

APPENDIX SIX. Sicyonian Silver Coins

in Hoards

The following hoards from the period *ca.* 330–200 B.C., all from mainland Greece, are on record in *IGCH* and *CH* vols. 1–6 as containing silver coins of Sicyon. *IGCH* 67 (350–325): 10 Sicyonian coins in a total of *ca.* 150; *IGCH* 68 (*ca.* 350–325): 2 in 38; *IGCH* 70 (350–325): 12 in 42; *IGCH* 73 (*ca.* 350–325?): 60 in 62; *IGCH* 75 (*ca.* 330–320): 78? in *ca.* 100; *IGCH* 76 (*ca.* 327): 6 in 35; *IGCH* 78 (*ca.* 323): 15 in 133; *IGCH* 81 (*ca.* 319): 3 in 37+; *IGCH* 83 (*ca.* 315–310): 2 in 150+; *IGCH* 93 (*ca.* 310–300): 1 in 112; *IGCH* 111 (late 4th): 3 in *ca.* 69; *IGCH* 115 (end of 4th): 22 in 22; *IGCH* 117 (*ca.* 300): 2 in 38; *IGCH* 122 (*ca.* 300): 5 in 28; *IGCH* 129 (310–290): 13 in 478+; *IGCH* 130 (early 3rd): 3 in 37+; *IGCH* 132 and *CH* 3.31 (280): 7 in 55+; *IGCH* 133 (early 3rd): 2 in 11+; *IGCH* 159 (*ca.* 264 or 260–240): 3 in 61; *IGCH* 162 (*ca.* 250): 1 in 30; *IGCH* 170 (250–240): 31 in 33; *IGCH* 173 (*ca.* 250–225): 26 in 50; *IGCH* 176 (*ca.* 235–225): 2 in 82; *IGCH* 182 (after 265 or *ca.* 220): 31 in 55; *IGCH* 195 (*ca.* 225–200?): 27 in 63; *IGCH* 199 (3rd): 7 in 11; *IGCH* 207 (late 3rd): 1 in 15; *CH* 2.42 (350–325): 4 in 25+; *CH* 2.51 (323–320): 1 in 9+; *CH* 2.74 (3rd?): 52 in 75+; *CH* 2.75 (3rd?): an abundance in a large hoard; *CH* 3.43 (229–228): 2 in 38; *CH* 6.24 (270): 9 in 575.

Information on the condition of these coins is available only in a limited number of cases. The Sicyonian obols in *IGCH* 78 are in FDC condition, which is better than the condition of all but one of the accompanying Olympian coins.¹ Furthermore, the Sicyonian coins in *IGCH* 78 are contemporary with those in *IGCH* 76, which Newell dated to the early 320s by comparison

¹ These latter specimens are from the most recent period of production of the mint at Olympia, 363–323 B.C., according to C. T. Seltman, *The Temple Coins of Olympia* (Cambridge, 1921), pp. 111–113.

with the condition of the Macedonian coins in the latter hoard.² The condition of the Sicyonian staters in *IGCH* 83 matches that of the lifetime and early posthumous Alexander tetradrachms in the hoard.³ In *IGCH* 122, four of the five Sicyonian coins are better preserved than the coins of Thebes, which of course should be no later than 335 B.C.⁴

In *ICGH* 159 the staters of Sicyon are worn, but not as badly as are the smaller denomination Alexander III drachms. On the other hand, the condition of the two Theban staters in the hoard is perhaps comparable to that of the more worn Sicyonian staters but much worse than that of the best preserved specimen of the latter group.⁵ The Theban and Sicyonian coins are the same denomination, but we should notice that the Theban types have almost no raised detail which would show signs of wear as quickly as would the fine detail of the more elaborate Sicyonian types. After a similar period of circulation, coins of Sicyon should perhaps appear more worn than Theban coins of the same denomination. Therefore, the Sicyonian staters in *IGCH* 159 should be more recent than the Theban staters in the hoard. But it must be admitted that reliable analysis is difficult when the coins from a hoard have experienced extremely extended periods of circulation. Of the specimens illustrated from *IGCH* 173, the triobol and stater of Sicyon are in better condition than the tetradrachm and drachm of Alexander III and in approximately the same condition as the drachm of Lysimachus (Lampsacus, 299 B.C.).⁶ Similar comparisons can be made from *IGCH* 176. The two Sicyonian staters are at least as well preserved as four of the five Alexander drachms in the hoard, and their condition is

² See Seltman, *Temple Coins*, p. 112.

³ See E. T. Newell, *Alexander Hoards III: Andritsaena* (New York, 1923). Compare, for example, no. 107 (Sicyon) in pl. 5 with no. 53 (posthumous Alexander) in pl. 3.

⁴ See *ArchDelt* 18 (1963), *Chronica* p. 6; 24 (1969), *Chronica* p. 9.

⁵ See *AA* 1958, pp. 38–62. Nos. 47–49 are Sicyonian, nos. 38–39 Theban.

⁶ See *BCH* 80 (1956), p. 227, pl. 6, nos. 5–6 (Alexander), 7 (Lysimachus), and 12–13 (Sicyon).

significantly better than that of the Theban stater in the hoard.⁷ In *IGCH* 182, the Sicyonian triobols seem to be slightly better preserved as a group than either the drachms of Chalcis or the drachm and triobol of Corinth.⁸

In *CH* 3.31, the three Sicyonian drachms illustrated seem to be at least as well preserved as the three drachms of Alexander III and one of Philip III. In *CH* 3.43, the two Sicyonian staters are generally comparable in their condition to the other later fourth-century coins in the hoard. Obviously none of these comparisons can be regarded as precise, especially when they are made from photographs. On the basis of the available evidence, one might guess that the mint of Sicyon may have closed at least for a while in the last quarter of the fourth century, like the mints in Thessaly.

⁷ See E. T. Newell, *Alexander Hoards IV: Olympia* (New York, 1929), nos. 32–33 (Sicyon), 50 (Thebes), and 58–61 (Alexander).

⁸ See *ArchDelt* 14 (1931–1932), pp. 71–77.