The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Corolla Numismatica *Corolla Numismatica: Numismatic Essays in Honour of Barclay V. Head*. Pp. vi + 386. Portrait and 18 Plates. Oxford University Press: H. Frowde, 1906. 30s. net.

Ronald M. Burrows

The Classical Review / Volume 22 / Issue 07 / November 1908, pp 221 - 224

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00002092, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00002092

How to cite this article:

Ronald M. Burrows (1908). The Classical Review, 22, pp 221-224 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00002092

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

430^b 16-17. The proposed interpretation of this deserves sympathy as an attempt to interpret without emending. But it seems impossible to explain *κατὰ συμβεβηκός* as meaning *τὸ κατὰ συμβεβηκός διαιρετόν*, when *διαιρετόν* has not occurred in the immediate context. Mr. Hicks does not seem very clear about his own view, for he translates *οὐχ ἡ . . . ἀλλ' ἡ* 'not in the same way as . . . but in the same way as,' but says in the note 'not in the sense that . . . but in the sense that.' 'In the same way as' and 'in the sense that' are very different things. It seems much better to excise *ἀλλ' ἡ ἀδιαίρετα* with Torstrik, or *ὅ νοεῖ καὶ ἐν ᾧ χρόνῳ* with Prof. Cook Wilson.

431^a 22. *οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὥς ὅροι* is not, and probably cannot be, satisfactorily translated.

433^a 29. *πρακτὸν δ' . . . ἔχειν* is mis-translated. *ἀγαθόν* is not to be supplied with *πρακτόν*. The point is not that practical good is 'something which may not be good under all circumstances,' but that the *πρακτόν* in general is that which need not *exist* in all circumstances. Cf. the passages quoted in the note.

433^b 21. *ὁργανικῶς* is not 'by means of organs' but 'as an organ.' Cf. l. 19.

434^a 13. It is very difficult to suppose that *καὶ κινεῖ* has nothing to do with *βούλησιν* and is purely parenthetical; it seems better to suppose that *ἐπιθυμία* is loosely said to move *βούλησις*. *κινεῖ* is really more prominent in the writer's mind than *νικᾷ*, as *ὥσπερ σφαῖρα* shows. The reasons for taking *σφαῖρα* as 'celestial sphere' rather than 'ball' are forcibly stated. But it is surely wrong to take *φύσει . . . κινεῖσθαι* as still part of the astronomical simile. The influence of one sphere on another is a good illustration of Aristotle's meaning, but any reference to the *number* of the motions of the spheres seems irrelevant. It is better to take *φύσει . . . κινεῖσθαι* as referring to the *ὁρέξεις*, following Simplicius on the first and Themistius on the second clause. The word *φοράς* is, however, probably suggested by the astronomical simile.

434^a 17. 'Judgment or proposition' apparently (cf. p. 572, l. 6) means 'unspoken or spoken proposition.' But this distinction is expressly set aside, p. 572, l. 8, and is not implied in the Greek; *καί* is simply explicative.

W. D. Ross.

COROLLA NUMISMATICA.

Corolla Numismatica: Numismatic Essays in Honour of Barclay V. Head. Pp. vi+386. Portrait and 18 Plates. Oxford University Press: H. Frowde, 1906. 30s. net.

It would be superfluous to spend much time in praising this Festschrift. It is enough to say that it is a collection of articles by thirty of the leading numismatists of the world, and has been admirably edited by G. F. Hill. It is naturally full of tributes to the great position Barclay Head has filled for nearly half a century as a *νεωκόρος τῆς νομισματικῆς*, as Behrendt Pick has put it.

The most useful way of reviewing a collection of miscellaneous essays like this is to pick out points that are likely to be of interest to the general classical scholar, and the best

arrangement is the roughly chronological one.

