The Damareteion Reconsidered*

R. T. Williams

1972

[See Plate 1]

1. **Boehringer**[2] in his monumental work on early Syracusan coinage classified and dated the issues as follows:

B. Group 1	530–510 B.C.	Archaic issues. Kraay, pl. iii, 2.
2	510–485	First dolphins. Kraay, pl. iii, 5.
3	485–479	Massive issues. Sections 6–11, 12*a*–*e* (12*e* = Damareteion issues). Kraay, pl. iii, 4–5 and 1.
	479–474	No coinage.
4	474–450	Sea-serpent issues. Kraay, pl. iv, 1.
5–6	450–435	Olive symbol, etc.
	435–425	No coinage.
Tudeer[3] **I**	425–412	Signed engravers.

2. However, it seemed to many numismatists that there were still problems, in particular the two coinless intervals which Boehringer created between 479 and 474 and between 435 and 425. The latter was due, to some extent, to the quality of research at this juncture where Tudeer had begun and Boehringer finished: the reason for the former interval was because, on the one hand, Boehringer believed that his section 12*e* of group 3, which contained the early decadrachms, was the last section of the massive issues, and that the decadrachm was the Damareteion, struck immediately after Himera in 480.[4] On the other hand, he associated the appearance of the sea-serpent in the exergue of group 4 issues with the naval battle between Hiero and the Etruscans off Cumae in 474. These were the corner-stones of his chronology and a very substantial one seemed at least the equation of the early decadrachm with the Damareteion,[5] secured both by historical reference and style. However, as there are neither historical nor stylistic reasons for these intervals, certainly not for the 479–474 interval when many postulate a glut of coinage resulting from the coining of the Carthaginian indemnity, on any reconstruction of the issues these gaps must be closed.

*A form of this article was given as a paper at the Joint Conference of the Greek and Roman Societies at Cambridge, July 1971. The paper aimed at refuting in particular Kraay's downdating of the Damareteion in his *Greek Coins and History* (here abbreviated to Kraay). I am grateful to the B.M. Dept. of Coins and Medals for facilities for photographing his coin, Pl. 1*d*, to Mrs. S. Hurter for Pl. 1*e*; to Dr. H. A. Cahn for allowing me to reproduce in Pl. 1 the coin no. 105 from the MMAG Niggeler Catalogue of 1965.

[2]E. Boehringer, *Die Münzen von Syrakus* (1929.) B = Boehringer.

[3]*Die Tetradrachmenprägung von Syrakus in der Periode signierenden Künstler* (1913).

[4]Diodorus xi, 26, 3.1

[5]But of course he was not the first to suggest it: see Schwabacher, *Das Damareteion* (1958). That the sea-serpent commemorates Cumae is not so secure.

3. The later gap between 435 and 425 may be closed summarily by extending the end of the sea-serpent group from 450 to 440 and running groups 5–6 from 440 to 425.[6] But it will be the earlier break of 479–474 that will be of more immediate relevance to the present topic. Several numismatists have suggested adjustments to the end of group 3 to bring that down to 474 without destroying the connection between the decadrachms and the Damareteion and Himera. Of these the most recent known to me and the most cogent is that of G. K. Jenkins in his monograph on the coinage of Gela.[7] He extends the end of group 3 right down to 474, but excludes the Damareteion section, 12*e*, and throws it back to the period immediately after Himera. For this section is not die-linked to the other sections and is quite alien to them in style, except for one Artemis head, R. 276, which is die-linked to the Damareteion section and comes late in that section, but whose nearest stylistic relations belong earlier: R. 201 of 12*a* [Pl. 1**b**] and R. 244 of 12*d* [Pl. 1**c**] clearly come from the same hand as R. 276 [Pl. 1**a**]. There is no reason, therefore why the Damareteion section should be placed right at the end of section 12 and the massive issues, but it could be inserted at the end of section 11.

4. However, in the meantime C. M. Kraay and C. Boehringer[8] have rejected the connection both of the early decadrachm with the Damareteion and also of group 4 and its sea-serpent with the battle of Cumae. Kraay's main objection, as I understand it, to E. Boehringer's chronology is that there is far too much coinage, over 140 obverse dies, for the short period of 485–479 (group 3) at a time when in his opinion there was little need for it; and hoard evidence, he maintains, shows that these massive issues with the decadrachm come later. The hoards he adduces are the following:

   Gela 1956[9]

5. The latest datable coin (Jenkins, *Gela*, pl. 36, 1) which provides a *terminus post quem*, is the Zankle-Messana piece with the initial A in front of the prow, dated probably c. 493,[10] as it was in good condition, a date of c. 490–485 for the hoard seems reasonable at the moment. The latest Syracusan is B. 46, which on Boehringer's dating is c. 490. Kraay dates the burial of the hoard to 484. Although this date may well not be wrong, the arguments which he used to substantiate it may be criticized. They are based on the coinage of Leontini, of which there was not one coin in the hoard. That is not strictly true, as Kraay points out: only about 80 per cent of the original hoard was recovered, but the authorities were so energetic that they managed to extract a coin of Leontini from someone or other, which Jenkins asserts could hardly have been in the hoard.[11] However, Leontini fell to Gela in the 490s: Gelon of Gela took over Syracuse, according to the traditional chronology, in 485. Kraay's premise is that the coinage of Leontini was inspired by Syracuse and that a Syracusan-inspired coinage at Leontini is only intelligible *after* 485. With this in mind he sets about bringing together as closely as possible the latest Syracusan coins in the Gela hoard with the initial coinage of Leontini.

[6] Jenkins, *Gela* 60 f., closes the interval less summarily.

[7] 23 f.

[8] Kraay, *Greek Coins and History*, ch. 3, 'The Damareteion and Sicilian Chronology', Christof Boehringer, *JNG* 1968, 67 ff.

[9] Jenkins 20 ff.; Kraay 27 f.

[10] Robinson, *JHS* 1946, 14.

[11] Kraay 27 n. 3; Jenkins, 151, footnote.

6. He starts (p. 27) 'the group of Syracusan coins immediately following those which are in the hoard (B. 46) made use of an obverse die borrowed from Leontini'. Borrowing there certainly was,[12] but hardly immediately after. The Syracusan reverse die which was coupled with the Leontini obverse was Boehringer's R. 42. This was used with Syracusan obverses at B. 63, which could be said to be immediately after B. 46, also at B. 117 and B. 118. It developed a flaw during its life and Boehringer showed[13] that the flaw was worst at 118, but worst of all when coupled with the Leontini die and in this final phase the legend was recut. How long after B. 118 R. 42 was brought back into use is uncertain, but one could hardly say that it was immediately after B. 46. However, Kraay concludes that the mint of Leontini was already at work immediately after the date of the burial of the Gela hoard.

