur (no. 24). Dressel-Regling placed it near the start of the series as does Svorenos in HPM, Plate VII, 6. While the very bold figures on coins like H973 are clearly later strikings, the best indicator of stylistic development in the early stages of the series is the satyr's left arm and the folds of the nymph's chiton. The Ras Shamra coins are all early by this analysis.

MENDE


*Obv.* Ass l., on rump, bird r. Despite numerous die breaks, the letters are M and possibly I is legible between the ass' legs.

*Rev.* Incuse square diagonally divided into four triangles, « in two sections at least, a flower or pomegranate » symbol.

Tetradrachm.

15 (H975) 16.97

Naster did not read the inscription which is clearer on the other known example of these dies — Bourgey 17-19 June 1959, no. 247 (Plate V, C), which despite being clipped and test cut has little wear. No. 15 is a fascinating coin. Naster dates the piece 480-450. With the help of Asyut and other hoards, a considerably earlier date can be supported. The reverse die of this issue is distinct from nearly all of the other coins of this period which have mill sail incuse reverses. The obverse, Naster associated with a tetradrachm in the Pozzi (ex. Rhousopoulos) collection, no. 768. That piece, beautifully preserved, is similar but has the letter M above the ass' back.

The earliest coin in the Mende (Kaliandra) Hoard has the ass l. and the bird l. (Noe 1). All the other coins have the ass r. There is good reason to believe that the ass l., bird r. tetradrachms are even earlier than Noe 1. Asyut contained nine coins associated by the authors with Noe 1. Five coming from five obverse dies (nos. 195-99) are anepigraphic with the ass l. and bird l. Four coins (nos. 200-203) from three dies have the ass l. and the bird r. (as the de Hirsch coin) with the inscription MIN. The ordering in Asyut should probably be reversed 200-203 before 195-99. With this mint, the presence of an inscription, as will be seen below, is less important than
the position of the ass and bird in regard to chronology. Note that Asyut 209-10 are anepigraphic.

In addition, three other Mende tetradrachms appear in an early hoard context. Taranto contained two coins (nos. 22-23) from one obverse die with the ass l. and the bird r., as on our coin, but with the inscription MI to the l. of the ass. The ass on the Taranto coins is «more emaciated» than on the coins found in Asyut and despite the presence of the inscription is believed by Price and Waggoner to have been struck earlier than the Asyut coins (p. 45). This emaciated look is echoed by the de Hirsch coin and the Pozzi example referred to by Naster. A similar specimen is found in the Fayum Hoard (no. 2).

On the basis of the obverse die, the de Hirsch piece should be placed at the very beginning of the mint. The unique reverse reinforces rather than undermines this. The diagonally divided square is seen on many early coins like those of «Lete» and the first two coins of Thasos discussed above. It is likely to have preceded the mill sail reverse. The presence of symbols, which look to us more like flowers than pomegranates, is interesting; one might say experimental, but should not militate against an early date. Given the way the reverse die breaks all but obliterate the symbols, it is easy to see why the technique was abandoned. Die breaks render the symbols undetectable on the Bourgey coin. A similar flower can be found as an obverse symbol on an early ass l. bird r. tetradrachm found today in Copenhagen (SNG Macedonia, no. 198, Plate V, D). One much later tetradrachm, Noe. 17, also has a diagonally divided reverse. It is an isolated issue. Perhaps the die engraver was harking back to our earlier coin. A final note, there is one tetradrachm of Mende which may have been minted well before no. 15. That coin also is in the de Hirsch collection, no. 974 (Plate V, E). It is in bad condition but clearly has the ass l. and bird r. with a rough incuse that looks like the reverse of an early Aeginetan stater. De Hirsch saw a division into twelve sections (9). The reason for an early date in addition to the reverse is that the flan is thick and dumpy not at all like the broad flans of all the other tetradrachms of the mint. Unfortunately, the piece has no hoard context.

