

# Asyut (IGCH 1644) additions : Cyrenaica and "Chalcis"

Autor(en): **Van Alfen, Peter G.**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau = Revue suisse de numismatique = Rivista svizzera di numismatica**

Band (Jahr): **88 (2009)**

PDF erstellt am: **17.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-179777>

## **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

## **Haftungsausschluss**

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

---

PETER G. VAN ALFEN

ASYUT (IGCH 1644) ADDITIONS:  
CYRENAICA AND “CHALCIS”

PLATE 11

One project left uncompleted at the time of Silvia Mani Hurter's death was the study of a group of coins that had surfaced in Zurich around 2006. Silvia had been able to obtain photographs of the 89 coins and few fragments and immediately recognized the lot as coming from the Asyut hoard (IGCH 1644)<sup>1</sup>, over half of which had already been recorded in PRICE/WAGGONER 1975, while 39 were “new” coins which Price and Waggoner had not seen. As exciting as the discovery of 39 new coins from Asyut obviously was, it was made even more so by several rarities and mints not previously known from Asyut. It was Silvia's plan to present a selection of the more noteworthy coins at the International Numismatic Congress in Glasgow. Shortly before she died, the entire group of 89 coins was donated to the American Numismatic Society (accession numbers 2008.39.1-89). While a full publication of the 39 new Asyut coins will appear in the *American Journal of Numismatics*, I offer in the meantime a discussion of two coins that Silvia had selected to present in Glasgow.

The first coin is as follows:

1. AR, tetradrachm, 17.25 g (ANS 2008.39.76) (*Pl. 11, 1*)  
*Obv.*: Lotus-like plant feature above second object obscured by deep cut.  
*Rev.*: Shallow rectangular incuses, some of which overlap.

Silvia attributed this coin to Cyrenaica, which must be correct. The lotus-like feature is almost certainly a representation of some part of the silphion plant, most likely the juncture of the leaves and stem. The umbels that normally appear on the ends of the stem and leaves in representations of silphion on other coins from Cyrenaica are missing in this representation, although it may be that they are off-flan. Even though it is mostly obliterated by the cut, the second object on the obverse is almost certainly the silphion fruit, heart-shaped with a distinctive outline in its representation on other coins. The outline is clear on our example, and one can make out the cleft of the heart below the cut.

Price and Waggoner recorded 42 coins from Cyrene and Barce in the Asyut hoard<sup>2</sup>, many of which were die-linked, and most of which have developed reverse types such as the head of Ammon, the Gorgoneion, or the silphion fruit with dolphins. Five of the coins recorded by Price and Waggoner have simple incuse reverses<sup>3</sup>, but these rough squares share no similarity with the shallow

<sup>1</sup> I am most grateful to Wolfgang Fischer-Bossert, Jonathan Kagan, Ute Wartenberg Kagan, Andrew Meadows, and Kenneth Sheedy for comments on earlier drafts or in conversation. None, of course, should be held accountable for the views expressed here.

<sup>2</sup> PRICE/WAGGONER 1975, pp. 111–114, nos. 818–859.

<sup>3</sup> PRICE/WAGGONER 1975, nos. 836, 856–859.

rectangles of our coin. Likewise, the depiction of the silphion plant and fruit on our coin has no parallels among the other Asyut coins, which tend to show the entire plant with additional features, like lion heads or silphion fruits, in the fields around. No direct parallels for this coin can be found elsewhere, although BABELON 1907, no. 1974, a fragment of a tetradrachm from the Mit Rahineh hoard (IGCH 1636), has perhaps a similar silphion fruit in the lower field on the obverse, which may have been surmounted, as on our coin, by a depiction of the silphion plant itself, although this portion of the Mit Rahineh coin is missing (see *CH* II, p. 2, fig. 15). A number of Cyrenaican tetradrachms have parallel rectangular incuse reverses, but none that appear as shallow as on our coin<sup>4</sup>. Commentators like Babelon and Robinson have placed the coins with this type of reverse at the beginning of the Cyrenaican series, which is most likely where our coin belongs. Unique as this coin is, it does not change the overall picture of Cyrenaican coins from the Asyut hoard.

The second new coin is the second known of this type:

2. AR tetradrachm (?), 12.78 g (ANS 2008.39.77) (*Pl. 11, 2*)  
*Obv.*: Diademed beardless head to l.  
*Rev.*: Frontal quadriga within shallow incuse square

Although very worn, the other example (*Pl. 11, 3*), now in the BM, is still better preserved than the ANS coin and shows the complete obverse type of (fe)male head to l. This is partially obliterated by a deep gouge on the obverse of the ANS coin, which no doubt accounts for its lower weight (12.78 g) compared to the BM specimen (15.69 g). The BM obtained their example from the Hermann Weber collection in the 1920s. Although that coin was reportedly found near Chalcis<sup>5</sup>, Weber himself argued for an attribution to Olynthus<sup>6</sup>, an attribution challenged by Hill, who preferred a mint in Euboea<sup>7</sup>. Weber's attribution was supported by Head<sup>8</sup> and Forrer<sup>9</sup>. Babelon remained uncommitted<sup>10</sup>, while Seltman entered the dispute suggesting a mint in the Thracian Chersonesus<sup>11</sup>. Gaebler's attribution to Chalcis has been accepted<sup>12</sup>, although Chantraine expressed serious reservations a couple of decades after Gaebler wrote<sup>13</sup>. With the appearance of the second example of the type, it is worth revisiting the arguments for the attributions.

