

APPENDIX FIVE. *Pegasi* of Ambracia

in Hoards

In *IGCH* and *CH* vols. 1–6, *pegasi* of Ambracia occur in eight hoards which have been dated to the reigns of Philip and Alexander: from Aetolia, *IGCH* 72 (350–325): 1 Ambracian coin in a total of 12; from Sicily, *IGCH* 2127 (ca. 350): 4 in 29+; *IGCH* 2130 (ca. 350–340): 4 (5) in 91; *IGCH* 2131 (ca. 340): 10 in 88; *IGCH* 2132 (ca. 340–330): 1 in 26; *IGCH* 2133 (ca. 340–330): 16 in 327; *IGCH* 2135 (350–325): 2 in 47; *CH* 3.20 (340): 2 in 42?

There are *pegasi* of Ambracia in eighteen hoards dated ca. 325–275 B.C.: from western Greece? *IGCH* 88 (ca. 325–300): 3 in 28+; from Cephallenia, *IGCH* 140 (ca. 300–275): ? in ca. 350–400; from southern Italy, *IGCH* 1948 (ca. 300?): 2 in a large hoard; from Sicily, *IGCH* 2144 (333–332, or 320–310): 5 in ca. 245; *IGCH* 2145 (320–310): 16 in ca. 300?; *IGCH* 2147 (ca. 310): 1 in 277+; *IGCH* 2148 (ca. 310): 2 in 58+; *IGCH* 2149 (ca. 310?): 3 in 65; *IGCH* 2151 (ca. 300): 9 in 642; *IGCH* 2152 (ca. 300 or ca. 220): 1 in 16; *IGCH* 2153 (ca. 300): 2 in 77; *IGCH* 2180 (early 3rd): 6 in ca. 530; *IGCH* 2181 (early 3rd): ? in 460; *IGCH* 2185 (ca. 289): 1 in 269; *IGCH* 2187 (early 3rd): 19 in 169; *IGCH* 2189 (early 3rd): 1 in 23; from southern Italy, *CH* 1.39 (late 4th): 1 in 13; from Sicily, *CH* 2.63 (280): 1 in 13+. I have not included *IGCH* 201 from Epirus, which has an unknown number of Ambracian drachms and is dated only to the “3rd cent. B.C.”

The available information on the state of wear of the coins in these hoards is, as usual, not extensive. Of the coins illustrated from *IGCH* 2131, one of the Ambracian coins is corroded, but the other is approximately as worn as the E series *pegasus* of Cor-

¹ See *NotSc* 1954, p. 72, figs. 2.5 (Corinth) and 2.12 (Ambracia).

inth also shown.¹ The E series appears to belong to the 340s.² The condition of the one Ambracian coin in *IGCH* 72 is “très bien” as opposed to the “bien” of the most recent Corinthian coin in the hoard, a stater of Ravel’s group IV, which is probably to be dated to the first half of the fourth century.³ This information need not mean that Ambracian coinage continued past *ca.* 338–336, but in *IGCH* 2144 there are two Ambracian coins illustrated (*NC* 1928, pl. 6, nos. 11–12) whose condition is slightly worse than that of the two Corinthian *pegasi* of the ΑΑ series (pl. 6, nos. 5–6) but better than that of a Δ series *pegasus* (pl. 6, no. 9). Both the ΑΑ and Δ series are more recent than the E series. In *IGCH* 2149, the condition of the only Ambracian coin described is “buona,” while the Corinthian staters range from “buona” to “ottima conservazione.”⁴ Unfortunately the other two Ambracian coins of *IGCH* 2149 cannot be identified from the publication, but one of them is, according to Ravel’s scheme in his arrangement of Ambracian coinage, more recent than the coin listed as “buona.” In *IGCH* 88, two of the Ambracian coins are apparently more worn than the Corinthian staters of the letter series, all of which are described as in good (καλή) condition.⁵ These two Ambracian coins, however, are not of Ravel’s most recent types. The third Ambracian coin, of a type (quiver and bow symbol) not found in Ravel’s catalogue, is as well preserved as the Corinthian coins (καλή).

In *IGCH* 2151, there are tetradrachms of Alexander III together with Ambracian and Corinthian coins.⁶ The condition of five of the eight tetradrachms is given as “media,” of the remaining three, “buona.” Only eight of the nine Ambracian staters have their condition listed, five “media” and three “cattiva.” As a group, therefore, the Ambracian coins are more worn than the Alexander tetradrachms, but as a smaller denomination

² See G. K. Jenkins, “A Note on Corinthian Coins in the West,” in *Centennial Publication of the American Numismatic Society*, ed. Harald Ingholt (New York, 1958), pp. 373–374.

³ See *BCH* 86 (1962), p. 421.

⁴ See *AJN* 5–6 (1958–1959), pp. 167–177.

⁵ See *JIAN* 11 (1908), pp. 258–260.

⁶ See *AJN* 5–6 (1958–1959), pp. 125–165.

the staters would have shown more evidence of wear than would the tetradrachms in a similar period of circulation. Therefore, the staters in this hoard do not have to be older than the tetradrachms of Alexander.

The condition of the Corinthian staters from the letter series in this hoard ranges from "cattiva" to "buona." One gains the impression that the Ambracian staters could be contemporary with the earlier Corinthian staters from the letter series but that the letter series continued to be produced for a longer period than did the issues of Ambracia. This impression is reinforced by the state of wear of the coins in *IGCH* 2187.⁷ The condition of the Ambracian staters ranges from "media" to "ottima." As a group they are at least as well preserved as the letter-series staters of Corinth in the hoard ("pessima" to "buona"). The conditions of the two *pegasi* of the period of Agathocles at Syracuse found in the hoard are given as "quasi-buona" and "buona." Of the Ambracian coins, the condition of two is "quasi-buona," of three "buona," and of one "ottima." Since the Agathocles coins probably belong to the period *ca.* 306–289 B.C., while the letter-series staters of Corinth are to be dated to the last four decades of the fourth century, the date of at least some of the Ambracian coins should be later than the 330s, perhaps a good deal later.

⁷ See *AJN* 5–6 (1958–1959), pp. 91–124.