(9) L. de Hirsch, Monnaies de Thrace & de Macédoine, in ASFN, 8, 1884, p. 34, no. 5.
NEAPOLIS

Obv. Facing Gorgon's head.
Rev. Four part incuse square.
Stater.

16 (H976) 9.98

There were four similar staters of Neapolis in the Demanhur hoard. Three had a diagonally divided incuse. The fourth had a similar incuse to our coin. The diagonal division, judging by the pattern of other mints and other issues of Neapolis, was the earlier reverse type. The presence of the Demanhur specimen, however, assures that the de Hirsch coin is still an early type. The recently published Pontilivado hoard contains Neapolis staters similar to 16 and staters from Thasos akin to nos. 6-11 along with related fractions. Coins of Neapolis while present in the Sakha, Fayum, Delta (one example each) and Benha (two fragments) are absent from the later Egyptian hoards — Asyut and Zagazig. (See also CH VII, p. 38-39)

STAGEIRA


Obv. Lion to l. on boar to r.
Rev. Quadripartite incuse square.
Tetradrachm.

17 (H989) 17.23  Badly centered, head and legs of boar off flan. Incuse divisions unclear. Large die break. Cahn 9 (this coin).

Obv. Four flowers attached to a central dot rosette; above, boar forepart r.
Rev. Incuse square divided into eight triangles by a cross and diagonals.
Didrachm.

18 (H990) 7.34  Very close to Gaebler 1.

Obv. Boar r. Below a spiraling branch terminating in volutes with two flowers hanging from it.
Rev. Rough quadripartite incuse square.
Didrachm.

19 (H991) 8.44 Obverse die of Gaebler 9.

In *Stagira in Tel Aviv* (p. 50), Cahn supports the traditional attribution of both the didrachm and tetradrachm to the same mint. The authors of *Asyut* (p. 30, no. 45) would remove the didrachms and treat them as uncertain Macedonian. Chronologically, Cahn has the coinage begin with his Period 1 didrachms to which no. 18 belongs. Period 2 consists of the first group of tetradrachms including no. 17 and didrachms as no. 19. Period 2 is stylistically contemporaneous with the earliest tetradrachms of Acanthus that can be found in the Taranto hoard. Coins of Stageira, in addition to the de Hirsch group, appear in both Ras Shamra and Demanhur without, however, any Acanthus coins present. There were four Period 2 didrachms in Ras Shamra. Stucky no. 31 shares its obverse die with our no. 19. Demanhur contained a tetradrachm (Cahn 6) from the same group as no. 17 in addition to nine didrachms — three from Period 1 and five from Period 2. Cahn’s Period 2 didrachms were divided into two groups by Gaebler, B and C. The C didrachms have a prominent boar and a single flower and should come after Group B to which 19 belongs. One of the Ras Shamra didrachms and three of the Demanhur didrachms belong to this later Group C.

UNCERTAIN THRACO-MACEDONIAN

*Obv.* Winged-female in knee-length chiton running r. between two flowers pointing outwards.

*Rev.* Quadripartite incuse square.

Stater.

20 (H1007) 8.58

21 (H1008) 8.53

Stucky has studied this mint, which contained fourteen specimens from five obverse dies, as part of his republication of Ras Shamra. Coins 20 and 21 may share obverse and reverse dies with coins from that hoard and belong in Stucky’s Group A. That Group consists of a linked series of three obverse and six reverse dies that includes three of the six staters found in Demanhur and seven of the fourteen Ras Shamra pieces. One should note that while unimportant to the relative chronological arguments being made, the Group’s linkage is
dependent on an obverse link between Ras Shamra no. 14 and 20 and a reverse link between 20 and 21 discerned by Stucky. The links are difficult to confirm. Stucky is appropriately cautious. No. 20 and Ras Shamra 14 are clearly closely related by the knee length chiton and the flowers which place them at the beginning of the series.