<sup>4</sup> See, for example, BABELON 1907, nos. 1973–1977; E.S.G. ROBINSON, *Catalogue of the Greek coins of Cyrenaica in the British Museum* (London, 1927), pl. 1, nos. 1–4; N. WAGGONER, *Early Greek coins from the collection of Jonathan P. Rosen, ACNAC 5* (New York, 1983), nos. 758–759.

<sup>5</sup> GAEBLER 1925b, p. 194.

<sup>6</sup> WEBER 1892.

<sup>7</sup> HILL 1897; HILL 1920.

<sup>8</sup> HEAD 1890, p. 328; HN<sup>2</sup>, p. 208.

<sup>9</sup> FORRER 1924, p. 25.

<sup>10</sup> BABELON 1907, p. 1249.

<sup>11</sup> SELTMAN 1924, pp. 137–139.

<sup>12</sup> GAEBLER 1925a; GAEBLER 1925b; WALLACE 1962, p. 36; ACGC, p. 89.

<sup>13</sup> CHANTRAINE 1958a.



The attribution of the coin began, in fact, with another coin, published in 1883 by E. Muret:

- A. AR, Tetrobol, 2.45 g (*Pl. 11, 4*)  
*Obv.*: Frontal horse with rider.  
*Rev.*: Rough incuse square<sup>14</sup>.

Following both Muret and Sambon, Wroth suggested that this tetrobol, which had been found in Histiaia, and an octobol acquired by the British Museum (B), were Euboean, based on the find spot and weights<sup>15</sup>.

- B. AR, Octobol, 5.56 g (*Pl. 11, 5*)  
*Obv.*: Rider on frontal horse leading another frontal horse without rider; the whole on a round shield.  
*Rev.*: Rough incuse square, diagonally divided into four parts<sup>16</sup>.

Barclay Head, on the other hand, had a different view<sup>17</sup>. Supposing that the frontal quadriga and horseman types were agonistic, with reference specifically to the Olympian games, he felt the coins were more aligned with the later types of Olynthus showing horses in competition<sup>18</sup>. Weber continued to steer attention to Olynthus as the mint for these two types of coins, an attribution that was based partly on the assumption that the head on the obverse of no. 2 (above) was that of Apollo, who appeared on the obverses of the later coinage

<sup>14</sup> BABELON 1907, no. 1833. A second example of this type, now in the BM and weighing 2.80 g, was acquired from the Weber collection. See WEBER 1892, p. 190, no. 11, and FORRER 1924, p. 25, no. 1899. Both coins appear to be from the same dies although the flan on the Weber example is broader.

<sup>15</sup> MURET 1883; SAMBON 1889; WROTH 1890.

<sup>16</sup> Two examples of this type are now in the BM, both from the same dies. The first, weighing 5.56 g, was acquired in 1889 (WROTH 1890, p. 328). The second, weighing 5.60 g, was acquired from Weber; see SAMBON 1899, lot 833, who attributed the coin to Chalcis; WEBER 1892, p. 189, no. 10; FORRER 1924, p. 25, no. 1898. A third example, also of the same dies, appeared in the BCD Euboeia sale (Lanz 111, 2002, lot 113) weighing 5.67 g.

<sup>17</sup> WROTH 1890, p. 328 notes that: "Mr. Head, partly on account of the weight (the third of an Euboic tetradrachm), is inclined to attribute our coin to Olynthus, in the Macedonian Chalcidice."

<sup>18</sup> The full catalogue of Head's Olynthian types is found in HN<sup>2</sup> (p. 208), which include quadriga types (in profile) that now appear to be from the River Strymon area, not Olynthus (see CAHN 1979; C.C. LORBER, Weight standards of Thracian toreutics and Thraco-Macedonian coins, RBN 154, 2008, p. 4), and the horse cantering horse/eagle types, some with the inscription XALK in Euboean letters (see S. PSOMA, Olynthe et les Chalcidiens de Thrace: Études de numismatique et d'histoire [Stuttgart, 2001], pp. 253–261). Included among Head's Olynthian types was one having a quadriga in profile on the obverse, and an incuse square reverse divided into eight or more triangular compartments; the fabric and style of the two known examples (16.94 g and 16.78 g) are different from those quadriga coins of the Strymon area. When the BM acquired one example (16.94 g), HILL 1922, pp. 166–167 could not decide between Olynthus or Chalcis for the attribution; see also HEAD 1878. JENKINS 1989, p. 40 at no. 505, on the other hand, in discussing the example in the Gulbenkian collection (16.78 g) sided firmly with Chalcis.