7. He then takes a step further—'since Leontini's coinage was modelled on that type of Syracusan coinage, of which there are only three dies in the hoard, it cannot have started much earlier than the burial of the hoard. In fact we must conclude that the coinage of Leontini started at about the time that the Gela hoard was buried'. Now if one recalls Kraay's premise that it is only after 485 that a coinage inspired by Syracuse is intelligible at Leontini, one may find difficulty in disagreeing when he says that the highest date for the hoard is 485 or more probably 484. But there seems to be another flaw in his argument. Everything is based on the assumption that the latest Syracusan coin in the hoard must be as late as the burial date of the hoard. In point of fact the odds are against the Syracusan coins being as late, because the hoard was laid down, and probably saved, at Gela, which in the crucial years of 490–485, on the traditional chronology, was not in the same sphere of influence as Syracuse. One cannot postulate that a hoarder at Gela must have in his hoard Syracusan coins from the latest dies.

8. But Kraay's reason for squeezing us into 484 is clear: he is now able to assert (p. 28) 'the really massive issues are not yet under way', which for him should be appearing if Boehringer's chronology is right. Yet even if this hoard is to be dated as late as 485 or 484, it must be emphasized that it does not follow automatically that the latest Syracusan coins must also be of this date.

   Passo di Piazza[14]

9. In this hoard, again found a few miles from Gela, the latest datable coin is a Messenian didrachm with the mule-car obverse (Kraay, pl. iv, 4), which is thought to commemorate the Olympian victory of Anaxilas of Rhegium in the mule-car event, struck either after 484 or 480. The latter seems more likely since these coins were struck on the Attic-Syracusan standard instead of the previous Chalcidian standard and the change seems more likely, as Robinson pointed out,[15] on the occasion of the *rapprochement* between Anaxilas and the Syracusans immediately after Himera than in 484 when he was ranged on the Carthaginian side. The latest Syracusan coin is B. 85, on Boehringer's dating struck soon after 485. Kraay dates the hoard to 484 or 480. The date of 484 of course presents no problems for Syracusan chronology: if it is to be dated c. 480 or later, a discrepancy of only four years is insufficient to warrant the assumption that the Syracusan coins are dated too early. Again one cannot

[12] See Kraay, pl. iv, 2–3; *SNG* v, 1913 and 1776.
[13] Catalogue 117.
[14] Jenkins 21 f.; Kraay 28.
[15] Op. cit. 17.

postulate that because a hoard was laid down near Gela in 480 the latest Syracusan coins in the hoard must have been struck in the same year. Nor is it necessary to invoke the defence that the Messenian didrachm, which provides the date for the hoard, is one of those interlopes extracted by an over-energetic gendarmerie.

Mazzarino[16]

10. This hoard buried north of Gela has for its latest datable coins the didrachms of Himera with the usual cock on the obverse, but a crab on the reverse (Kraay, pl. iv, 5–6), which must have been struck within the decade 482–472, when Theron of Acragas, whose type the crab was, had Himera under his control. The latest Syracusan is B. 118; on Boehringer's chronology, coming up to 480. Kraay dates the hoard to 475 and again notes the discrepancy between his date of the hoard and the latest Syracusan. But if the adjustment which was outline at the beginning is made to Boehringer's chronology, the extension of section 12, to which B. 118 belongs, down to 474, then on this occasion the date of the hoard does coincide exactly with the latest Syracusan.

Villabate[17]

11. Here the latest coin is that of Rhegium (lion/seated oecist) dated by Herzfelder to c. 450.[18] The latest Syracusan is B. 535 in the sea-serpent group; on Boehringer's dating, c. 459. An apparent discrepancy here, but when allowance is made for the closing of the ten-year interval, 435–425, this Syracusan coin may be brought down to the late 450s, where it coincides with the date of the Rhegium coin and allows a date in the 440s for the burial of the hoard—buried in north Sicily, again some considerable distance from Syracuse.

Seltmann hoard[19]

12. Kraay adduces as evidence a hoard of coins shown to E. J. Seltmann in north Sicily in 1890: some of these coins Seltman bought and of these he illustrated some. He was, as Kraay says, a practised numismatist, but he was shown the hoard a generation before the publication of Boehringer's monograph and such a person might well in the field have failed to recognize an early tetradrachm of the sea-serpent group if the sea-serpent happened to be off the flan, as frequently it is. The latest coins which Seltmann mentioned are the Himera tetradrachms which may be dated to the 460s: the Syracusan coins in the hoard he says were all Gelonian (485–478). Kraay argues that a hoard of this date (465) would be expected to show at least some examples of the sea-serpent group, and that it does not indicates that the preceding group of Syracusan coins, the massive issues of group 3, must come down to the late 460s (p. 34). Now if all the relevant hoards showed a similar discrepancy to the Seltmann hoard, then the Seltmann hoard might be used as confirmatory evidence; but they do not, so that the Seltmann hoard, unsatisfactorily published as it was, should not be used to bring down the date of the end of group 3 from 474 to the late 460s.

13. Jenkins has asked an interesting question, which he has kindly allowed me to repeat, may the Seltmann hoard have been part of the Villabate hoard? Time and place are close. In this case, the Seltmann hoard would cease to be a problem.

[16] Jenkins 22 ff.; Kraay 31; Noe 667 and 188. For the site see Jenkins 154.
[17] Noe 1161; Jenkins 66 ff.; Kraay 35; Evans, *NC* 1894, 291 ff.
[18] *Les Monnaies d'argent de Rhegion* 51, pl. 1, 5.
[19] ZfN 1895, 165 ff.; Jenkins 159; Kraay 32.



14. A more formidable piece of ammunition Kraay uses is an overstrike; a Syracusan coin, B. 517, was overstruck upon an Apollo tetradrachm of Catana (his pl. v; here Pl. 1**a**). Of the two Catana groups of coins, the bull/nike series and the Apollo series, Kraay believes that the former began in 461, lasted about five years at least, and was then followed by the Apollo issues from c. 456, which must be the *terminus post quem* for the overstrike, for this Apollo is about the first in this issue [Pl. 1**f**].[20] But Boehringer's date for the Syracusan B. 517 would be c. 460. There seems to be a discrepancy here, but, as in the Villabate hoard, when the readjustment is made to allow for the closing of the ten-year interval between 435 and 425, the Syracusan coin can be brought down to the late 450s, which is on the right side of Kraay's *terminus post quem*. Kraay's date of the 40s for the overstrike seems far too late, because both pairs of dies, the Syracusan and the Catanaean, are very close in style, and if the Catana coin was struck c. 456, the Syracusan must follow very soon after [cf. Pl. 1**e** and **f**].