Stucky repeats a misprint found in Svoronos HPM that warrants correction. The coin illustrated in Svoronos HPM pl. 17, 10 is his 32c = H. Weber collection 8544 «(Found at Thasos; from Rhouspoulos, 1897)» not (cf. Stucky) ex Hirsch. Svoronos HPM pl. 17, 9 that Stucky has as «aus Thasos» is the following coin, Hirsch VII pl. IV 184 = Hirsch XXV pl. V 454 = Hirsch XXX pl. XV 477 = HPM p. 136 32d = Demanhur no. 53 = SNGANS 1010 (Demanhur connection not noted). Demanhur no. 54 is unillustrated but said to share the same die.

AEGINA

*Obv.* Turtle.

*Rev.* Union Jack incuse square.

Stater.

22 (H1304) 12.21

The incuse, while somewhat hard to read because of die breaks, is of the Asyut Group II type — Union Jack divided in eight triangles. Hoards containing Aeginetan staters down to Group II include Demanhur, Sakha and Taranto. The publication of the Selinus hoard contains a recent chronological discussion with proposed dates for the series of 525/20-500.

TENOS?


*Obv.* Bunch of grapes.

*Rev.* Irregular incuse square.

Aeginetan stater.

23 (H1399) 12.05 Artemis-Gyselen Class 1a.

This is a unique coin. Trihemiobols exist including two that were found in Taranto (no. 36). A coin was found in Asyut (no. 608) that the authors thought might be related. It has a grape cluster for an obverse and an incuse reverse. The Asyut piece's weight is light at
11.20, however, and its obverse design is less compact. A Tenos attribution for the Asyut no. 608 is rejected by Artemis-Gyselen. The uniqueness of the de Hirsch piece, its style and fabric and the presence of the fractions in Taranto all argue for an early date. Artemis-Gyselen suggested a date before 515-500 feeling that the coin was stylistically older than the hemidrachms.

THERA


*Obv.* Dolphin l. over dolphin r.

*Rev.* Union Jack incuse reverse.

Aeginetan stater.

24 (H1300. attributed to Megara) 11.90 Large die breaks on rev.

The de Hirsch piece, presumably because of its attribution, was not included in Boutin’s catalogue of 44 coins of the series. Given the condition of no. 24 it is hard to make meaningful die comparisons. The presence of single comparable specimens in Taranto and Matala provide a terminus ante quem for the issue. How early the issue could be is a matter of some conjecture based upon one’s interpretation of the Cyclades 1889 and Santorini 1821 hoards. Those finds contained nine and 23 specimens respectively of our issue. If one were only working from the illustrated examples of the Cyclades hoard, one could put a date on it well into the sixth century (before 525). There are some very early coins in that hoard. The problem is accounting for the unillustrated Aeginetan specimens which cannot have been of such an early date if they survived in the marketplace (See Asyut, p. 17 for discussion). With the Santorini hoard, the same is true only our information is worse. Borrell recorded but did not illustrate 541 Aeginetan coins. If these turtles entered the collections of the time and were not somehow lost or melted down, it is hard to believe that the hoard was buried much before 500 because there is no way to account for 541 coins from the earlier periods of the Aeginetan mint.

COS

Naster considered this a possible intrusion and it is not listed in IGCH but its presence is perfectly consistent with other mixed archaic hoards. Mit Rahineh, Demanhur and the Delta hoard each had a single Cos fraction. In style and possibly die, the de Hirsch coin is most similar to Demanhur no. 113. Only a discobolos triple siglos is recorded for Asyut (p. 94), but there was a rumor of a crab fraction being present. Barkay has recently published a coin from this series found in a controlled excavation in Jerusalem. The context is seventh century to beginning of fifth century B.C., with most of the small finds dating from the sixth century. The coin's obverse is exceedingly close to ours and its reverse is similar but shows traces of a diagonal division. Its weight is the identical 1.76. In publishing the coin, Barkay collected other known specimens of this series from hoards and "standard numismatic publications". Unfortunately, Barkay missed the de Hirsch coin, presumably because of its absence from ICGH. If she had found it, she may have been less perplexed by the weight of the Jerusalem specimen which, as the highest of the eleven other coins examined (the next being 1.67), was viewed as an "enigma". Surely, now that Barron has demonstrated that the diskoboloi are triple siglos, one should assume that the crabs are thirds based on either the 5.6 siglos used by the discoboloi which renders a theoretical weight of 1.86 or the earlier 5.4 siglos implying a 1.8 weight, rather than heavy Aeginetan trihemibols or light diobols. Once a Persic standard is accepted for the fractions, one need be less hesitant in accepting them as early coins of Cos (see Barkay p. 2).