of the Chalcidian league<sup>19</sup>. Weber also added to the repertoire of “Olynthus” with two new types:

- C. AR, Tetradrachm, 16.76 g. (*Pl. 11, 6*)  
*Obv.*: Frontal quadriga with linear border around  
*Rev.*: Incuse square with four deep triangular spaces separated by four level triangular spaces<sup>20</sup>.
- D. AR, Tetrobol, 2.80 g (*Pl. 11, 7*)  
*Obv.*: Rider facing with legs almost at right angles from the body of rider and horse. Horse’s head to r.  
*Rev.*: Incuse square, diagonally divided into four parts<sup>21</sup>.

In addition, Weber brought into consideration a fifth coin, not in his collection, but in that of Allier de Hauteroche, which has a related obverse, but a significantly different reverse:

- E. *Obv.*: Horse standing facing with man at its side, also facing. (*Pl. 11, 8*)  
*Rev.*: Bird (eagle?) flying l., in shallow incuse square<sup>22</sup>.

Again, the frontal horse corresponds to those on the other coins, but the eagle (?) was a type found on the later coinage of Olynthus<sup>23</sup>.

Seltman’s arguments for attributing the coins to the Thracian Chersonesus were far more tenuous<sup>24</sup>. Like Head, he felt the frontal quadriga on no. 2 (above) was a racing rig, but he argued that the type was meant to commemorate Miltiades’s chariot victory at Olympia<sup>25</sup>. It was the next ruler of the Chersonesus, Miltiades’s nephew Stesagoras, who minted the coin placing Miltiades’s portrait in profile, as oikist of the Chersonesus, on the obverse. To further strengthen his contention of an Athenian connection to this frontal horse/quadriga coinage, Seltman drew parallels between the frontal quadriga on the tetradrachms (nos. 2 and C) and those appearing in Attic black figure vase painting. Seltman’s attribution has mostly been ignored; indeed Gaebler called it “abwegig und unhaltbar”<sup>26</sup>.

<sup>19</sup> WEBER 1892, p. 191.

<sup>20</sup> This coin is now in the BM; see HN<sup>2</sup>, p. 208; BABELON 1907, no. 1250; FORRER 1924, no. 1897.

<sup>21</sup> This coin is now in the BM. A second example was in the 1920 Pozzi sale (lot 743) weighing 2.82 g.

<sup>22</sup> This coin is now missing and has no recorded weight. On this account, GAEBLER 1925b, p. 200 dismisses it as evidence.

<sup>23</sup> E.g., HN<sup>2</sup>, p. 185.

<sup>24</sup> SELTMAN 1924, pp. 137–139.

<sup>25</sup> HDT. 6.36.1.

<sup>26</sup> GAEBLER 1925a, p. 2. In an unpublished ANS Summer Seminar paper from 2005 entitled “The Philaid Coinage of the Thracian Chersonesus,” Sarah Bolmarcich soundly dismisses any lingering notions that this coinage was a product of Miltiades and his successors.



Hill felt that the similarities in fabric and incuse style between the late sixth century Gorgoneia of Athens and that of our coin, and the seemingly shared use of the Attic-Euboic weight standard, justified bringing all of the frontal horse/quadrige issues closer to Athens, and (re)assigned them to Euboea<sup>27</sup>. Hill, of course, was writing at a time when a number of scholars believed the Gorgoneia should be assigned to Euboea anyway<sup>28</sup>; it was Seltman who proved their Athenian attribution<sup>29</sup>.

Gaebler’s strenuously argued attribution to Chalcis, however, is the one that has been taken most seriously<sup>30</sup>. Agreeing with Hill that the tetradrachm (no. 2 above) and Gorgoneia were coeval and co-regional, he adopted Seltman’s then fresh arguments for the Athenian origins of the Wappenmünzen and Gorgoneia in order to write a parallel history of Euboean coinage, which was partly dependent on the notion that as close neighbors and sometime enemies, the Athenians and Euboeans would keep close tabs on each other’s monetary developments. Thus the earliest coinage of Euboea, here nos. A–D, like the Wappenmünzen of Athens, had thick(er) flans and square incuse or mill-sail reverses. As Athens shifted to its new fabric and double-sided types with the Gorgoneia, so did Eretria with its new cow/sepia series, and Chalcis, first with a short lived series represented by no. 2 (above), which presumably continued the frontal horseman-quadrige motif of the earlier incuse coinage, and then with the considerably larger eagle/wheel series. The initiation of this new double-sided coinage in Chalcis (and Eretria) also coincided with a change in denominational structure: the “original” Chalcidian structure of tridrachms (or staters of c. 17.20 g), drachms (or octobols of c. 5.60 g), and hemidrachms (or tetrobols of c. 2.80 g), as witnessed by nos. A–D (above), was replaced by one that paralleled the Athenian structure of tetradrachms (17.20 g), drachms (4.30 g), and obols (0.70 g).