15. Kraay's dating of the two Catana series, bull/nike and Apollo, has been accepted above, but there are other arrangements of the coinage. Cahn[21] believes that the bull/Nike series belongs to before 476, that is before the original Catanaeans were ejected by Hiero, and that the Apollo series was instituted on their return in the late 460s, which would then be the *terminus post quem* for the overstrike. The same terminus would be given by the arrangement of Herzfelder[22] who believed that both series ran concurrently from the late 460s. Both these theories would give more elbow-room for the overstrike.

16. Kraay's interpretation of the hoard and overstrike evidence led him to redate the Syracusan issues as follows. He downdates the archaic issues (group 1) to 520–500. Then come a coinless gap of fifteen years—surprising in view of the good condition of the archaic issues in the Gela hoard. The earliest dolphins he allots to 485–480. Then a gold Damareteion, which has not survived, is postulated. The massive issues of group 3 are spread over eighteen years from 479 to 461. The decadrachms belong to c. 461. The sea-serpent issues he places after 461. Now to test some of the repercussions of these new dates on the burial dates of the hoards.

17. Gela, 1956, which Kraay dated to 484, contained Syracusan coins in excellent condition down to late in the group of the earliest dolphins, for which his date is near 480. Thus the hoard will have to be downdated to 480 at least: Syracuse will be the latest in the hoard: there will be no coins in Gela until Gelon has left for Syracuse.[23]

18. For the Passo di Piazza Kraay's lower date is 480. The latest Syracusan, B. 85, well down in the massive issues, on his dating will be c. 475. Again the hoard will have to be downdated and again Syracuse will be the latest in the hoard.

19. The real crunch comes in the Mazzarino hoard, which Kraay had dated to 475. The latest Syracusan coins in this are associated with the decadrachm, which he dates to 461. The date of the hoard will have to be brought down to the late sixties: Jenkins's Gela Group II will have to be downdated a decade: and the latest Syracusan will be a decade or more later than the latest dated coins in the hoard, the Himera crabs, 482–472.

[20] I am grateful to Mrs. S. Hurter for this information.

[21] *Knidos* 161.

[22] Quoted by Ashmole, 'Late Archaic and Early Classical Greek Sculpture in Sicily and South Italy', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 1934, p. 24 n. 2.

[23] Jenkins (p. 21) allows about five years to Geloan coinage before the burial of the Gela 1956 hoard.

20. *Complete* hoards will produce important information, but it may be doubted whether even they should of themselves be used to make fine chronological adjustments. Such hoard evidence as has been adduced by Kraay does not seem to me to upset the traditional date for the early decadrachm provided a reconstruction such as Jenkins's is accepted to eliminate the very unlikely coinless gaps.

21. Another argument which both Kraay and C. Boehringer use to undermine the theory that the decadrachm is the Damareteion is epigraphical. The archaic letter koppa is employed in the ethnic of Syracusan coins until B. 49, which on Boehringer's dating is approximately 490/489; thereafter kappa takes its place. However, on the limestone base[24] for the golden tripod and nike which Gelon dedicated at Delphi in commemoration of Himera in 480 koppa was used on the inscription. Therefore, they argue, the coinage from B. 49, on which the last koppa was used, ought to be brought down to c. 480 at least, and consequently the decadrachm will be later than 480 and cannot be the Damareteion.

22. But there are counter arguments. Jeffery in her *Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* is quite specific on the relation between letters on coins and vases, on the one hand, and those on monumental stone inscriptions, on the other. 'Letter forms used by the vase-painter will almost certainly be considerably more developed than those cut by a contemporary mason' (p. 63). Again on coins—'But apart from these instances' (she refers to the special retention by Corinth of the koppa) 'coin legends in general reflect the script in use at the time when the die was cut, the informal script, probably rather than the monumental, for a die-cutter, like a vase-painter, might well prefer to use simple forms for his tiny letters' (p. 65). Thus the discrepancy of date between the koppa on the monument and the first kappa on the coin—separated as they are by about ten years, is not unexpected. Again it seemed to me entirely unlikely that this stone base of limestone would have been quarried in Syracuse and then transported all the way to Delphi. Therefore, the Delphian Amandry was consulted,[25] who replied that the base was a black limestone (calcaire noire) and *almost certainly local Delphian*. The stone then is probably Delphian; the sculptor certainly a Milesian; the mason of the lower part of the inscription an Ionian (Jeffery), perhaps the sculptor himself; is it likely that a mason was sent from Syracuse just to carve the six words of script at the top? Wherever this leaves the issue, we seem to be still further away from the engravers of the coins.

23. Christof Boehringer in his recent article mentioned above (p. 2 n. 4) presents four reasons why, for him, the early decadrachm is not the Damareteion. Two of these have already been dealt with, the hoard evidence, which he deals with only briefly, and the epigraphical, the apparent discrepancy between kappa and koppa; the third is the historical probability that the massive issues postdate 480—this will be discussed below; and finally, the evidence of his new Aetna tetradrachm (his pl. 7, 1; here Pl. 1**f**; 8**a**; 8**b**; 9: *Obv.* Athena driving chariot; in exergue, plant. *Rev.* Seated Zeus, AIT-NAION).

24. The new Aetna tetradrachm he decides, rightly, is earlier than the superb, once unique, Brussels tetradrachm. He dates the latter to c. 470 and the new one to 476, the year of the foundation of the state under its new name of Aetna. But now he thinks that this new tetradrachm is contemporary in style with section 11 of the Syracuse group 3 issues,

[24]Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*[2] 17: for a photograph see Woodhead, *Greeks in the West*, fig. 37.
[25]I am grateful to Professor Amandry for the information and to Dr. Peter Warren who obtained it for me.

which E. Boehringer had placed before 480: if section 11 were to be brought down to 476 to accommodate the Aitna coin, then the Syracusan decadrachms of section 12*e* would be that much later again and could not be the Damareteia. Such is his argument and he places the decadrachms in the latter part of Hiero's reign, 470–468.

25. The obverse dies of Syracuse with which he compares the Aetnaean obverse are Boehringer's V. 87, 95, and 116 (his pl. 8): these, apart from the nikai, he says are very close to the Athena die of the Aetna coin—e.g. the proportions of the rump and legs of the first horse, the fanning out of the hind legs, and the grouping of the forelegs; V. 106 and 119 show similar nikai to the Aetnaean with their wings outspread, but their horses are different. There is not a Syracusan coin which combines all these features. This mixture of features taken from Syracusan chariots of the previous few years, which still constituted the bulk of the available coinage, is what one would expect in a local engraver of no great individuality cutting a chariot for the first issues of the Hieronian Aetna: however, if those features which on the Aetna chariot clearly differ from those on section 11 chariots are taken into account, then it will be clear that the Aetna tetradrachm is also influenced by section 12*d* and the Damareteion section together with associated issues at Leontini, and should, therefore, be later than or at least contemporary with the Damareteion section.