IALYSOS

Obv. Winged boar forepart l.
Rev. Bird head l.; in upper l. corner, double volute within dotted incuse square.

Third stater.

(10) Presumably this indication of context supersedes the pre-publication report in H. Cahn, Stagira in Tel Aviv, op. cit., p. 45.
Ialysos fractions have been found in two other hoards Demanhur (no. 114) and Sakha (no. 9). Both appear to be die duplicates with this piece. The staters only first appear in Asyut.

**PHASELIS**

*Obvo.* Galley r. in shape of boar forepart; in exergue, fish.

*Rev.* Incuse square. Sign of test trench.

Persic stater.

**27 (H1579) 10.69**

Same obverse and maybe reverse die as *SNGvAulock* 4391 which is much better preserved and worth comparing (Plate V, F).

A Phaselis stater in poor condition was found in the Demanhur deposit (no. 116). While Asyut contained eleven staters, the dies of the de Hirsch specimen were not represented. Certain features of the de Hirsch coin, such as the ear pointing straight up rather than being angled, the general attention to detail and the lack of a linear design on the reverse point to it being an early issue in the series.

**LYCIA: UNCERTAIN DYNASTS**

*Obv.* Boar forepart r.

*Rev.* Irregular incuse square.

Stater.

**28 (H1581) 9.04**

**29 (H1582) 9.09**

Shallow test trench on obv.

These coins have been placed at the very start of the Lycian series cf. *BMC Lycia*, no. 1. The seven Lycian coins from Demanhur were not of this type and probably struck later. Asyut had one similar coin (no. 743) in its 30 Lycian coin contingent. The authors considered it the earliest Lycian coin in the hoard.

*Obv.* Boar forepart l.

*Rev.* Incuse square filled in triangles protruding on three sides, on fourth an open triangle.

Stater.

**30 (H1583) 8.90**

Symbol in the interior of the open triangle: Ψ

This coin is very similar to BMC no. 8 and to a stater found in Demanhur (no. 117).
Before discussing intrusions, it should be noted that all 30 coins catalogued above share a common appearance. The coins all suffer from surface corrosion and show a degree of porosity. The collective weak appearance does not seem to have been caused by long circulation. Surprising details are visible such as the dots on the Aeginetan stater's turtle shell despite its high relief. On condition alone, one could argue that these coins were stored together or at least subjected to the same harsh cleaning (1).  

**Group B: Intrusions**

**AEGINA**

*Obv.* T-back turtle.  
*Rev.* Large skew.  

**31a (H1305) 11.86**

The introduction of the large skew staters post dates the Aeginetan component of the Asyut deposit. The authors suggest that the large skew group begins "after 480". The series is likely to have continued to 457 or even later. Cf. *SNG France, Delepierre*, 1758 ff.  

*Obv.* Tortoise.  
*Rev.* Large skew.  

**31b (H1306) 11.85**

Coins of this type are customarily dated without much foundation to 457-431 (cf. *Kraay, ACGC*, p. 47). In any event no. 31b is no earlier than no. 31a. According to this catalogue, only one of these two staters came with the collection. If one had to choose, no. 31a appears a much better candidate on the basis of metal surface. Naster did not consider both intrusive.

**RHODES**

*Obv.* Three quarter facing head of Helios.  
*Rev.* Rose.  

Attic hemidrachm.  

**32 (H1555) 1.85** As *BMC Caria*, p. 230 no. 2.  

**33 (H1559) 1.93** As *BMC*, no. 3.  

(1) See Dressel's account of the Sakha hoard for an interesting account of the dangers faced by hoard coins in cleaning. Cf. note 1.
Naster considered these as intrusions. They certainly do not date before the foundation of Rhodes in 408.