(1) We begin earlier than any coin book has ever begun before with Arthur Evans's Minoan dump. I remember with pain that I described it fully in my *Discoveries in Crete* (pp. 15-17), and have delayed a year before reviewing the whole book. It is enough here to say that Evans believes he has found an actual coin, a dump of silver dropped while molten on to a marked surface.

(2) Earle Fox shows (pp. 34-5) that there is a change of animal on the coins of Aegina, the sea turtle being replaced by the land tortoise. The first he places before 431, the latter after 404, and treats the survival of the incuse reverse in these later coins as a piece of business conservatism. He draws a

distinction between what he calls anvil-struck and punch-struck coins, finding a *via media* between the theory supported by Arthur Evans in the same book (p. 366), that the obverse was on the upper side of all early Greek coins, and the more common theory that it was on the lower side. Fox shows that on the coins of Aegina, and practically all other early coins of the Greek mainland, the flattened surface of the reverse all round the sharp incuse impression means that the incuse was engraved on a raised projection and fixed in an anvil,—the obverse die being hammered in on the upper side; but that in the early coins of Asia Minor and of Athens the irregular bulging surface round the actual impression on the reverse means that the obverse die was below and the metal driven into it from above by a punch marked with the incuse. On this view the Minoan dump, whose only marking is on its lower side, has its tradition closest preserved in the coinage of Asia Minor and Athens, and not in that of Aegina. This is what we should expect (see *Discoveries in Crete*, pp. 17 and 118). One important inference from this view is that Athens, borrowing its methods from Asia and not from its neighbours, may have well also borrowed from that source, even in the early Sixth Century, a type instead of an incuse for the reverse. One of Babelon's strongest arguments against a Solonian coinage is thus refuted. We need not, it may be added, follow Fox in his late date of 620 for Pheidon and the beginnings of coinage in Europe. Although he grants that an electrum coinage existed 'many years earlier' in Asia Minor, he is writing before D. G. Hogarth's book on Ephesus (pp. 238–42) with its 24 Lydian coins found in a foundation deposit of about 700 B.C. Apart from all question of the date of Pheidon, Europe could scarcely have stayed behind in development so long.

(3) E. Babelon publishes an important coin of the tyrant Hippias, bought by him at Smyrna. It is the first coin found bearing the name of Hippias, and while its obverse bears the head of Athena without the olive crown, its reverse has an ear of corn behind the owl. Both Eretria and Sigeium are rejected as the place where it was struck,

and some town in the Thracian Chersonnese is provisionally accepted.

(4) Percy Gardner discusses the now well-known coin of Magnesia which originated the story of the death of Themistocles by drinking bull's blood, and suggests that we can find a copy of his statue in a marble now at Munich.

(5) R. Weil deals with the whole question of Themistocles at Magnesia. Incidentally he suggests that the fifty talents Themistocles is said to have received from Magnesia shows that he was master not only of the city itself but of a large area round, and was a vassal prince on the scale of Mausolus. He ingeniously draws a connection between this and the mention of *Μαγνητες οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ* in Hdt. iii. 90 as one of seven units, who together furnished 400 talents as tribute to Darius. In comparing, however, the 50 talents with the small sums at which various Ionian cities are assessed in the Athenian tribute lists, it should be remembered (a) that we cannot assume that the seven units paid in practically equal proportion; (b) that Themistocles, the resident governor, would naturally get a much bigger revenue from a city than would go to headquarters at Susa; (c) that the Athenian Empire was made extraordinarily cheap for cities, however admittedly rich, that were liable to temptation from the hinterland. In regard to the question as to whether the plated Didrachm and Drachm prove that Themistocles was issuing debased coinage (see Hill's *Historical Greek Coins*, p. 48), Weil remarks that in the Didrachm, at least, the die is of an inferior style to that of the two good silver ones that are also extant, and points to forgery by private individuals rather than to trickery by the head of the state. This is a valid argument if we can assume the date to be the same, but is there no precedent for a given king's coinage beginning good and ending bad? We await, too, the inspection by some competent numismatist of the plated drachm which lies unpublished in a private collection at Aidin.