26. Firstly, the low-slung chariot rail, continuing horizontally along and to the front of the car on the Aetna obverse is found elsewhere only in section 12*d* (V. 170 ff.) and on certain Leontini issues contemporary with the Damareteion section (Kraay and Hirmer, *Greek Coins*, pl. 16, 18; *PCG* pl. 15, 44); in the Damareteion section the rail is continuous to the front but not horizontal. Then the pole rising diagonally from the car is rare[26] on Syracusan coins, but is depicted on the decadrachms and two of the associated tetradrachms. The space in front of the Aetna car and behind the horse's tails is more reminiscent of the decadrachms with their less cramped composition. Finally, and more important, the presence of a symbol in the exergue of the Aetna coin occurs only on the majority of the Damareteion section dies and again on the contemporary Leontini issues (lion), and of course on the later Syracusan sea-serpent issues. The symbol on the Aetna coin, whatever plant it represents, clearly sets it apart from section 11 of Syracuse.

27. It might be argued that the Athena who is driving the chariot on the Aetna obverse is rather awkwardly posed with frontal chest (as on the charioteers of some earlier Syracusan chariots) and not in pure profile (as, for example, on the Damareteion); but this position is not a sign necessarily of greater archaism, for this was the only way the engraver could show on her chest the aegis, her essential distinguishing symbol.

28. C. Boehringer's main contribution to the Damareteion controversy that the Aetna coin, dated not before 476, must bring down the Syracusan chronology because in his view its chariot resembles pre-Damareteion chariots, does not seem to me to be formidable: on the contrary, the fact that the influence of the Damareteion and associated issues can be seen on the Aetna coin of 476 should indicate that the Damareteion issues precede 476 or at least should not be later than 476.

29. The objection to E. Boehringer's chronology on the part of Kraay and C. Boehringer that the massive issues should come after 480 and not before is met by Jenkins's rearrangement

[26] It can be seen on V. 51, 69, 106–7, 142–3.



of the issues which brings them down to 474. But it would be wrong to assume that substantial coinage was not required before 480. For between 485 (if the traditional chronology is accepted)[27] and 480 Gelon had to finance numerous expensive projects in Syracuse—Damarete's palace and presumably his own court, housing for the total population of Camarina now removed to Syracuse, also for half the population of Gela and for the well-to-do of the Megarians and the Euboeans, accommodation and pay for his large mercenary force, the execution of the campaign against the Carthaginians to avenge Dorieus (but this may belong before 485), the preparations such as the building of the 200 triremes to meet the inevitable counter attack of the Carthaginians which led up to the battle of Himera.[28] Admittedly, after Himera there might be the Carthaginian indemnity of 2,000 talents to be coined, but the coining of the previous five years must have been far from negligible and greater, for example, than that of Athens before 480 where there were no large-scale building operations involved.

30. There are of course other problems connected with the Damareteion apart from its date. Diodorus' reason why it was called after Damarete, her intercession on behalf of the Carthaginians and the presentation of the crown, has always seemed to me hard to credit. Nor does the statement of Pollux that she went round with a hat collecting jewellery for the war effort appeal to me any more. I think that Holloway[29] was on the right lines when he said that all these smack of the ill-informed conjectures of the man in the street. My own conjecture is that the man in the Syracusan street corrupted the name of an issue of coins into Damareteion from Damatreion; and that later men in the street and historians had to think up reasons why the coin was called apparently after Damarete, and as a result several versions appeared. It must have been a decadrachm, a pentakontalitron, for this could hardly have been invented and for the corruption to have been made to Damareteion the coin ought to have been struck in Damarete's lifetime in Syracuse (after Gelon's death she married Polyzalus of Gela).[30] ΔAMAPETEION and ΔAMATPEION are certainly both aurally and palaeographically very close, but what would be the significance of Damatreion? ΔAMATPEIOΣ or ΔAMATPIOΣ[31] means pertaining to Demeter. Δαματρεῖον is her shrine. Gelon had a special relationship with the worship of Demeter; he and his family held the priesthood of Demeter and Kore. From the spoils of Himera Diodorus records that Gelon built fine temples in Syracuse to Demeter and Kore.[32] To explain the significance of Damatreion

[27]The traditional chronology is based on Aristotle (*Pol.* 1315^b 34) and Diodorus (xi, 38, 7). Diodorus said that Gelon died in 478: both Diodorus and Aristotle say that he reigned for seven years (in Aristotle this is seven years at Syracuse; in Diodorus it is not clear). Hence 485 for the seizure of power at Syracuse. At the conference I suggested that the chronology of Pausanias (vi, 9–5 and Tzetzes (*Chil.* i 86: Cor. 160) might be considered. Both believed that Gelon took over Syracuse in 490. If they are right, it is possible that the source of Diodorus and Aristotle was mistaken and confused the length of reign of Hippocrates and Cleander, the predecessors of Gelon in the tyranny, with that of Gelon himself, for Herodotus vii, 154–5 says that both Cleander and Hippocrates reigned seven years. But it is probable that the authorities on both sides could be right: Gelon got control of Syracuse in 490 and held it from Gela until 485, and only then moved his court to Syracuse, and thus could be said to have ruled in Syracuse only for seven years. Such a chronology would give more room for all Gelon's activities before 480, which seem rather excessive for the five years on the traditional chronology and would also allow more elbow room for the coinage. However, I have no wish to press it, as it may be thought that acceptance of it is a prerequisite for the rejection of Kraay's downdating of the Damareteion.

[28]Herodotus vii, 155 ff.; Diodorus xi, 38, 4.

[29]*ANS MN* 1964, 2.

[30]Schol. Pindar, 15 (29) b.

[31]For obvious reasons I have taken Δαμάτρειος.

[32]Herodotus vii, 153, 2; Diodorus xi, 26, 7.

it might be conjectured that after Himera a special issue of coins was struck (the wreath around the head of the goddess on this issue may indicate victory, and this wreath on the coins may be the basis for the gold wreath of Diodorus' version); perhaps this issue was struck in the precinct of Demeter, whereas the regular coinage was struck elsewhere; perhaps the issue was struck from the metal paid into the temple of Demeter by the Carthaginians (Demeter seems a more likely recipient of the Carthaginian gold crown than Damarete);[33] perhaps it was a special issue on the occasion of the dedication of Demeter's temple by Gelon to commemorate Himera. Soon this Damatreion issue (Δαμάτρειον νόμισμα) was corrupted to Damareteion after Gelon's queen Damarete, who it would be nice to think was Demeter's priestess, as her husband was priest.

31. From the numismatic point of view this conjecture has the advantage of releasing the Damareteion issue from its close connection with Himera and of allowing it to float a little further into the 470s, but Damareteion or Damatreion, there seems to me no valid reason yet for downdating it to the end of the 460s.