**SOLOI**

*Obv.* Amazon kneeling.  
*Rev.* Bunch of grapes. **σολεων.**  
Stater.

**34** (H1597) 10.25 Cf. *SNG Switzerland, Levante, 40.*


**TARSUS**

*Obv.* Persic horsemen r.  
*Rev.* Hoplite nude kneeling r.  
Persic tetrobol.

**35** (H1599) 3.20

Unlike 34, Naster considered this an intrusion. Perhaps because it is a fraction. He dated it to about 475. Kraay would place this issue after 420 (See entry to no. 34).

*Obv.* Bust of Athena facing.  
*Rev.* Baaltars seated.  
Persic stater.

**36** (H1608) 10.50 Cf. *SNG Switzerland, Levante, 116.*

Dates to time of Alexander the Great. Naster viewed it as an intrusion.

Chronology rather than surface condition has been the methodology employed for determining intrusions. While subjective, condition can also be cited for at least some of the specimens. Nos. 31b, 33 and 36 have much better silver than Group A. Other coins including those from Cyrene show a similar surface condition to Group A. A common cleaning rather than a common discovery may account for this. The coins from Cyrene, however, present special chronological and contextual problems.
Group C: CYRENAICA

CYRENE

*Obv.* Silphium plant.
*Rev.* Gazelle l.; in field l. silphium plant, above it K; another K beneath gazelle, above gazelle, fruit.

Attic Tetradrachm.

37 (H1834) 16.81 **BMC, Cyren.,** p. xxiv, 15b (this coin, dated «not earlier than 500»).

*Obv.* Silphium plant.
*Rev.* KVPA Head of Ammon r. Circular dotted border framed between two thin solid circular lines.

Attic Tetradrachms.

38 (H1837) 16.92 Cf. **BMC, no. 42** (dated ca. 480-435)

39 (H1838) 16.41 As above. *Obv.* double struck.

*Obv.* Silphium plant.
*Rev.* KYPA Female head (Cyrene) r. Incuse square.

Asiatic Drachm.

40 (H1839) 3.17 **BMC, p. xxxvii, 46a** (this coin, dated ca. 480-435).

41 (H1840) 3.09

BARCE

*Obv.* Two fruits set base to base.
*Rev.* BAP above. Ram’s head r. in incuse square.

Asiatic Drachm.

42 (H1857) 3.37 **BMC, p. clxvii, 2b** (this coin, dated 480’s).

BARCE AND TEUCHIRA

*Obv.* Silphium plant; below on l. and r., T E.
*Rev.* Head of Ammon r. in front T, [B]AR[K] in four corners of the incuse square.

Attic tetradrachm.

43 (H1859) 16.66 **BMC, p. clxxxvi, 50a** (this coin, dated after 450)
EUHESPERIDES

Obv. Silphium plant.
Rev. E V Dolphin to l. slanting up. Gazelle's foreleg to r. slanting down. Incuse square.
Asiatic drachm.

44 (H1860) 2.88 Obverse legend [E]S. BMC cxc, 1c (this coin, dated ca. 480).
Rev. Dolphin to r. crab claw to l. EY above. Circular incuse.
Asiatic drachm.

45 (H1861) 2.63 BMC cxc, 1d (this coin, dated ca. 480).

Looking at the nine coins from Cyrene with dates (based on the BM catalogue) ranging from roughly 500 to after 450, the easiest and perhaps correct approach is to view the whole of Group C as distinct from Group A. Two likely possibilities follow.

If one accepts the find spot of Rhodes that Hoffmann passed on to de Hirsch, then we are probably dealing with two hoards. Group A is typical of the early archaic hoards found in both Egypt and the Levant. The movement of such coins in this period despite the exceptional Taranto hoard was to the East and Egypt, not away from it. Somehow Group A never made the full passage and got stranded in Rhodes. The Cyrenaic coins are far less likely to have journeyed to Rhodes. Only five other coins from Cyrene are known to have been found outside of Africa in the archaic and classical period: two in Taranto, two in IGCH 1252 (buried ca. 430) and a coin from Barce in the Malayer hoard from Iran (IGCH 1790, buried ca. 375). One can imagine a find of Cyrenaic coins from Egypt or Libya being mingled with the group discovered in Rhodes prior to the coins ever having reached Hoffmann.

