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An Unedited Gold Stater of Lampsakos.

(Pl. I.)

An archer kneeling r. on r. knee, l. elbow resting on l. knee, holding in l. hand, a bow, upright, together with an arrow; his r. arm drawn back from the body hangs down with open palm; he wears a cap with loose flaps, bound with a ribbon the ends of which are tied in a bow-knot, a long-sleeved tunic girt up at the waist, an ax y r i d e s, and shoes turned up at the toes; over the tunic, he wears a close-fitting jacket of some padded material, or of leather, laced down the front, with short caps over the arms: ground line. Rs. Forepart of a winged sea-horse r., wings rounded, r. raised, l. lowered; traces of the square incuse.

N 16 mm. 8,42 gr. Berlin (Löbbecke) Pl. I, 1.

This unpublished stater of Lampsakos is the coin briefly noted in my Gold Coinage of Lampsacus (Journ. Inter. de Num. 1902, p. 8) as bearing the type of “a kneeling figure”. It was acquired in 1895 by Herr Arthur Löbbecke of Braunschweig, and has since passed with his collection into the Berlin Cabinet. Through the courtesy of Dr. Dressel, I am permitted to describe this beautiful and remarkable, new type.

The coin is one of the earlier issues of the gold stater series of the Fourth Century B. C. In my former paper on these staters, the coins with the figure-types were described before those with the head-types, since the series admittedly starts with two figure-types, Herakles strangling the serpents, and, Helle (?) on the ram, the reverses of which show the winged half-horse to the left as on the Fifth-Century electrum coins (op. cit. Pl. I, 1a, 1 and 2), and
because the majority of the figure-types are earlier in style than the head-types. No attempt was made, however, to arrange this whole series of uninscribed, autonomous coins, with an apparently uniform reverse type, in a completely chronological order. In the case of such a coinage lasting less than a century (circ. 390-330 B. C. or, as some writers have thought, 394-350 B. C.) it seemed hardly possible to discover differences of style sufficiently marked to enable one to determine throughout the order of the issues. But in casting about for a more satisfactory arrangement in connection with a re-publication of these staters which I propose shortly to issue²), the key to the order in which the coins were issued has been found in the comparison of the details of the reverses, and, in general, of the size of flans and types, and lastly, as a check to this method of classification, the style of the obverses³). The resultant scheme, convincing enough on its general lines, may perhaps be open to criticism, in regard to the grouping of one or two coins which are more difficult to place, or of the relative position of a given coin in the group, but the salient distinctions are so obvious as convince anyone after a study of the new plates. The earliest issues, which include both figure-and head-types, are those coins which have smaller-size flans and types, and reverses of a style more closely akin to their prototype, the half-horse of the electrum coins. It is from the study of the development of the wing particularly that one obtains an infallible clue to the order. The rounded-end wing, curving back towards the horse's head, characteristic of archaic Greek art which, according to M. Georges Perrot, derived it from Phoeni-


2) The revised paper will be published this year in monograph form by the American Numismatic Society of New York.

3) This method (Stempel- und Stilvergleichung) of classifying chronologically a series of autonomous, anepigraphic coins has been applied with remarkable success to the electrum coinage of Kyzikos (H. von Fritze, in Nomisma VII, 1912), a series far more extensive than that of Lampsakos, but presenting the same problem of classification.
An Unedited Gold Stater of Lampsakos.

cian models\(^1\)), is preserved down to the very latest coins of the series, but, in minute details, it is gradually modified, the wing becoming insensibly differentiated from the genuinely archaic style\(^2\)), an evolution well paralleled by that of the wing of the Sphinx on the coins of Chios\(^3\)). The development which the archaic prototype