Although the eagle, as Zeus’s bird, of the eagle/wheel coinage of Chalcis is explained by the presence of a Temple of Zeus in the polis<sup>31</sup>, Gaebler struggled to establish the significance of the frontal quadrige in Chalcis, which was assumed to be the mint because that was the findspot of the BM’s example of the head/quadrige coin. Dropping all notions of agonistic chariots, Gaebler argued that we are to understand Hera as the one holding the reins to the steeds as she goes forth in her wedding car<sup>32</sup>. His case was built upon: a mention of a cult to Hera

<sup>27</sup> HILL 1897; HILL 1922.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. BABELON 1907, pp. 675–679.

<sup>29</sup> SELTMAN 1924. Ch. FLAMENT, *Le monnayage en argent d’Athènes: de l’époque archaïque à l’époque hellénistique (c. 550- c. 40 av. J.-C.)* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 2007), pp. 21–23 has recently suggested a Euboean, or joint Euboean-Athenian, origin for the wheel series of Wappenmünzen, a provocative, but as yet unproven contention that harkens back to the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup>-c. arguments concerning the origins of the Wappenmünzen and Gorgoneia. Kenneth Sheedy’s Early Athens Project promises to resolve some of these issues; cf. G. DAVIS / K. SHEEDY, Seltman, the Wappenmünzen, and the early owls: a new research project in Athenian coinage. *ANS Magazine* 8.3, 2009, pp. 47–50.

<sup>30</sup> GAEBLER 1925a; GAEBLER 1925b.

<sup>31</sup> *IGI*<sup>3</sup> 40.35, 61–62.

<sup>32</sup> GAEBLER 1925a.

Henioche near Lebadeia on the mainland across the channel from Chalcis<sup>33</sup>; a Hellenistic issue of Chalcis depicting “Hera” on the obverse and “Hera” in a quadriga on the reverse<sup>34</sup>; a Chalcidian Roman provincial issue of Marcus Aurelius with a seated Hera on the reverse<sup>35</sup>; and one of the frontal quadriga metopes from Temple C at Selinus, which he understood also to represent Hera in her wedding car<sup>36</sup>. In addition, Gaebler argued that the head on the obverse of no. 2 is not male, but female and thus could be either Hera, the nymph Euboea, or the nymph Chalcis<sup>37</sup>.

Gliding over Chantraine’s reservations about Chalcis as the mint, which focused on chronological inconsistencies in Gaebler, Wallace ignored Gaebler’s arguments concerning Hera, but reaffirmed both the Chalcidian attribution and the parallel tracks of Athenian-Euboean coinage development<sup>38</sup>.

Gaebler’s now long-since accepted attribution is problematic, however. The strength of the argument, as Hill noted before him, lies in the Euboean find spot of a few of the coins and the similarities in fabric with Athenian Wappenmünzen and Gorgoneia. His arguments linking a bride Hera to Chalcis are weak at best, nor does Gaebler address how the other frontal-horsemen coins fit into the wedding program, or why there would need to be a dramatic and sudden shift in the iconographic program, as would have to have happened in his schema, from the head/quadriga type to the eagle/wheel types. Unlike neighboring Eretria, which had a cult to Hera and a month named after her, there is no textual or archaeological evidence for a strong and specific archaic or classical association between Hera and Chalcis<sup>39</sup>. The numismatic evidence from the Hellenistic and Roman periods marshaled by Gaebler suggests a long-standing link, but of this we cannot be sure, or even be certain that it is Hera that appears on the pre-

<sup>33</sup> PAUS. IX.39.5.

<sup>34</sup> PICARD 1979, pl. XIX, nos. 56–57.

<sup>35</sup> *RPC* online temp. no. 7480.

<sup>36</sup> Gaebler has remained alone in seeing Hera in this metope; Apollo is the favored deity; see MARCONI 2007, p. 177. ERHART 1979, appendix 3 notes that the wedding procession interpretation for frontal quadrigae, championed by Gaebler, has largely fallen out of favor.

<sup>37</sup> GAEBLER 1925b, p. 195.

<sup>38</sup> CHANTRAINE 1958b; WALLACE 1962.