[33]For gold crowns dedicated to goddesses see Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*[2] 69–70.





a



b



c



d





e



f





The Damareteion Reconsidered[1]

R. T. WILLIAMS

[SEE PLATE 1]

1. BOEHRINGER[2] in his monumental work on early Syracusan coinage classified and dated the issues as follows:

B. Group	1	530–510 B.C.	Archaic issues. Kraay, pl. iii, 2.
	2	510–485	First dolphins. Kraay, pl. iii, 5.
	3	485–479	Massive issues. Sections 6–11, 12*a–e* (12*e* = Damareteion issues). Kraay, pl. iii, 4–5 and 1.
		479–474	No coinage.
	4	474–450	Sea-serpent issues. Kraay, pl. iv, 1.
	5–6	450–435	Olive symbol, etc.
		435–425	No coinage.
Tudeer[3]	I	425–412	Signed engravers.

2. However, it seemed to many numismatists that there were still problems, in particular the two coinless intervals which Boehringer created between 479 and 474 and between 435 and 425. The latter was due, to some extent, to the duality of research at this juncture where Tudeer had begun and Boehringer finished: the reason for the former interval was because, on the one hand, Boehringer believed that his section 12*e* of group 3, which contained the early decadrachms, was the last section of the massive issues, and that the decadrachm was the Damareteion, struck immediately after Himera in 480,[4] and, on the other hand, he associated the appearance of the sea-serpent in the exergue of group 4 issues with the naval battle between Hiero and the Etruscans off Cumae in 474. These were the corner-stones of his chronology and a very substantial one seemed at least the equation of the

[1] A form of this article was given as a paper at the Joint Conference of the Greek and Roman Societies at Cambridge, July 1971. The paper aimed at refuting in particular Kraay's downdating of the Damareteion in his *Greek Coins and History* (here abbreviated to Kraay). I am grateful to the B.M. for providing photographs of their coins in **Pl. 1b–c**, to the owner for the photograph of his coin, **Pl. 1d**, to Mrs. S. Hurter for **Pl. 1e**; to Dr. H. A. Cahn for allowing me to reproduce in **Pl. 1f** the coin no. 105 from the MMAG Niggeler Catalogue of 1965.

[2] E. Boehringer, *Die Münzen von Syrakus* (1929.) B = Boehringer.

[3] *Die Tetradrachmenprägung von Syrakus in der Periode signierenden Künstler* (1913).

[4] Diodorus xi, 26, 3.

early decadrachm with the Damareteion,[1] secured both by historical reference and style. However, as there are neither historical nor stylistic reasons for these intervals, certainly not for the 479–474 interval when many postulate a glut of coinage resulting from the coining of the Carthaginian indemnity, on any reconstruction of the issues these gaps must be closed.

3. The later gap between 435 and 425 may be closed summarily by extending the end of the sea-serpent group from 450 to 440 and running groups 5–6 from 440 to 425.[2] But it will be the earlier break of 479–474 that will be of more immediate relevance to the present topic. Several numismatists have suggested adjustments to the end of group 3 to bring that down to 474 without destroying the connection between the decadrachms and the Damareteion and Himera. Of these the most recent known to me and the most cogent is that of G. K. Jenkins in his monograph on the coinage of Gela.[3] He extends the end of group 3 right down to 474, but extracts the Damareteion section, 12*e*, and throws it back to the period immediately after Himera: for this section is not die-linked to the other sections and is quite alien to them in style, except for one Artemis head, R. 276, which is die-linked to the Damareteion section and comes late in that section, but whose nearest stylistic relations belong earlier: R. 201 of 12*a* **[Pl. 1b]** and R. 244 of 12*d* **[Pl. 1c]** clearly come from the same hand as R. 276 **[Pl. 1a]**. There is no reason, therefore why the Damareteion section should be placed right at the end of section 12 and the massive issues, but it could be inserted at the end of section 11.

4. However, in the meantime C. M. Kraay and C. Boehringer[4] have rejected the connection both of the early decadrachm with the Damareteion and also of group 4 and its sea-serpent with the battle of Cumae. Kraay's main objection, as I understand it, to E. Boehringer's chronology is that there is far too much coinage, over 140 obverse dies, for the short period of 485–479 (group 3) at a time when in his opinion there was little need for it; and hoard evidence, he maintains, shows that these massive issues with the decadrachm come later. The hoards he adduces are the following:

Gela 1956[5]

5. The latest datable coin (Jenkins, *Gela*, pl. 36, 1) which provides a *terminus post quem*, is the Zankle-Messana piece with the initial A in front of the prow, dated probably c. 493;[6] as it was in good condition, a date of c. 490–485 for the hoard seems reasonable at the moment. The latest Syracusan is B. 46, which on Boehringer's dating is c. 490. Kraay dates the burial

[1] But of course he was not the first to suggest it; see Schwabacher, *Das Demareteion* (1958). That the sea-serpent commemorates Cumae is not so secure.

[2] Jenkins, *Gela* 66 f., closes the interval less summarily.

[3] 23 f.

[4] Kraay, *Greek Coins and History*, ch. 2, 'The Demareteion and Sicilian Chronology'. Christof Boehringer, *JNG* 1968, 67 ff.

[5] Jenkins 20 ff.; Kraay 27 f.

[6] Robinson, *JHS* 1946, 14.

of the hoard to 484. Although this date may well not be wrong, the arguments which he used to substantiate it may be criticized. They are based on the coinage of Leontini, of which there was not one coin in the hoard. That is not strictly true, as Kraay points out: only about 80 per cent of the original hoard was recovered, but the authorities were so energetic that they managed to extract a coin of Leontini from someone or other, which Jenkins asserts could hardly have been in the hoard.[1] However, Leontini fell to Gela in the 490s: Gelon of Gela took over Syracuse, according to the traditional chronology, in 485. Kraay's premise is that the coinage of Leontini was inspired by Syracuse and that a Syracusan-inspired coinage at Leontini is only intelligible *after* 485. With this in mind he sets about bringing together as closely as possible the latest Syracusan coins in the Gela hoard with the initial coinage of Leontini.

6. He starts (p. 27) 'the group of Syracusan coins immediately following those which are in the hoard (B. 46) made use of an obverse die borrowed from Leontini'. Borrowing there certainly was,[2] but hardly immediately after. The Syracusan reverse die which was coupled with the Leontini obverse was Boehringer's R. 42. This was used with Syracusan obverses at B. 63, which could be said to be immediately after B. 46, also at B. 117 and B. 118. It developed a flaw during its life and Boehringer showed[3] that the flaw was worst at 118, but worst of all when coupled with the Leontini die and in this final phase the legend was recut. How long after B. 118 R. 42 was brought back into use is uncertain, but one could hardly say that it was immediately after B. 46. However, Kraay concludes that the mint of Leontini was already at work immediately after the date of the burial of the Gela hoard.