2) On Pl. I (nos. 8—17) are figured ten reverses of Lampsakene staters representative of the evolution in style to be remarked in the coinage. No. 8, type, Helle (?) on the ram (J. I. N. pl. I, 3, 4), of identical die with the Herakles and serpents type (op. cit. pl. I, 2), the earliest types as the direction of the horse to the left, and the kinship with the electrum stater (type with, op. cit. pl. I, 1a) indicate, show a half-horse of semi-archaic style. Nos. 9 and 10, types ,Kneeling Archer' and Nike sacrificing a ram (Pl. I, 1 and op. cit. pl. I, 9) of strikingly similar style, exhibit an advance over the two former types and the intervening ones, but the feathered portions of the wings are still more or less naturalistic as on the archaic electrum coins, and the far wing not yet separated from the division line of the body. No. 11, Maenad type (op. cit. pl. III. 10, but a different coin) shows the beginning of the separation of the far wing from the end of the body, and the feathered parts of the wings conventionally schematized. No. 12, Aphrodite type (op. cit. pl. II, 6: the reverse associated on this plate with this head belongs to the Hermes head, ibid. 12) marks the complete development of the schematic treatment of the wings, a sort of ,,ladder pattern'' running down the middle of the r. wing, and finishing off the inside of the l., and fine cross-hatching appearing on the feathered portions of both wings. No. 13, Zeus(?) type (op. cit. pl. I, 11—13, example from the Jameson Coll., Cat. 1439) shows the same details of treatment, and larger-size type and flan. No. 14, type ,Zeus with thunderbolt'' (op. cit. pl. I, 14—18, Berlin example) with still larger size of type and flan, exhibits the highest development of style in a finely proportioned, vigorous half-horse of which several different dies exist. The succeeding numbers, 15, Aktaion type (op. cit. pl. III, 18—20), 16, Kabeiros type (op. cit. pl. II, 18—20) and 17, Persephone (?) type (op. cit. pl. II, 13—16) illustrate the gradual decline in style, which is most evident in the carelessly executed reverses of the Kabeiros type and the slovenly style of the Persephone reverses.

3) The modification of the wing on the Chian coins is of a different character from that on our Lampsakene staters, and the break with the purely archaic style of wing is effected suddenly, first appearing on the splendid uninscribed tetradrachms of circ. 420 B. C. (B. M. Cat. Ionia, pl. XXXII. 2). The didrachms, which in the B. M. Cat., are given to 478—412 B. C., and as following the tetradrachms, show the truly archaic form of the wing, and

---

\(^1\) The modification of the wing on the Chian coins is of a different character from that on our Lampsakene staters, and the break with the purely archaic style of wing is effected suddenly, first appearing on the splendid uninscribed tetradrachms of circ. 420 B. C. (B. M. Cat. Ionia, pl. XXXII. 2). The didrachms, which in the B. M. Cat., are given to 478—412 B. C., and as following the tetradrachms, show the truly archaic form of the wing, and
undergoes in the course of its modernization on a Fourth-Century coinage can only be properly understood from the study of all of the reverses, and we cannot therefore enter upon the analysis now. The later coins of the series exhibit a notable advance in style over the earlier pieces, the flan is larger and somewhat flatter, the types are of larger size, and the incuse less marked.

Some time ago, Six (Num. Chron. 1888, p. 111), taking the style of the reverses as a guide, had arranged the twenty types known to him in a chronological order which, in many points, corresponds with our proposed scheme. Lübbecke\(^1\) also, and Greenwell\(^2\), in commenting on the two finds of Lampsakene staters made about the year 1888, at Avola, near Syracuse, and in Asia Minor (probably in the Troad) made very just observations based solely upon the differences in style presented by the coins in the finds. Of the Asia Minor hoard, Lübbecke wrote, „Alle diese aus Klein-Asien kommenden Stateren scheinen jünger als die des Avolafundes zu sein, der Schrotling der ersteren ist größer und flacher und das vertiefte Viereck der Rs. fast ganz verschwunden, auch die Arbeit einzelner darunter läßt schon ein Sinken der Kunst erkennen“ (Zeit. für Num. 1890, p. 179). Greenwell (Num. Chron. 1890, p. 25) wrote of the facing Satyr head which came from the Avola find, “This fine stater of Lampsacus, of an earlier issue than some of those presently to be noticed\(^3\), formed part of a hoard lately found in Sicily”. And, again, Greenwell in discussing the Asia Minor find, said, “Two of them appear to belong to the later issue of gold staters of Lampsacus, and probably do not date from a time earlier than that of Philip II of Macedon”. (Num. Chron. 1890, p. 26).