Alternatively, we could reject the purported find spot and speculate that what we have is one or two Egyptian hoards. It is easy to envision how a Rhodian find spot got assigned the coins once the intrusions from Group B got mixed in including the late Rhodian hemidrachm easily identifiable as among the latest issues in the «collection». O. Picard in listing the hoards containing early Thasian coins already has raised the following speculation «pourrait bien provenir lui aussi d'Égypte» (12). In reading the history of the

Sakha find, we can see how hoards became mixed. It is an interesting coincidence that the two Cyrene tetradrachms in Sakha (nos. 45 and 46), of the same type as nos. 38 and 39 above, which were introduced into the hoard in Egypt are now considered as intrusions (Asyut, p. 18). We know by luck from Dattari's letter to Dressel that the Cyrene coins came to him in a later package of six coins but we do not know what they were with. The other four coins in that lot have presumably been integrated into the hoard. In fact, the 65 coins recorded by Dressel as belonging to Sakha were purchased by Dattari in Cairo in no less than four lots all from the same purported find. An all Egyptian two-find hypothesis is certainly a possibility for IGCH 1185.

One could also try to construct a single-hoard-from-Egypt hypothesis. In its favor is the condition of the nine coins from Cyrenaica. They show a similar corrosion/porosity to the Group A coins. The coins from Cyrenaica could simply be a later parcel.

Before speculating further, we should examine more closely the dates given above for the Cyrenaic coins because, as will become clear, the chronology is not completely straightforward. In his BM catalogue, Robinson established the following sequence: earliest were coins without true reverse types (570-525), followed by uninscribed coins with reverse types, then inscribed coins with reverse types. Inscriptions have chronological implications because their introduction probably corresponds with the establishment of Barce as separate mint from Cyrene (ACGC, p. 297). The Asiatic drachms (fifths of tetradrachms), as 40-42, 44, and 45 above, Robinson viewed as being a later feature of the mint introduced after 525 (cf. BM, p. cc.lxi). Price and Waggoner (Asyut, p. 114) would start the coinage only in 510 at the beginning of the reign of Battus IV. Their arguments are in part based upon an overstrike of an uninscribed tetradrachm with reverse type on an Athens tetradrachm they would date to 490. (Asyut Group IV = Seltman M and G. Kraay read the undertype as Asyut II = Seltman H. See Asyut, p. 65 with note 90). Mit Rahineh contained two of the earliest tetradrachms without reverse types (nos. 15-16). Taranto nos. 44-45 are also tetradrachms without reverse types. This evidence can be construed as consistent with the late starting date for the region argued in Asyut. Two fractions, however, were found in Demanhur (nos. 139-40). One, no. 139, an inscribed Asiatic drachm from Barce (cited in Asyut, note 224), is provocative. Robinson included this
coin in his catalogue (no. 2a, p. CLXVII), which was completed prior to Demanhur's publication and makes no reference to its hoard provenance. He dates it to the 480's.

On page cxc, Robinson makes the following statement: "The rest (Euhesperides 1 a-d) form a homogeneous group which may be compared with nos. 46-47 of Cyrene and nos. 2a-4a of Barce." On this basis our nos. 40-42, 44 and 45 are stylistically and chronologically comparable with Demanhur no. 139. No. 37, the tetradrachm with the single letter inscription, Robinson would place at the start of the inscribed tetradrachms, certainly earlier than the Asiatic drachms with fuller inscriptions.