<sup>39</sup> A sixth century BC inscription from Eretria (*IG* XII, 9, 1273–1274) mentions the payment of monetary fines to Hera; see F. CAIRNS, *Chremata dokima: IG* XII, 9, 1273 and 1274 and the early coinage of Eretria, *ZPE* 54, 1984, pp. 145–55; ID., The “laws of Eretria” (*IG* XII, 9, 1273 and 1274): epigraphic, legal, historical, and political aspects, *Phoenix* 45.4, 1991, pp. 296–313; WALKER 2004; pp. 193–194. For an overview of the evidence for Euboean cultic practices see K. REBER, M.H. HANSEN, P. DUCREY, Euboea, in: M.H. HANSEN, T.H. NIELSEN (eds.), *An inventory of archaic and classical poleis* (Oxford, 2004), pp. 643–663, who discuss a sanctuary to Zeus and another to Athena in Chalcis, but not one to Hera. The entire island of Euboea was, of course, sacred to Hera, and the island’s highest peak, Mt. Dirphys, had a sanctuary to her, but again this was not exclusively Chalcidian; see WALKER 2004, p. 150.



Roman issues<sup>40</sup>. Despite the problems linking Hera to Chalcis specifically, the shift in iconography to eagle/wheel may, of course, have indicated the presumed change in denominational structure, but there are as yet no subdivisions of the head/quadrige type to show that even with the introduction of the two-sided coinage, which itself may have been the signal of monetary change, the old structure persisted. Much has been made of the parallels between this “older” system and that used in the earliest coinages of Chalcis’s colonies in the west (Himera, Naxos, and Zancle), which initiated their coinages in the later sixth century on a similar system of thirds, centered on a drachm of c. 5.70 g<sup>41</sup>; Chalcis, it has been suggested, was the model they followed, presumably because there were continued close social and economic ties between the metropolis and her *apoikoi*<sup>42</sup>. The first coinages of Himera, Naxos, and Zancle, however, were double-sided, following perhaps the Athenian-Euboean model<sup>43</sup>; indeed the earliest coins of Himera share the same type of fabric and shallow square incuse as the Athenian Gorgoneia, Eretrian cow/sepia coins, and Chalcidian eagle/wheel issues. If the international ties remained so strong, we might wonder why the western colonies adopted the most modern fabric and style for their initial coinage, but retained the now outmoded denominational system. Equally, we might also wonder why any Euboean city, if it was following monetary developments in Athens so closely, would adopt a tripartite system when Athens did not, but soon thereafter take up the Athenian system anyway.

Gaebler’s attribution to Chalcis, in other words, raises more questions than it answers. Even so, more recent studies of Macedonian and Thracian coinage have not made the northern Aegean any more probable as the location for the mint(s) of the frontal horsemen-quadrige coins. Time has continued to scatter to other mints and regions the group of coins Head attributed to Olynthus<sup>44</sup>, including those with quadrigae. Cahn’s doubts, for example, about attributing the early quadrige (in profile)/eagle types to a pre-*andrapodismos* (479 BC), Bottiaian Olynthus seem to have been confirmed by more examples found in the River Strymon area (cf. n. 6)<sup>45</sup>. With Olynthus taken out as a possible mint for the quadrige group, few other poleis in the region stand out as strong contenders despite the popularity of horses and chariots, square incuses, and the Euboic weight standard in some of the early coinage of Macedonia and the Chalcidike.

<sup>40</sup> Despite PICARD’s (1979, p. 91) claim (“...est très certainement Héra”) there is no certainty at all that any one of the females that appear on the Hellenistic coinage of Chalcis is Hera, rather than the nymph Chalcis, for example (cf. BABELON 1946, p. 9). Like Gaebler’s, Picard’s arguments have an element of circularity, using the archaic coinage, which presumably depicted Hera, to argue for her appearance on the Hellenistic types and vice versa. Both side step the fact that it is only centuries later, with the appearance of the coin under Marcus Aurelius, that an unequivocal association between Hera and Chalcis can be established numismatically or otherwise. But this Hera, with her name inscribed, is seated upon a stone that could well represent Mt. Dirphys, again a general Euboean and not specifically Chalcidian association; see BABELON 1946.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. ROBINSON 1947, p. 14; ACGC, p. 89.

<sup>42</sup> ACGC, p. 89.

<sup>43</sup> ACGC, pp. 206–207.

<sup>44</sup> HN<sup>2</sup>, p. 208.

<sup>45</sup> CAHN 1979; cf. above, n. 18.



Indeed, Kagan's "bovine curiosities"<sup>46</sup>, not to mention the Eretrian-inspired cow/sepia coinage of Dikaia, underscore not only the economic and cultural links between Euboea and the north, but also the great difficulty, in some cases, of distinguishing one region's archaic coinage from the other's.