The Avola find was composed of the following types: one figure-type, Apollo seated (Journ. Int. de Num. 1902, pl. I, 6, 7, no. 4 b), and the heads, Demeter r. (op. cit. pl. II. 9, 10, no. 17 b),

they antedate the tetradrachms, as the early transitional style of the heads in itself suffices to prove.

1) Zeit. f. Num. 1890, p. 179.
2) Num. Chron. 1890, p. 25.
3) Namely, these from the Asia Minor hoard.
Satyr facing (op. cit. pl. III, 15-17, no. 32, a and b), Hermes (op. cit. pl. II, 11, 12, no. 18 b), Herakles (op. cit. pl. III, 11, no. 28 a), Maenad (op. cit. pl. III, 7-9, no. 26 d), and Athena (op. cit. pl. II, 1-3, no. 12 c). The Asia Minor find contained the following: Aktaion (op. cit. pl. III, 18-20, no. 33 c), Kabeiros (op. cit. pl. II, 18-20, no. 21), Zeus (op. cit. pl. I, 14-18, no. 9 d), Hekate (op. cit. pl. II, 17, no. 20 a) and Persephone (?) (op. cit. pl. II, 13-16, no. 19 b), as well as one specimen each of the Maenad and Athena heads, found likewise in the Avola hoard. The contents of these two hoards correspond roughly with the pronouncedly earlier and later groups which our comparison of die and style has distinguished, since none of the coins from Avola are of the later style, while the Asia Minor hoard contained none of the earlier staters. Furthermore, the two staters common to both hoards, the Maenad and Athena types, are precisely of that style which, according to our chronological arrangement, lies intermediate between the easily recognized, earlier and later styles. The two hoards may therefore be said to dovetail chronologically, the latest staters in the Avola find, Maenad, Athena, and Zeus (cf. note 1, below) types furnishing a terminus post quem for the burial of that hoard, and the two former types in the Asia Minor hoard giving a terminus ante quem for the formation of the second hoard whose terminus post quem is supplied by the Persephone (?) type, which has commonly been recognized as showing a late style, a very decided falling-off from the high excellence of the Hekate, Zeus, and Aktaion heads which may safely be dated circ. 350 B.C. Now the Maenad and Athena heads must have been consecutive issues for their reverses show a horse of identical style, and there is a good deal of similarity in the style of their obverses. Later on we shall have occasion to show that the Athena head was issued circ. 360 B.C., and there would seem then no reason why the Avola find should be dated any later. But the find was reported as containing besides the Lampsakene staters, a number of silver

1) A specimen of the type Zeus (?), without the thunderbolt (op. cit. pl. I, 11—13) in the collection of M. R. Jameson is also said to have come from this find.
coins of the Fourth Century, a hundred-litra gold piece of Syracuse and a gold stater of Abydos, also a Persian daric. Lübbecke assumed, therefore, quite logically from his data, that the date of deposit was circ. 320 B.C., the limit furnished by the silver coins. We have it, however, on the authority of Mr. A. J. Evans that the Avola find as reported by Lübbecke was, in reality, a composite one, made up of two separate finds unearthed in Sicily at about the same time 1). If Lübbecke's hoard was a fusion of two distinct finds of gold and silver coins, the absence of any staters of Lampsakos of the later style, i.e. of 360-330 B.C., is readily accounted for, and the period represented by the coins in the gold hoard would be, circ. 410 B.C. or later, the date of the Syracusan gold coin, to circ. 360 B.C.