Demanhur is dated in Asyut to ca. 500. It is unusual in not being known for intrusions, though as it was recorded out of situ, that certainly is a possibility for no. 139. However, if the coin is allowed to stand and Robinson's reasonable view is accepted that the uninscribed tetradrachms preceded the inscribed tetradrachms and inscribed Asiatic drachms, then the chronological argument presented in Asyut no longer follows. The Cyrene tetradrachm must have been overstruck on the Athenian owl well before 500. In fact, the Cyrene coin becomes more important as a terminus ante quem to the Athens series than the Athenian coin is as a terminus post quem to Cyrene. If the Athens undertype is indeed a Seltman type M or G rather than, as Kraay thought, type H, then the low chronology given for Athens in Asyut would collapse. In addition, the Cyrene parcel in Asyut would go from being minted near the closing of the hoard to being a parcel that closed substantially earlier than the final burial date. All this may be asking too much of the Demanhur fraction. Perhaps the fractions developed faster than Robinson thought. Hopefully what this puzzle shows is that we are often on tenuous footing in extracting too exact a chronology from these early hoards.

Returning to IGCH 1185, we have shown, at least, that six of the nine coins are compatible with Demanhur. The three remaining tetradrachms, 38, 39 and 43, are all closely related in style to each other and presumably were struck close in date to each other. We see no reason why the alliance coin 43 need be much later than the two Cyrene pieces. Robinson's absolute dates (see entries above) are based on comparative stylistic analyses with other mints and need not be definitive. On a relative basis, Robinson places the Cyrene fraction, as no. 40 above, contemporary with or just slightly earlier
than his Period II, Group I tetradrachms, which immediately pre­ced the Group II tetradrachms to which nos. 38 and 39 belong (BMC, p. xxxiii-xxxiv). If the Cyrenaic contingent was minted at the same time as or just a little later than Group A, IGCH 1185 could well be a single Egyptian hoard rather than two separate deposits.

It should be stressed, however, that tetradrachms like 38 and 39 do not appear in Asyut. All the coins there are clearly earlier — nothing with a circular border or a reverse inscription. Sakha, as mentioned above, has two similar coins but they did not come with the two main packages and hence may well be intrusions. Zagazig, which has many similarities to Asyut, contains only one coin of Cyrene (no. 249), an uninscribed tetradrachm with a reverse type (cf. Asyut no. 819). One wonders, why despite its later date Zagazig also has no inscribed coins if the Demanhur fraction was already minted prior to 500. In the end, it is hard to reconcile the Barce fraction in Demanhur with the coins in Asyut. The Barce coin must either be later than the bulk of Demanhur or the Cyrenaic coins in Asyut cannot be amongst the latest groups in that hoard. It would be nice to have more evidence.

Conclusion

The questions and possibilities surrounding Group C do not in any way affect the integrity of Group A. In conclusion, we should assess that group’s significance. What follows on the chart is a summary analysis of Group A in relation to other early hoards. To make it more useful a crude attempt has been made to attribute relative sequences to the deposits mint-by-mint. Letters are used — A being the earliest. The same letter is used when the contents of two or more hoards are contemporary. The justification for the respective sequences can be found in the Catalogue with bibliography given above. For the Sakha hoard, we have used the contents as given by Asyut (p. 14-15), which includes Cyrene but excludes several likely intrusions.

Several observations emerge from this chart. The overlap both in contents and chronology with Ras Shamra, Sakha and Demanhur is striking. With the exception of a coin from an uncertain issue and five staters of Salamis, all of the mints in Ras Shamra can be found in IGCH 1185. The overlap, as we have seen, extends even to dies.
**IGCH 1185** has a later Abdera tetradrachm but the Stageira and the uncertain Winged-figure series extend further in Ras Shamra. The date of the two deposits must be close.