Leaving the fabric and findspot issues aside for the moment, some headway in the problem might be made by considering the most unusual feature of the coins in question: the dramatic frontal representation of horses, horsemen, and quadrigae. As Gaebler rightly noted, a link between the frontal quadriga on the coins and those appearing in other media can be established. In the sixth century particularly the image appeared with great frequency in vase paintings, on shield bands, and in sculpture. Some of the earliest examples of frontal quadrigae in vase paintings and on shield bands originated from Corinth and the Peloponnese; by the early sixth century, however, Athens was increasingly becoming the major producer of this imagery in other media as well<sup>47</sup>. Large sculptural frontal quadrigae were found on the east pediment of the archaic temple at Delphi (c. 515 BC), depicting Apollo making an epiphany in his chariot, and possibly on the west pediment as well, depicting Zeus making war against the Giants from his chariot<sup>48</sup>. Through its Alkmaionid sponsors, the design and construction of the east pediment was directly connected with Athens<sup>49</sup>. Closer to home, the east pediment of the Old Athena Temple (c. 515 BC) on the Athenian acropolis probably had a frontal quadriga group, with Zeus or Athena as the charioteer descending into battle with the Giants<sup>50</sup>. Archaic Athenian artists

<sup>46</sup> KAGAN 1988.

<sup>47</sup> The basic study of frontal quadriga imagery is G. HAFNER, *Viergespanne in Vorderansicht* (Berlin, 1938). Of the 130 archaic vase painting images he was able to collect for study, five are Corinthian, five Chalcidian, and 120 Athenian. J.D. BEAZLEY, *The development of Attic black-figure* (Berkeley, 1951), p. 43 notes that while the image may have originated in Corinth, it was already used by the Gorgon painter in Athens c. 590 BC. MARCONI 2007, p. 104 suggests that frontal quadrigae appearing in Peloponnesian shield bands and Athenian vase painting, both of which were exported to Sicily, provided the model for the frontal chariots that appear in the metopes of Temple C at Selinus.

<sup>48</sup> While the frontal quadriga group of the east pediment is undisputed, that of the west pediment remains only a possibility due to the fragmented nature of the evidence; see MARSZAL 1998, p. 174. For the date of the Alkmaionid temple see HDT. 5.62; W. CHILDS, *Herodotos, Archaic chronology, and the Temple of Apollo at Delphi*. *JdI* 108, 1993, pp. 399–441.

<sup>49</sup> J. BARRINGER, *Art, myth, and ritual in classical Greece* (Cambridge/New York, 2008), chp. 4, discusses in detail the strong Athenian connections in the development of the east pediment of the late archaic temple and of the fourth century temple that replaced it.

<sup>50</sup> M.B. MOORE, *The central group in the Gigantomachy of the Old Athena Temple on the acropolis*. *AJA* 99.4, 1995, pp. 633–639 argues that it is Zeus who drives the chariot, while MARSZAL 1998 argues it is Athena. For the date of the temple see W. CHILDS, *The date of the Old Temple of Athena on the Athenian Acropolis*, in: W.D.E. COULSON ET AL. (eds.), *The archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 1–6. We should not forget the connection between an epiphany of Athena in a chariot and Peisistratian politics: Herodotos (1.60) tells us that, after he was driven out of Athens, Peisistratos was escorted back into the city by a statuesque local girl dressed up as Athena Promachos mounted in a chariot. For an analysis of this episode and chariot procession



were experimenting with the depiction of frontal poses for horses and riders in other sculpture also, suggesting that this form had a particular resonance within Attica<sup>51</sup>. In numismatic art, Athenian die cutters famously depicted horse protomes and hindquarters<sup>52</sup>, but more accomplished images of horses also appeared, such as the didrachm depicting a three-quarter view of a standing horse that immediately brings to mind the artistic sophistication of the frontal horsemen-quadriga coinage<sup>53</sup>. In short, no other archaic community besides Athens appears to have produced such an abundance of frontal horse-quadriga imagery in as many different media. On this basis alone, Athens should be considered the mint for the new ANS coin (no. 2) and the other related coinage (nos. A–D).

But there are, of course, problems with this attribution as well. On the iconographic side, the presentation of frontal quadriga imagery tends, in vase painting, to be militaristic, with the driver and heroic warrior setting off for battle with arms and armor. In sculpture it tends to be epiphanic, with the god(s) making a dramatic appearance in battle or among worshippers<sup>54</sup>. Significantly, frontal quadrigae in these media do not depict competition, as is so often the case with the depiction of quadrigae in profile found on many archaic and classical coins, like those from Sicily<sup>55</sup>. If frontal quadrigae were associated in viewers' minds with heroic military endeavors or divine epiphanies, we should expect the same to be the case with our coins. There is great temptation to see in these frontal quadriga coins an allusion to the east pediment group of the Old Athena Temple (or of the temple at Delphi), all of which it would seem are roughly coeval, but this is complicated by the relationship of the quadriga image on the tetradrachms to the frontal horsemen coins. If the frontal quadriga-horsemen coinage was programmatic, as the presumed iconographic relationship has long implied, in so far as it was meant to depict a related group of actors or events, then the fact that the horsemen coins appear militaristic confounds a divine interpretation of the quadriga: few gods are ever depicted on horseback, unlike heroes and contemporary cavalymen. Indeed, outside of agonistic or heroic (rather than divine) military contexts, there are few places in archaic imagery where single horses and chariots are found together. Additional interpretative clues about the program might be offered by the head on the obverse of no. 2, but the