If, therefore, we assume circ. 360 B.C. to be the correct date of the burial of the Avola gold hoard, the contents of the finds from Sicily and Asia Minor corroborate our division of the staters into two well-defined groups of earlier and later coins, with an intermediate group, represented in the hoards by the staters common to both. Now, happily, there is one coin which can be approximately dated by external evidence which will throw light on the date of the coins of our middle group. This is the type bearing the head of a Persian satrap 2), which M. Babelon has, in my opinion, conclusively proved to be the portrait of the satrap, Orontas, who was governor of Mysia and Ionia, circ. 362-345 B.C. 3). This coin, according to the style of the head and the reverse type, falls precisely in that group which is intermediate between the two chief

1) Num. Chron. 1891, p. 297, note. "According to my own information more than one find has been discovered in the same Sicilian district within the last few years, and I have myself seen specimens of two hoards of very different composition one apparently dating from the early part of the Fourth Century, and the other from the beginning of the Third. The coins described by Herr Lübbecke seem to me to belong to two distinct hoards, one of early gold coins including besides the Syracusan, staters of Lampsakos and Abydos, and a Persian daric: the other of late silver coins, Pegasi etc."


3) Babelon, Traité, II 1, pp. 105 ff.
groups, that is, to the same group to which the above-mentioned Maenad and Athena types belong. The latter coin, indeed, may well have been issued by Orontas himself, for it is identical in treatment and style with the Athena head on the silver coins issued by this satrap, at Lampsakos, as we know from the reverse type of the latter, which bear the "arms" of this city, and are inscribed with his name. The occasion of the issues of these satrapal coins at Lampsakos is undoubtedly, as Six first pointed out, and M. Babelon has further developed, the revolt of the satraps against Artaxerxes II Mnemon, circ. 362 B. C. Our external evidence, then, both that supplied by the finds\(^1\) and that derived from historical data, in every way confirms the deductions drawn from the study of the types alone.

To return to the Kneeling Archer type, this coin, by its reverse, belongs among the very earliest issues of the first group. Preceding it, are the types, Herakles (op. cit. pl. I, 1, 2), Helle (?) (op. cit. pl. I, 3, 4), the new type recently published by M. Babelon, a Perseus head (Traité, II\(^2\), n. 2547, pl. CLXXI. 14, "tête d'Atys"), Nereid on a dolphin (op. cit. pl. I. 5) and Apollo seated (op. cit. pl. I, 6, 7). Immediately following it, comes the type, Niké sacrificing a ram (op. cit. pl. I. 9), of which the reverse, though not from an identical die, bears the strongest resemblance to that of the Archer coin.\(^2\) These two well-executed coins may quite probably be from the same hand. The date of our coin, which is thus placed sixth in the series, may be given as circ. 390-380 B. C.

The new coin brings up the total number of types known to forty. In the B. M. C. Mysia (1891) Wroth gave a list of thirty-one types. This number was increased in my paper (op. cit.) to thirty-six, by the addition of three coins published subsequent to Wroth's

---

1) A third find of Lampsakene staters is reported by Dr. Eddé in Ras. Num. (Voyages d'autrefois) 1909. The find was made near Alexandria in 1908, and contained, as far as can be ascertained, three staters bearing Maenad heads (op. cit. pl. III. 10, pl. III 4—6, and pl. III 7—9), and a fourth with the head of Helios (op. cit. pl. II. 21), types which belong to our earlier and middle groups.

2) cf. Pl. I, 9, 10.
list, and of two types (op. cit. nos. 27 and 35), known to Sestini, but not identified as separate types by Wroth. The existence of the present coin, which would form the thirty-seventh type, was mentioned in my paper, but the coin was not described nor illustrated. During the last decade, but one new type has come to light, the Perseus head above-noted, which forms the thirty-eighth type in the order of discovery. But, as a result of the rearrangement of the staters as outlined in this paper, it becomes clear that the three Dionysus heads which were formerly listed as one type are not merely three different dies employed for a single issue (whether annual or not need not now be discussed), but are rather three chronologically separate issues belonging respectively, to Group I, the earlier style (i. e. the Weber coin, op. cit. pl. III, 1), Group II, the intermediate style (i. e. the Waddington coin, op. cit. pl. III. 3) and to Group III, the fully-developed style (i. e. the Boston (Greenwell-Warren) specimen, op. cit. pl. III. 2). These three coins furnish us with a very neat illustration of the same subject treated according to the three chief styles discernible in the coinage. By classing them as separate types, as a glance at pl. III of the Journ. Int. de Num., 1902, will suffice to justify, we gain two more types, and arrive at forty as our total number.