Of the fifteen mints found in Group A, twelve are also found in Demanhur. Missing from Demanhur is Mende, Tenos and Thera. **IGCH 1185** for its part does not contain coins from mainland Greece, Ionia, and Cyprus areas represented in the larger Demanhur hoard with its 165 coins. Athens is notably absent from both. The Brussels group may represent a slightly earlier deposit. Demanhur contains later examples from some of the northern mints — notably Abdera, «Leto» and Stageira. The presence of the two early Cycladic tetradrachms from Tenos and Thera and the absence of drachms from Paros also argue for **IGCH 1185**'s primacy: The two tetradrachms are not found in later hoards while Paros was actively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Sk</th>
<th>De</th>
<th>Se</th>
<th>Ta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABDERA</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>3C</td>
<td>7D</td>
<td>1D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICAEA</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THASOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8A?</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>12B</td>
<td>11B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LETE</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>12A</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>17B</td>
<td>18C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENDE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAPOLIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGEIRA</td>
<td>didr.</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>9C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tetra.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unc. Winged-running female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14B</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>6B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEGINA</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>16A</td>
<td>81B</td>
<td>16A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENOS</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2fr.B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THERA</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IALYSOS</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASELIS</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYCIA</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>7C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group C**

| CYRENE | fractions | 5B | 1A | 2B |
| | tetradrachms | 2A | 3C | (2)C | 2B |
minting drachms in the first part of the fifth century judging by Asyut (nos. 602-607). This argument is not, of course, conclusive. There was an early Paros didrachm and one drachm in the Sakha find. That hoard is also very close to our group and arguably, once the intrusions are removed, a little earlier than Demanhur. The Mit Rahineh deposit is contemporary or just slightly earlier. The overlap is not so extensive. At the extremes, the small ten coin Adana hoard published by Robinson in 1973 seems to have consistently earlier coins. Taranto, in its non-Western group, while containing some similar coins, has pieces that are clearly later like the large, knobby figured "Lete" staters. IGCH 1185 has only two coins, a Lycian stater and the Phaselis stater, that show signs of a test trench. Nor are any coins chopped. In this it is again similar to Demanhur and Sakha and quite distinct from later hoards like Benha and Asyut.
Given the small size and history of Group A, we can never be completely confident in our conclusions. At best, we can only hope that our judgements are logical. If a date is required, no later than ca. 500 for closure seems reasonable. About Ras Shamra which has an archaeological context, Stucky writes the following: «es besteht somit kein Anlass, die Vergrabung des Hortes vor etwa 510/500 v. Chr. zu datieren». As mentioned earlier, the Asyut authors would close Demanhur ca. 500.

The de Hirsch group, despite its problems, deserves a place in comparative tables of early hoards. At a minimum, it is no more suspect than the better known Sakha find. IGCH 1185 provides the earliest context for the coinage of Thasos, Mende and Tenos. When it is studied in conjunction with Mit Rahineh, Ras Shamra, Sakha and Demanhur, a fuller picture of Greek coinage circulating in the decades before 500 B.C. emerges than when it is ignored (13).

Photographs

Plate I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>(H1516)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>(H902)</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>(H906)</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>(H971)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(H1006)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(H903)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(H907)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(H970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(H887)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(H904)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(H908)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(H901)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(H905)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(H969)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plate II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15</th>
<th>(H975)</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>(H990)</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>(H1008)</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>(H1300)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>(H976)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(H991)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(H1304)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(H1547)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>(H989)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(H1007)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(H1399)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plate III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26</th>
<th>(H1551)</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>(H1582)</th>
<th>31b</th>
<th>(H1306)</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>(H1597)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>(H1579)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(H1583)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(H1555)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(H1599)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>(H1581)</td>
<td>31a</td>
<td>(H1305)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(H1559)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(H1608)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plate IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>37</th>
<th>(H1834)</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>(H1839)</th>
<th>43</th>
<th>(H1859)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>(H1837)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>(H1840)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(H1860)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>(H1838)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>(H1857)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>(H1861)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plate V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>(H973)</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SNG Cop. Macedonia no. 198</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Ras Shamra no. 16</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>(H974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bourgey 17-19 June 1959, no. 247</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>SNGvAulock 4391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(13) The author wishes to thank the following for their help and comments: Fr. de Callatay, Chr. Howgego, Prof. P. Naster, Prof. T. Hackens, S. Fried and J. Spier.
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