7. He then takes a step further—'since Leontini's coinage was modelled on that type of Syracusan coinage, of which there are only three dies in the hoard, it cannot have started much earlier than the burial of the hoard. In fact we must conclude that the coinage of Leontini started at about the time that the Gela hoard was buried'. Now if one recalls Kraay's premise that it is only after 485 that a coinage inspired by Syracuse is intelligible at Leontini, one may find difficulty in disagreeing when he says that the highest date for the hoard is 485 or more probably 484. But there seems to be another flaw in his argument. Everything is based on the assumption that the latest Syracusan coin in the hoard must be as late as the burial date of the hoard. In point of fact the odds are against the Syracusan coins being as late, because the hoard was laid down, and probably saved, at Gela, which in the crucial years of 490–485, on the traditional chronology, was not in the same sphere of influence as Syracuse. One cannot postulate that a hoarder at Gela must have in his hoard Syracusan coins from the latest dies.

[1] Kraay 27 n. 3; Jenkins, 151, footnote.
[2] See Kraay, pl. iv, 2–3; *SNG* v, 1913 and 1776.
[3] Catalogue 117.

8. But Kraay's reason for squeezing us into 484 is clear; he is now able to assert (p. 28) 'the really massive issues are not yet under way', which for him should be appearing if Boehringer's chronology is right. Yet even if this hoard is to be dated as late as 485 or 484, it must be emphasized that it does not follow automatically that the latest Syracusan coins must also be of this date.

Passo di Piazza[1]

9. In this hoard, again found a few miles from Gela, the latest datable coin is a Messenian didrachm with the mule-car obverse (Kraay, pl. iv, 4), which is thought to commemorate the Olympian victory of Anaxilas of Rhegium in the mule-car event, struck either after 484 or 480. The latter seems more likely since these coins were struck on the Attic-Syracusan standard instead of the previous Chalcidian standard and the change seems more likely, as Robinson pointed out,[2] on the occasion of the *rapprochement* between Anaxilas and the Syracusans immediately after Himera than in 484 when he was ranged on the Carthaginian side. The latest Syracusan coin is B. 85, on Boehringer's dating struck soon after 485. Kraay dates the hoard to 484 or 480. The date of 484 of course presents no problems for Syracusan chronology: if it is to be dated c. 480 or later, a discrepancy of only four years is insufficient to warrant the assumption that the Syracusan coins are dated too early. Again one cannot postulate that because a hoard was laid down near Gela in 480 the latest Syracusan coins in the hoard must have been struck in the same year. Nor is it necessary to invoke the defence that the Messenian didrachm, which provides the date for the hoard, is one of those interlopers extracted by an over-energetic gendarmerie.

Mazzarino[3]

10. This hoard buried north of Gela has for its latest datable coins the didrachms of Himera with the usual cock on the obverse, but a crab on the reverse (Kraay, pl. iv, 5–6), which must have been struck within the decade 482–472, when Theron of Acragas, whose type the crab was, had Himera under his control. The latest Syracusan is B. 333; on Boehringer's chronology, coming up to 480. Kraay dates the hoard to 475 and again notes the discrepancy between his date of the hoard and the latest Syracusan. But if the adjustment which was outline at the beginning is made to Boehringer's chronology, the extension of section 12, to which B. 333 belongs, down to 474, then on this occasion the date of the hoard does coincide exactly with the latest Syracusan.

[1] Jenkins 21 f.; Kraay 28.
[2] Op. cit. 17.
[3] Jenkins 22 ff.; Kraay 31; Noe 667 and 188. For the site see Jenkins 154.

Villabate[1]

11. Here the latest coin is that of Rhegium (lion/seated oecist) dated by Herzfelder to c. 450.[2] The latest Syracusan is B. 535 in the sea-serpent group; on Boehringer's dating, c. 459. An apparent discrepancy here, but when allowance is made for the closing of the ten-year interval, 435–425, this Syracusan coin may be brought down to the late 450s, where it coincides with the date of the Rhegium coin and allows a date in the 440s for the burial of the hoard—buried in north Sicily, again some considerable distance from Syracuse.

Seltmann hoard[3]

12. Kraay adduces as evidence a hoard of coins shown to E. J. Seltmann in north Sicily in 1890: some of these coins Seltman bought and of these he illustrated some. He was, as Kraay says, a practised numismatist, but he was shown the hoard a generation before the publication of Boehringer's monograph and such a person might well in the field have failed to recognize an early tetradrachm of the sea-serpent group if the sea-serpent happened to be off the flan, as frequently it is. The latest coins which Seltmann mentioned are the Himera tetradrachms which may be dated to the 460s: the Syracusan coins in the hoard he says were all Gelonian (485–478). Kraay argues that a hoard of this date (465) would be expected to show at least some examples of the sea-serpent group, and that it does not indicates that the preceding group of Syracusan coins, the massive issues of group 3, must come down to the late 460s (p. 34). Now if all the relevant hoards showed a similar discrepancy to the Seltmann hoard, then the Seltmann hoard might be used as confirmatory evidence; but they do not, so that the Seltmann hoard, unsatisfactorily published as it was, should not be used to bring down the date of the end of group 3 from 474 to the late 460s.

13. Jenkins has asked an interesting question, which he has kindly allowed me to repeat, may the Seltmann hoard have been part of the Villabate hoard? Time and place are close. In this case, the Seltmann hoard would cease to be a problem.

14. A more formidable piece of ammunition Kraay uses is an overstrike; a Syracusan coin, B. 517, was overstruck upon an Apollo tetradrachm of Catana (his pl. v; here **Pl. 1a**). Of the two Catana groups of coins, the bull/nike series and the Apollo series, Kraay believes that the former began in 461, lasted about five years at least, and was then followed by the Apollo issues from c. 456, which must be the *terminus post quem* for the overstrike,

[1] Noe 1161; Jenkins 66 ff.; Kraay 35; Evans, *NC* 1894, 291 ff.
[2] *Les Monnaies d'argent de Rhegion* 51, pl. 1, 5.
[3] *ZfN* 1895, 165 ff.; Jenkins 159; Kraay 32.

for this Apollo is about the first in this issue [**Pl. 1f**].[1] But Boehringer's date for the Syracusan B. 517 would be c. 460. There seems to be a discrepancy here, but, as in the Villabate hoard, when the readjustment is made to allow for the closing of the ten-year interval between 435 and 425, the Syracusan coin can be brought down to the late 450s, which is on the right side of Kraay's *terminus post quem*. Kraay's date of the 40s for the overstrike seems far too late, because both pairs of dies, the Syracusan and the Catanaean, are very close in style, and if the Catana coin was struck c. 456, the Syracusan must follow very soon after [cf. **Pl. 1e** and **f**].

15. Kraay's dating of the two Catana series, bull/nike and Apollo, has been accepted above, but there are other arrangements of the coinage. Cahn[2] believes that the bull/Nike series belongs to before 476, that is before the original Catanaeans were ejected by Hiero, and that the Apollo series was instituted on their return in the late 460s, which would then be the *terminus post quem* for the overstrike. The same terminus would be given by the arrangement of Herzfelder[3] who believed that both series ran concurrently from the late 460s. Both these theories would give more elbow-room for the overstrike.