(6) C. Jørgensen shows that the extant coins of Thurii cover its history from its foundation in 443 onwards.

(7) C. Oman points out the deliberate

archaism of Corinthian coins up to 460 B.C. He also makes the interesting suggestion that the four dolphins that suddenly appear on its later coins are a compliment to Syracuse, and are to be connected with the failure of the Sicilian expedition in 413, in which the Corinthians played so large a part. They would thus be a counter to the well-known Cimon Decadrachms of Syracuse itself.

(8) G. F. Hill, the editor of the volume, publishes a coin of what is almost certainly the Messenian Asine, showing traces of a cult of Dryops and a representation on the reverse of the ἀρχαῖον ἀγαλμα mentioned by Pausanias iv. 34, 99. The resemblance Hill points out to the archaic hero reliefs of Sparta (Wace and Tod, pp. 121-2, 133-4) when combined with the indications of Pausanias, suggests that Asine may have been almost as truly an ἐπιτείχισμα of Sparta in Messenia as Naupactus was of Athens in the Corinthian gulf. That Sparta made use of it in the Peloponnesian War may be seen from Thuc. iv. 13, vi. 93. That it was expected to take the side of Sparta is seen too from the gratitude of Messenia for its not doing so in the first Theban invasion (Paus. iv. 27, 8). It is probable that it is our Asine that is referred to by Xen. *Hell.* vii. 1, 25, and that the attack on its Spartan garrison by the Arcadians refers to some early phase of this invasion; but Underhill (*Commentary on the Hellenica*, p. 275) must have failed to notice the passage in Pausanias when he suggests that it happened after the foundation of Messene, and that Asine 'had not been incorporated in the new independent district of Messenia.'

(9) H. Weber publishes a coin of Smyrna with types exactly like those of Colophon. The history of Smyrna is a blank between its destruction by Alyattes at the end of the Seventh Century, and its refoundation after the death of Alexander. The late J. P. Six makes the ingenious suggestion that Colophon, its old μητρόπολις, may have tried to refound it before this, when Conon and Pharnabazus declared the coast towns free after the battle of Cnidus. We must await confirmation of this from some new fragment of the Oxyrhynchus historian.

(10) J. Svoronos publishes a die of the

reverse of an Athenian tetradrachm of the late Fifth and early Fourth Century style, found in Egypt in the same place as six months before there had been found a hoard of several hundreds of the tetradrachms. It differs from all dies of ancient coins hitherto found in being a genuine article of the state mint, and not the work of a contemporary forger. It must have been a fruitful source of revenue to the workman who ran away with it to Egypt.

(11) E. J. Rapson gives several convincing new readings of Graeco-Indian coins. His suggestion, however, that the term Θεότροπος, as applied to the Queen Regent Agathokleia, is to be explained on the analogy of the Homeric πολύτροπος, and construed 'quae regis vice fungitur, or specifically quae divi [Euthydemus] vice fungitur,' is unsound. The formation is different and the analogy does not help us. None the less the way Θεότροπος occurs shows it is a title and refers to the Queen's Regency. It is not merely a longer equivalent for Θεία. Θεός, too, as Rapson says, is the translation of devah, the ordinary Sanskrit word for a prince. Was the controlling force of ἐπὶ in ἐπίτροπος, the ordinary word for 'guardian,' misunderstood, and Θεότροπος invented as an apparently parallel form, with the sense of 'directing a prince,' 'guardian of a prince'? I do not know any use of the simple τρέπω which could of itself justify such a rendering, but its root meaning may have given a plausible *prima facie* support to what would on my hypothesis be a kind of title in shorthand.

(12) V. Regling finds Charaspes, a king who figures in rare coins, not, as others have done, in Syria or Armenia, but on the west coast of the Black Sea, behind Tomi, working him into a Dynasty between two other kings, Canites and Acrossander.