scenes in black figure Attic vases see R.H. SINOS, *Divine selection: epiphany and politics in archaic Greece*, in: C. DOUGHERTY, L. KURKE (eds.), *Cultural poetics in archaic Greece: cult, performance, politics* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 73–91. A numismatic commemoration of this event, viz. no. 2, is, however, unlikely as an Athenian attribution of this coin is highly problematic as discussed further below.

<sup>51</sup> M.A. EAVERTLY, *Archaic Greek equestrian sculpture* (Ann Arbor, 1995), pp. 33–34, who discusses the evidence in detail, argues that this “type of statue filled a need specific and unique to this area” (sc. Attica).

<sup>52</sup> E.g., ACGC, pl. 9, nos. 163–164; 167.

<sup>53</sup> ACGC, pl. 9, no. 166.

<sup>54</sup> See MARCONI 2007, p. 193; R.R. HOLLOWAY, *Early Greek architectural decoration as functional art*. *AJA* 92.2, 1988, p. 183; ERHART 1979, appendix 3.

<sup>55</sup> If there was a formal semiotic difference between frontal quadrigae and profile quadrigae, the tetradrachm noted above with a profile quadriga (n. 6), which has long been thought to be part of the horsemen-quadriga series, must then stand apart.



diadem, curls, and bun in archaic art can belong equally to males or females, actual individuals or divinities. Seltman's desire to see this head as the earliest numismatic portrait of a living individual (Miltiades) cannot be resurrected without difficulty, but the search for an appropriate divinity in an Athenian context without martial attributes, like a helmet or aegis, is equally challenging. Although, like the Wappenmünzen imagery, it may be possible to divorce the frontal horsemen/quadriga types from any specific Athenian civic reference, and thus resolve some of the issues noted here, nevertheless the figure depicted on the obverse of the new ANS coin must have had some significance for the community as a whole. The identity of that figure remains key to any attribution.

Further problems with an Athenian attribution lie in the denominational structure of the quadriga-horsemen coins and the weight of the two head/quadriga coins. To date, there is no evidence, besides perhaps these coins, that archaic Athens produced octobols (e.g., no. B) and tetrobols (e.g., nos. A, D), denominations that were more in demand at the time in the northern Aegean and in Sicily. Also, the low weights of the BM's example of the head/quadriga coin (15.69 g) and the (damaged) ANS coin (12.78 g) raises the disturbing possibility that these two coins may not in fact be on the Attic-Euboic standard at all, and thus perhaps not related to the other horsemen-quadriga coins. However, without additional, better preserved examples of the type to provide further insight into the weight standard, we can, like most other commentators, take refuge in the similarities between these coins and the Athenian Gorgoneia and assume congruence not only in fabric, but also weight standard.

In conclusion, while we must seriously question Gaebler's attribution to Chalcis, no readily apparent alternative besides Athens seems likely, which also presents a litany of problems. Without additional evidence, it is at this point most prudent to conclude that these coins were minted within an Attic-Euboic context, perhaps, as the findspots may indicate, within Euboea itself, but where exactly we do not know. Such a conclusion does not alter the overall picture of Asyut since both Athenian and Euboic coins were already known from the hoard. Twenty years ago, Jonathan Kagan remarked: "It may be significant that Asyut contained a one-sided coin of Carystus and also an eagle/wheel coin of Chalcis but no specimens of the earlier quadriga types."<sup>56</sup> Even with, now, the presence of a quadriga type in the Asyut hoard, its significance has yet to be determined.

<sup>56</sup> KAGAN 1988, p. 39.

*Abstract*

The American Numismatic Society recently acquired 39 unpublished coins from the archaic Asyut hoard (IGCH 1644). Two of the more enigmatic coins from this lot are presented here, the first of which is almost certainly an issue of Cyrenaica. The second coin poses greater problems. The only other known example was attributed to Chalcis in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, an attribution which is here examined, and ultimately rejected.

*Zusammenfassung*

Die American Numismatic Society konnte kürzlich 39 unpublizierte Münzen aus dem archaischen Fund von Asyut (IGCH 1644) erwerben. Der Beitrag stellt zwei problematische Münzen aus dieser Gruppe vor: einerseits eine Prägung, die mit grösster Wahrscheinlichkeit aus der Kyrenaika stammt. Andererseits eine Münze, von der bisher nur ein Exemplar bekannt war, das im frühen 20. Jahrhundert Chalkis zugewiesen wurde – wohl zu Unrecht, wie die Untersuchung zeigt.