16. Kraay's interpretation of the hoard and overstrike evidence led him to redate the Syracusan issues as follows. He downdates the archaic issues (group 1) to 520–500. Then come a coinless gap of fifteen years—surprising in view of the good condition of the archaic issues in the Gela hoard. The earliest dolphins he allots to 485–480. Then a gold Damareteion, which has not survived, is postulated. The massive issues of group 3 are spread over eighteen years from 479 to 461. The decadrachms belong to c. 461. The sea-serpent issues he places after 461. Now to test some of the repercussions of these new dates on the burial dates of the hoards.

17. Gela, 1956, which Kraay dated to 484, contained Syracusan coins in excellent condition down to late in the group of the earliest dolphins, for which his date is near 480. Thus the hoard will have to be downdated to 480 at least: Syracuse will be the latest in the hoard: there will be no coins in Gela until Gelon has left for Syracuse.[4]

18. For the Passo di Piazza Kraay's lower date is 480. The latest Syracusan, B. 85, well down in the massive issues, on his dating will be c. 475. Again the hoard will have to be downdated and again Syracuse will be the latest in the hoard.

[1] I am grateful to Mrs. S. Hurter for this information.

[2] *Knidos* 161.

[3] Quoted by Ashmole, 'Late Archaic and Early Classical Greek Sculpture in Sicily and South Italy', *Proceedings of the British Academy 1934*, p. 24 n. 2.

[4] Jenkins (p. 21) allows about five years to Geloan coinage before the burial of the Gela 1956 hoard.

19. The real crunch comes in the Mazzarino hoard, which Kraay had dated to 475. The latest Syracusan coins in this are associated with the decadrachm, which he dates to 461. The date of the hoard will have to be brought down to the late sixties: Jenkins's Gela Group II will have to be downdated a decade: and the latest Syracusan will be a decade or more later than the latest dated coins in the hoard, the Himera crabs, 482–472.

20. *Complete* hoards will produce important information, but it may be doubted whether even they should of themselves be used to make fine chronological adjustments. Such hoard evidence as has been adduced by Kraay does not seem to me to upset the traditional date for the early decadrachm provided a reconstruction such as Jenkins's is accepted to eliminate the very unlikely coinless gaps.

21. Another argument which both Kraay and C. Boehringer use to undermine the theory that the decadrachm is the Damareteion is epigraphical. The archaic letter koppa is employed in the ethnic of Syracusan coins until B. 49, which on Boehringer's dating is approximately 490/489; thereafter kappa takes its place. However, on the limestone base[1] for the golden tripod and nike which Gelon dedicated at Delphi in commemoration of Himera in 480 koppa was used on the inscription. Therefore, they argue, the coinage from B. 49, on which the last koppa was used, ought to be brought down to c. 480 at least, and consequently the decadrachm will be later than 480 and cannot be the Damareteion.

22. But there are counter arguments. Jeffery in her *Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* is quite specific on the relation between letters on coins and vases, on the one hand, and those on monumental stone inscriptions, on the other. 'Letter forms used by the vase-painter will almost certainly be considerably more developed than those cut by a contemporary mason' (p. 63). Again on coins—'But apart from these instances' (she refers to the special retention by Corinth of the koppa) 'coin legends in general reflect the script in use at the time when the die was cut, the informal script, probably rather than the monumental, for a die-cutter, like a vase-painter, might well prefer to use simple forms for his tiny letters' (p. 65). Thus the discrepancy of date between the koppa on the monument and the first kappa on the coin—separated as they are by about ten years, is not unexpected. Again it seemed to me extremely unlikely that this stone base of limestone would have been quarried in Syracuse and then transported all the way to Delphi. Therefore, the Delphian Amandry was consulted,[2] who replied that the base was a black limestone

[1] Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*[2] 17: for a photograph see Woodhead, *Greeks in the West*, fig. 37.

[2] I am grateful to Professor Amandry for the information and to Dr. Peter Warren who obtained it for me.

(calcaire noire) and *almost certainly local Delphian*. The stone then is probably Delphian; the sculptor certainly a Milesian; the mason of the lower part of the inscription an Ionian (Jeffery), perhaps the sculptor himself; is it likely that a mason was sent from Syracuse just to carve the six words of script at the top? Wherever this leaves the issue, we seem to be still further away from the engravers of the coins.

23. Christof Boehringer in his recent article mentioned above (p. 2 n. 4) presents four reasons why, for him, the early decadrachm is not the Damareteion. Two of these have already been dealt with, the hoard evidence, which he deals with only briefly, and the epigraphical, the apparent discrepancy between kappa and koppa; the third is the historical probability that the massive issues postdate 480—this will be discussed below; and finally, the evidence of his new Aetna tetradrachm (his pl. 7, 1; here **Pl. 1f**; 8A; 8E; 9: *Obv.* Athena driving chariot; in exergue, plant. *Rev.* Seated Zeus, AITNAION).

24. The new Aetna tetradrachm he decides, rightly, is earlier than the superb, once unique, Brussels tetradrachm. He dates the latter to c. 470 and the new one to 476, the year of the foundation of the state under its new name of Aetna. But now he thinks that this new tetradrachm is contemporary in style with section 11 of the Syracuse group 3 issues, which E. Boehringer had placed before 480: if section 11 were to be brought down to 476 to accommodate the Aitna coin, then the Syracusan decadrachms of section 12*e* would be that much later again and could not be the Damareteia. Such is his argument and he places the decadrachms in the latter part of Hiero's reign, 470–468.

25. The obverse dies of Syracuse with which he compares the Aetnaean obverse are Boehringer's V. 87, 95, and 116 (his pl. 8): these, apart from the nikai, he says are very close to the Athena die of the Aetna coin—e.g. the proportions of the rump and legs of the first horse, the fanning out of the hind legs, and the grouping of the forelegs; V. 106 and 119 show similar nikai to the Aetnaean with their wings outspread, but their horses are different. There is not a Syracusan coin which combines all these features. This mixture of features taken from Syracusan chariots of the previous few years, which still constituted the bulk of the available coinage, is what one would expect in a local engraver of no great individuality cutting a chariot for the first issues of the Hieronian Aetna: however, if those features which on the Aetna chariot clearly differ from those on section 11 chariots are taken into account, then it will be clear that the Aetna tetradrachm is also influenced by section 12*d* and the Damareteion section together with associated issues at Leontini, and should, therefore, be later than or at least contemporary with the Damareteion section.