The pose and action of the archer should be compared with that of the kneeling Apollo on the stater of Kyzikos (Pl. I, 2, 3)\(^1\) which is of somewhat earlier style, as the slightly cramped foreshortening of the right leg in itself would indicate\(^2\)). On the Lamp-sakene stater the kneeling is admirably managed, although it would be interesting to know how the artist succeeded with the left foot now off the flan, as the left leg seems stretched almost two far in advance. A similar pose is found in the kneeling Apollo of a coin of Sikyon (Pl. I, 4)\(^3\)), and in the kneeling figures of Artemis on

---

1) Babelon, Traité, II\(^2\), pl. CLXXIV. 27. B. M. C. Mysia, pl. VI. 10.
3) B. M. C. Peloponnesos, pl. VIII. 3.
coins of Sikyon (Pl. I, 5)\(^1\), Orchomenos (in Arcadia) (Pl. I, 6)\(^2\) and Chersonesos (Pl. I, 7)\(^3\). On the Kyzikene coin an arrow is held, together with the bow, in the left hand, as the Paris specimen (Pl. I, 2) clearly shows, and on our Lampsakene stater what looks like the shaft of an arrow, held horizontally, is visible. On the coins of Sikyon (Pl. I, 4, 5), Apollo and Artemis each hold an arrow in the left hand, but on the other coins (Pl. I, 6, 7), the presence or absence of an arrow is impossible to determine. What is the motif of these kneeling archers? I think we must understand that the artists intended to represent these figures as engaged in shooting the bow, and not as merely posing as archer, though the moment chosen is not the familiar one of archaic art, when the archer's hand is already on the bow-string and the arrow ready to be discharged\(^4\). In the B. M. Catalogue\(^5\), Apollo on the Kyzikene stater is said to be watching the effect of an arrow which he has just discharged, while Overbeck's description of this same figure as preparing to shoot, is rejected on the ground that Apollo holds no arrow. The more perfectly preserved Paris specimen (Pl. I, 2), however, shows that this objection cannot be supported. In fact, Overbeck's interpretation would appear to be the correct one, if it were not for the tense position of the right arm which would seem to indicate that the archer has just that very moment let fly an arrow. And, again, there is the arrow in the left hand. This incongruity in the representation may perhaps be best explained by assuming that the artist desired to represent his figure as keenly marking his aim, that is, preparing to shoot, with bow and arrow in readiness, and, that, to counteract the impression of inactivity which the pose might otherwise convey, the artist has caught that position of the right arm which would be natural

1) ibid., pl. VIII. 4.
2) ibid., pl. XXXV. 15.
4) Cilicia, Babelon, Traité IP, pl. CVI, 1-4. Thasos, Gardner, Types, pl. VII. 1.
5) Mysia, p. 26, n. 64 and note.
in the moment just succeeding the flight of the arrow. In his desire
to invent a variation of the stereotyped theme of the archer with
drawn bow, he has perhaps confused two moments of action, or,
as hinted above, he may have deliberately chosen to "gain his
effect", without giving any thought to anything else. The action
of the right arm has not infrequently been misunderstood by the
writers who have described these archer types, for the figures are
often described as picking up an arrow which is supposed to lie on
the ground under the right hand 1). On none of the examples of
these coins that I have seen is there any indication of an arrow on
the ground.

The costume which is worn by the archer on our Lampsakene
stater is best paralleled by that worn by the Persian satrap, Datames,
represented as an archer, on his coins struck in Cilicia (Babelon,
Traité II², 609-14, pl. CIX. 4-7). There is one feature however on
our stater, namely, the stiff jacket worn over the tunic above the
waist, which has no counterpart in the costume of Datames. The
latter costume, on the other hand, includes the χείλες, a sort
of arm-protector, which is not found on the Lampsakene stater.