Peter van Alfen  
American Numismatic Society  
75 Varick Street  
New York, NY 10013  
USA  
vanalfen@numismatics.org



*Bibliography*

- BABELON 1907 E. BABELON, *Traité des monnaies grecques et romaines*, Part II, vol. II. (Paris).
- BABELON 1946 J. BABELON, *Héra et Chalcis*, RN 9, pp. 1–6.
- CAHN 1979 H.A. CAHN, “Olynthus” and Syracuse. In: O. MØRKHOLM / N.M. WAGGONER (eds.), *Greek numismatics and archaeology: essays in honor of Margaret Thompson*, pp. 47–52 (Wetteren).
- CHANTRAINE 1958a H. CHANTRAINE, *Zur Münzprägung von Chalkis im 6./5. Jahrhundert*, JNG 9, pp. 7–17.
- CHANTRAINE 1958b H. CHANTRAINE, *Literaturüberblicke der griechischen Numismatik: Euboea*, JNG 9, pp. 23–56.
- CHILDS 1994 W. CHILDS, *The date of the Old Temple of Athena on the Athenian Acropolis*. In: W.D.E. COULSON ET AL. (eds.), *The archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy*, pp. 1–6 (Oxford).
- ERHART 1979 K.P. ERHART, *The development of the facing head motif on Greek coins and its relation to classical art* (New York).
- FORRER 1924 L. FORRER, *The Weber collection*. 3 vols. (London).
- GAEBLER 1925a H. GAEBLER, *Zur Deutung der selinuntischen Metope mit dem Viergespann in Vorderansicht*, JdI 40, pp. 1–7
- GAEBLER 1925b H. GAEBLER, *Zur Münzkunde Makedoniens*, ZfN 35, pp. 193–216.
- HEAD 1878 B.V. HEAD, *On an unpublished archaic tetradrachm of Olynthus*, NC 18, pp. 85–89.
- HN<sup>2</sup> B.V. HEAD, *Historia Numorum*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Oxford, 1911).
- HILL 1897 G.F. HILL, *Notes on additions to the Greek coins in the British Museum, 1887–1896*, JHS 17, pp. 78–91.
- HILL 1922 G.F. HILL, *Greek coins acquired by the British Museum*, NC 5<sup>th</sup> series, 2, pp. 149–175.
- JENKINS / CASTRO HIPÓLITO 1989 G.K. JENKINS/M. CASTRO HIPÓLITO (eds.), *A catalogue of the Calouste Gulbenkian collection of Greek coins*. Pt. 2 (Lisbon).
- KAGAN 1988 J. KAGAN, *Some archaic bovine curiosities*, ANSMN 33, pp. 37–44.
- MARCONI 2007 C. MARCONI, *Temple decoration and cultural identity in the archaic Greek world* (Cambridge).
- MARSZAL 1998 J.R. MARSZAL, *An epiphany for Athena: the eastern pediment of the Old Athena Temple at Athens*. In: K.J. HARTSWICK / M.C. STURGEON (eds.), *Stephanos: Studies in honor of Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway*, pp. 173–178 (Philadelphia).
- MURET 1883 E. MURET, *Monnaies rares ou inédites du cabinet de France*, RN 1, pp. 64–69.
- PICARD 1979 O. PICARD, *Chalcis et la Confédération Eubéenne: étude de numismatique et d’histoire (IV<sup>e</sup>–I<sup>er</sup> siècle)* (Athens).

- PRICE / M. PRICE / N. WAGGONER, *Archaic Greek coinage: the Asyut hoard* (London).
- WAGGONER 1975
- ROBINSON 1947 E.S.G. ROBINSON, *Region, Zankle-Messana, and the Samians*, *JHS* 67, pp. 13–20.
- SAMBON 1889 S. SAMBON, *Catalogue d'une précieuse collection de médailles grecques*, 26 March 1889 (Milan).
- SELTMAN 1924 C. SELTMAN, *Athens: its history and coinage before the Persian invasion* (Cambridge).
- WALKER 2004 K.G. WALKER, *Archaic Eretria: a political and social history from the earliest times to 490 BC* (London/New York).
- WALLACE 1962 W.P. WALLACE, *The early coinages of Athens and Euboa*, *NC* 2, pp. 23–42.
- WEBER 1892 H. WEBER, *On some unpublished or rare Greek coins in my collection*, *NC* 3<sup>rd</sup> series 12, pp. 185–208.
- WROTH 1890 W. WROTH, *Greek coins acquired by the British Museum in 1889*, *NC* 3<sup>rd</sup> series, 10, pp. 311–329.







Peter G. van Alfen  
Asyut (IGCH1644) additions: Cyrenaica and "Chalcis"