26. Firstly, the low-slung chariot rail, continuing horizontally along and to the front of the car on the Aetna obverse is found elsewhere only in section 12*d* (V. 170 ff.) and on certain Leontini issues contemporary with the Damareteion section (Kraay and Hirmer, *Greek Coins*, pl. 16, 18; *PCG* pl. 15, 44); in the Damareteion section the rail is continuous to the front but not horizontal. Then the pole rising diagonally from the car is rare[1] on Syracusan coins, but is depicted on the decadrachms and two of the associated tetradrachms. The space in front of the Aetna car and behind the horse's tails is more reminiscent of the decadrachms with their less cramped composition. Finally, and more important, the presence of a symbol in the exergue of the Aetna coin occurs only on the majority of the Damareteion section dies and again on the contemporary Leontini issues (lion), and of course on the later Syracusan sea-serpent issues. The symbol on the Aetna coin, whatever plant it represents, clearly sets it apart from section 11 of Syracuse.

27. It might be argued that the Athena who is driving the chariot on the Aetna obverse is rather awkwardly posed with frontal chest (as on the charioteers of some earlier Syracusan chariots) and not in pure profile (as, for example, on the Damareteion); but this position is not a sign necessarily of greater archaism, for this was the only way the engraver could show on her chest the aegis, her essential distinguishing symbol.

28. C. Boehringer's main contribution to the Damareteion controversy that the Aetna coin, dated not before 476, must bring down the Syracusan chronology because in his view its chariot resembles pre-Damareteion chariots, does not seem to me to be formidable: on the contrary, the fact that the influence of the Damareteion and associated issues can be seen on the Aetna coin of 476 should indicate that the Damareteion issues precede 476 or at least should not be later than 476.

29. The objection to E. Boehringer's chronology on the part of Kraay and C. Boehringer that the massive issues should come after 480 and not before is met by Jenkins's rearrangement of the issues which brings them down to 474. But it would be wrong to assume that substantial coinage was not required before 480. For between 485 (if the traditional chronology is accepted)[2] and 480 Gelon had to finance numerous expensive projects in

[1] It can be seen on V. 51, 69, 106–7, 142–3.

[2] The traditional chronology is based on Aristotle (*Pol.* 1315^{b} 34) and Diodorus (xi, 38, 7). Diodorus said that Gelon died in 478: both Diodorus and Aristotle say that he reigned for seven years (in Aristotle this is seven years at Syracuse; in Diodorus it is not clear). Hence 485 for the seizure of power at Syracuse. At the conference I suggested that the chronology of Pausanias (vi, 9, 4–5) and Plutarch (*Vit. Cor.* 16) might be considered. Both believed that Gelon took over Syracuse in 490. If they are right, it is possible that the source of Diodorus and Aristotle was mistaken and confused the length of reign of Hippocrates and Cleander, the predecessors of Gelon in the tyranny, with that of Gelon himself, for Herodotus vii,

Syracuse—Damarete's palace and presumably his own court, housing for the total population of Camarina now removed to Syracuse, also for half the population of Gela and for the well-to-do of the Megarians and the Euboeans, accommodation and pay for his large mercenary force, the execution of the campaign against the Carthaginians to avenge Dorieus (but this may belong before 485), the preparations such as the building of the 200 triremes to meet the inevitable counter attack of the Carthaginians which led up to the battle of Himera.[1] Admittedly, after Himera there might be the Carthaginian indemnity of 2,000 talents to be coined, but the coining of the previous five years must have been far from negligible and greater, for example, than that of Athens before 480 where there were no large-scale building operations involved.

30. There are of course other problems connected with the Damareteion apart from its date. Diodorus' reason why it was called after Damarete, her intercession on behalf of the Carthaginians and the presentation of the crown, has always seemed to me hard to credit. Nor does the statement of Pollux that she went round with a hat collecting jewellery for the war effort appeal to me any more. I think that Holloway[2] was on the right lines when he said that all these smack of the ill-informed conjectures of the man in the street. My own conjecture is that the man in the Syracusan street corrupted the name of an issue of coins into Damareteion from Damatreion; and that later men in the street and historians had to think up reasons why the coin was called apparently after Damarete, and as a result several versions appeared. It must have been a decadrachm, a pentakontalitron, for this could hardly have been invented and for the corruption to have been made to Damareteion the coin ought to have been struck in Damarete's lifetime in Syracuse (after Gelon's death she married Polyzalus of Gela).[3] ΔΑΜΑΡΕΤΕΙΟΝ and ΔΑΜΑΤΡΕΙΟΝ are certainly both aurally and palaeographically very close, but what would be the significance of Damatreion? ΔΑΜΑΤΡΕΙΟΣ or ΔΑΜΑΤΡΙΟΣ[4] means pertaining to Demeter. *Δαματρεῖον* is her shrine. Gelon had a special relationship with the worship of Demeter; he and his family held the priesthood of Demeter and Kore. From the spoils of Himera Diodorus records that Gelon built fine temples in Syracuse to Demeter and Kore.[5] To explain the signi-

154–5 says that both Cleander and Hippocrates reigned seven years. But it is probable that the authorities on both sides could be right: Gelon got control of Syracuse in 490 and held it from Gela until 485, and only then moved his court to Syracuse, and thus could be said to have ruled in Syracuse only for seven years. Such a chronology would give more room for all Gelon's activities before 480, which seem rather excessive for the five years on the traditional chronology and would also allow more elbow room for the coinage. However, I have no wish to press it, as it may be thought that acceptance of it is a prerequisite for the rejection of Kraay's downdating of the Damareteion.

[1] Herodotus vii, 155 ff.; Diodorus xi, 38, 4.
[2] *ANS MN* 1964, 2.
[3] Schol. Pindar, 15 (29) b.
[4] For obvious reasons I have taken *Δαμάτρειος*.
[5] Herodotus vii, 153, 2; Diodorus xi, 26, 7.

ficance of Damatreion it might be conjectured that after Himera a special issue of coins was struck (the wreath around the head of the goddess on this issue may indicate victory, and this wreath on the coins may be the basis for the gold wreath of Diodorus' version); perhaps this issue was struck in the precinct of Demeter, whereas the regular coinage was struck elsewhere; perhaps the issue was struck from the metal paid into the temple of Demeter by the Carthaginians (Demeter seems a more likely recipient of the Carthaginian gold crown than Damarete):[1] perhaps it was a special issue on the occasion of the dedication of Demeter's temple by Gelon to commemorate Himera. Soon this Damatreion issue (*Δαμάτρειον νόμισμα*) was corrupted to Damareteion after Gelon's queen Damarete, who it would be nice to think was Demeter's priestess, as her husband was priest.

31. From the numismatic point of view this conjecture has the advantage of releasing the Damareteion issue from its close connection with Himera and of allowing it to float a little further into the 470s, but Damareteion or Damatreion, there seems to me no valid reason yet for downdating it to the end of the 460s.

[1] For gold crowns dedicated to goddesses see Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*[2] 69–70.



a



b



c



d





e



f