It seems very doubtful to me whether the designation of
archers in barbarian costume similar to that worn by the archer
on our coin is correctly given as "Scythian" 2). All that we
know of any distinctly Seythian costume is derived from the vases
of local manufacture, found in the Crimea and its neighborhood,
on which are depicted barbarians whom we are doubtless correct
in considering as Seythians. Their unkempt appearance and long
hair brushed straight back from the forehead indicates a non-
civilized type. A distinctive feature of their dress is the twisted

---

1) e. g. Babelon op. cit. and Giel, op. cit.
2) Cf. the Kyzikene stater on which is a seated figure in barbarian
i.e. non-Greek costume, Babelon, Traité II², n. 2639, pl. CLXXIV. 14 "archer
seythe", and von Fritze, Nomisma VII, n. 166 Bärtiger Mann mit phrygischer
Mütze (?), Ärmelgewand, Hosen, etc. Also, Furtwaengler, Antike Gemmen,
p. 106, fig. 74, for a scarabaeus with an archer in Scythian (?) costume. cf.
E. H. Minns, Scythians and Greeks, on the subject of Seythian costume.
rope or cording which borders the neck and front of the upper garment.

**Note on the date of the Gold Staters.**

The usually accepted date for the beginning of this coinage, circ. 394 B.C., a well-established landmark in Greek numismatic chronology, seems to me open to certain objections. This is the date assigned by Waddington to the “Alliance Coinage” of Asia Minor 1), bearing the common type, Herakles strangling the serpents, from which the type of the first Lampsakene stater was obviously copied. Since Waddington’s time, a new member of the Symmachia has become known through the discovery of the unique tridrachm of Byzantion published by Dr. Regling. This coin, it has been shown, cannot have been struck before 389 B.C. 2) Now, if, as Waddington ingeniously argued, the Symmachia was an anti-Spartan confederation among certain powerful coast-tows and islands of Asia Minor formed directly after the Battle of Knidos in 394 B.C., when Konon aided by Pharnabazos freed these towns from Spartan misrule, then one is forced to assume that Byzantion, which, as we now know, belonged to the league, came into it some five years after its formation. This fact would be less extraordinary if the league had endured for any considerable time, but in 391 B.C., as Xenophon informs us 3), three of its most important members, Ephesos, Samos and Knidos had abandoned the “Alliance”, and

1) Rev. Num. 1863, p. 223. These coins, which are silver tridrachms of Rhodian weight, bear, on the obverse, the “Alliance” type, and, on the reverse, one of the “arms” or badges peculiar to either obverse or reverse of the regular issue. Ephesos, Rhodos, Knidos, Iasos and Samos have long been known to have belonged to the league, and, more recently, Byzantion has been shown to have taken part in it. cf. Regling, Ein Tridrachmon von Byzantion, Zeit. f. Num. 1905, pp. 207 ff.

2) The “Alliance” type, which is so clearly emblematic of a union for the purpose of political liberty, would not be appropriate for Byzantion in the early part of the Fourth Century when she was under the oligarchical control of Sparta; only when democracy was re-established there, after Thrasybulos’ expedition in 389 B.C. would such a type be admissible.

3) Hell. IV. 8: 17, 22, 23.
gone over to the enemy, Sparta, against whom supposedly the league had originally been directed. Waddington, unaware of the existence of the Byzantine coin, assumed that the league, having suffered this defection of three powerful, supporting members, ended its ephemeral existence, unrecorded by ancient historians, in 391 B.C. Later writers, now that the Byzantine coin has turned up, have concluded that the league was not after all entirely disrupted in 391, but must have continued until circ. 387, the date of Antalkidas' Peace. It should be remarked that the historians, Beloch 1) and Meyer 2) have always preferred the date 387 for the issue of the "Alliance" coins, as they have been unable to accept the theory of an anti-Spartan movement consequent upon the Battle of Knidos. Personally, I see no difficulty in accepting this date, after the King's Peace, for the issue of these coins. One may be surprised perhaps to think of the Great King as countenancing such an alliance among his dependant communities, but all that we know of Artaxerxes II tends to prove that he was a weak King 3), and, after all, he had obtained the coast-towns and islands at no personal effort or loss, but through the use of superfluous Persian gold. It seems to me that on just such an occasion namely, when a "Peace" had been drawn up in terms unlikely ever to be rigorously enforced, the Greek cities might wish to fling down defiance to Persian assumption of suzerainty in a belated, desperate attempt to accomplish the union they always failed to develop. Quite similar then in its origin would this spasmodic impulse towards federation be to the league of Ionian cities of the early Fifth Century, which became a reality when it led the Revolt against Persia, and