(13) A. de la Fuye studies the Persian coinage immediately prior to the Sassanid Dynasty.

(14) H. von Fritze, the autonomous coinage of Pergamum.

(15) P. Perdrizet, the site of Nicopolis on the Mestos.

(16) B. Pick, the νεοκόρραι of Ephesus.

(17) The late Sir John Evans publishes an aureus of Pescennius Niger.

(18) R. Mowat makes a careful list of the countermarked coins of Side in Pamphylia. Incidentally (p. 192) he brings out the change of attitude among modern numismatists to all such coins. Eighteenth Century collectors looked on them as inferior specimens and would hardly admit them into their cabinets.

(19) T. Reinach deals with the Achilles motif on Thessalian coins. He calls attention to the pedum or mace carried by Arcadian levies and by the cavalry of Pharsalia. The Pharsalians appear to have been a force of ἀμύρτοι, an armed squire running by the side of each mace-bearing horseman.

(20) H. A. Grueber shows that Luceria issued from 268 to 217 B.C. an autonomous coinage under the control of the city, as well as a military one under the Roman governor.

(21) H. Willers rejects Livy's 268 B.C. for the beginning of the silver coinage of Rome in favour of Pliny's 269.

(22) E. Haeberlin argues for the view that the head on Roman denarii from the foundation of this silver coinage is not that of Minerva, but of Roma. He rightly points out (p. 151) that it is no argument against it that the Samnites in the social war put the head on their coins. They took it over for their Italia, just as they took over many

other details of Roman organization, such as the double consulship.

(23) H. Dressel accepts as 'sicher echt' a Hadrian medallion divae Matidiae, which Mommsen pronounced 'sicher falsch.' On this hypothesis he ably argues against both Lanciani's and Hülsen's views on the Matidia Temple, and reconstructs it from the representation on the medallion as standing between two aediculae, with a basilica on either side.

(24) H. Gaebler describes the formation of the collection of Queen Christina of Sweden.

(25) A. Sambon urges the possibility of distinguishing Italian intaglios from those of the Greek mainland by the criteria afforded by coin types.

(26) Warwick Wroth discusses the future of Byzantine Numismatics.

(27) G. Macdonald points out the importance of the question as to whether given dies were fixed or loose, and the possibility of a 'die test,' when once they were fixed, as a criterion of date. The obverse and reverse dies of the same coin may be placed in respect to each other either as $\uparrow\uparrow$ or $\uparrow\downarrow$ or $\uparrow\rightarrow$, and the custom varies in different periods and countries. Macdonald suggests that these symbols might with advantage be added to all descriptions of coins.

RONALD M. BURROWS.

DUBOIS' POUZZOLES ANTIQUE.

Pouzzoles Antique. (Histoire et Topographie). By C. DUBOIS. Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome. Fasc. 98. Paris: Fontemoing, 1907. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. xi + 450. 1 map. Fr.

M. DUBOIS' volume on ancient Puteoli is a careful work for which students of local history and topography will be grateful. The historical section of the book (pp. 1-185) deals incidentally with various difficult problems in which the evidence for both sides is clearly put forward, e.g. as to the correct attribution of the coins bearing the Oscan inscription *Fistlus*, the tribe to which

Puteoli belonged, etc. The chapter on the commercial history of Puteoli is especially interesting, and (to take one especially knotty point) in the discussion as to the interpretation of the letter to the Senate of Tyre of 174 A.D. (*C.I.G.* xiv, 830), M. Dubois seems to me perfectly right in translating *στατίων* as 'factory,' and in determining it to be neither a 'schola,' still less a mere tribune from which to view the festivals in the Forum, but a depot of the Tyrian traders at Puteoli of some considerable size. The imports and exports of Puteoli are also well described, and the first section closes with an enumeration of the many cults, Greek, Roman, indigenous,