2) Gesch. des Altertums V, p. 308 and 310.
3) For a contrary view, see F. H. Marshall, Second Athenian Confederacy, p. 3, Note. The theory that the Persian Kings arrogated to themselves the exclusive privilege of issuing coin in gold (Gardner, Coinage of Asia) is completely untenable (Babelon, Traité I, Introduction), and the Lampsaikene gold coinage may perfectly well have begun after the city had again fallen under Persian control.
even, as we know to-day, struck coins to commemorate the union\(^1\). Recalling the traditions of fraternity, and impelled by the same fear as their ancestors, the Ionians and their allies, as Mr. Percy Gardner so aptly says, made one final attempt to "galvanize the corpse".

Whatever the opinion of historians may ultimately be in regard to the date of the Alliance issues, the Lampsakene stater which borrowed the Alliance type cannot be placed any earlier than 389 B.C., for the reason that it is copied with utmost fidelity of detail from the Byzantine tridrachm. The axis of inclination of the kneeling Herakles, the coils of the serpents, position of the arms, all indicate that the Byzantine coin served as a model for the Lampsakene engraver.

The lower limit of the coinage is given in the B. M. Cat. as "circ. 350" B.C. It is also noted in the Introduction to this catalogue (p. XXVI) that Six supposed that the coinage ceased in 330 B.C. with the introduction of Alexander the Great's gold staters, rather than in 350 B.C. when Philip's issues began. Six's reason for suggesting the later date was his interpretation of three of the Lampsakene types as relating to Alexander. The Zeus Ammon head (op. cit. pl. I, 20) he considered as Alexander's reputed father, the youthful heroic head (op. cit. pl. III. 22) was Alexander himself as the god-hero "Achilles", and the Maenad head (op. cit. pl. III, 4-6) he regarded as Olympias, the wild-natured mother of Alexander, in the guise of a Maenad. This triad of Alexander's favorite divinities was chosen by the city to show its gratitude to Alexander for his forbearance in sparing the inhabitants on his victorious march into Asia Minor in 334 B.C. Fanciful as this interpretation sounds, it will be readily admitted that the "Achilles" head has a somewhat Alexandrine character, and it is certainly curious that the reverse of this coin is of identical style with that of the Ammon coin, so that I see no reason, seeing that the coins

---

do belong towards the end of the series, why the types may not have been chosen out of compliment to Alexander. With the Maenad head, it is a different matter. That part of Six's theory, I find extremely far-fetched. As has been shown above, there are three main styles exhibited by the coinage, and this Maenad head (to be distinguished from the other Maenad type so frequently mentioned in this paper) is one of these undeniably "middle," types which belong to Group II, the lower limit of which we have fixed at circ. 360 B.C. Six, himself, at a later date (Num. Chron. 1894, p. 310) when classifying this same type according to the style of the reverses, placed it among a group of staters which he dated about 355 B.C. But, aside from the fact that we may have two types in the Lampsakene series which are connected with Alexander, there is greater intrinsic probability in the assumption that the Lampsakene gold coinage, like that in electrum at Kyzikos, did not cease abruptly with the mere initiation of Philip's gold coinage, but only came to a gradual end, when Alexander's abundant issues had begun to flood the marts of Asia Minor.

The dates then which we should assign to the series are circ. 390-330 B.C., or, more exactly, 387 B.C. to circ. 330 B.C.