

Zeitschrift: Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau = Revue suisse de numismatique = Rivista svizzera di numismatica
Herausgeber: Schweizerische Numismatische Gesellschaft
Band: 46 (1967)

Artikel: Peparethos : the early coinage reconsidered
Autor: Balcer, Jack Martin
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-173834>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 11.09.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

PEPARETHOS: THE EARLY COINAGE RECONSIDERED

During the past three-quarters of a century, several numismatists have discussed a group of early Greek silver tetradrachms, didrachms and tetrobols which bear the obverse types of the grape-cluster. These coins have been attributed accordingly to Cyrene, the Macedonian Chalcidice, Scione, Peparethos and Naxos, within a period as early as c. 530 B. C. or as late as c. 467 B. C. The latest discussion of these coins is that of J. G. Milne, who assigned several of the tetradrachms to the Aegean island of Naxos and to the period of her rebellion against Athens and the Delian Confederacy c. 467¹. Milne's observations claim that Naxos minted a series of coins to mark her revolution against Athens, and that the series ended when Athens subjected the island to her control, and closed the Naxian mint. If this theory is correct, the numismatist would be adding valuable historical information to the scant references by Thucydides (i. 98.4, 137.2) concerning the secession of Naxos from the Confederacy. To ascribe these coins to the Naxian rebellion, however, does not seem to be the correct evaluation of the evidence. A careful reappraisal suggests a return to the earlier attribution of these coins to Peparethos.

In 1891, B. V. Head published three archaic tetradrachms (Euboeic-Attic standard) from the 1891 Hoard from Kos which bore an obverse type of grape-clusters and reverses with various distinct die types². The following year, W. Wroth questioned but nevertheless accepted Head's conjecture that their origin was Cyrene³. Five years later, G. F. Hill suggested that their origin could have been the Macedonian Chalcidice⁴. In 1905, J. N. Svoronos suggested Scione⁵. The acquisition by the British Museum in 1906 of a tetradrachm found at Scopelos (ancient Peparethos) with a grape-cluster obverse type bearing the inscription ΠΕ led Wroth to reconsider his former attribution, and in 1907, he published an analysis of these tetradrachms and identified the source of the coins as neither Cyrene nor the Chalcidice but Peparethos⁶. The attribution to Cyrene was replaced by Peparethos not only on the basis of the provenance of the marked tetradrachm but also by Wroth's earlier arguments – questioning Head's theory – that the obverse type was the canting badge of the wine-producing community of Peparethos and not the silphium badge of Cyrene.

In 1941 Milne, reviewing the work of Head, Hill, Svoronos and Wroth, proposed that the coins should be attributed to the Naxian revolt from the Delian Confederacy in 467 B. C.⁷. Milne argued that: (1) although there was a strong likeness among the obverse types, the dissimilarities of their style and conception were more striking; (2) to base attribution upon provenance one should consider the origin of three

specimens from Kos more preferable to the one specimen from Peparethos and, therefore, not consider provenance at all; and (3) the grape motif was so common a Greek coin-type that it could be attributed to numerous other states. Milne's opinion remains unaccepted yet unchallenged.

His basic argument that the style and fabric of the tetradrachms are quite dissimilar is not convincing. Of the nine tetradrachms, a die linkage exists between Series I and II: the tetradrachms 1 and 2 (Series I) are linked by a common obverse, the pieces 3, 4 and 5 (Series II) have a second common obverse, and in addition 2 and 3 are linked by a common reverse. Between Series III and IV, a common reverse links tetradrachms 6 and 7. An apparent relationship between Series I and II as a first group, Series III and IV as a second group, and Series V as a third group, however, does not exist other than in the obverse grape-cluster motif. In Series I, the obverse type with a single-cluster is common to the reverse types of 1 («Agon» or «Boreas»)⁸ and 2 (the lion-capped head of Herakles). This latter reverse (2) is also common to the triple grape-cluster obverse die (3) and, consequently, links the reverse dies of 3 (the lion-capped head of Herakles) with the reverse dies of 4 (the Corinthian helmet) and 5 (the rosette). Similarly, between 6 and 7, the obverse die of the grape-cluster and four dolphins (6) is linked with the obverse die of the grape-cluster with star bursts (7) by the common reverse die of the dolphin-rider. The series with the capped grape-cluster (8) having the inscription on the obverse and the seated figure of Staphylos on the reverse is the only series of tetradrachms without die linkage to the other tetradrachm series.

The uniqueness of tetradrachm 8, Milne stated, is crucial because in addition to the absence of linkage for 8 with the other tetradrachms this specimen is a bronze – core plated with silver and, consequently, is three grams lighter than the average weight of the others. Although Milne would attribute 8 to Peparethos, he assigned 6 (and by analogy one may suspect 7, which Milne did not discuss, although the specimen had been published in 1912 as part of the Taranto Hoard⁹) to central Greece (possibly to Thessaly) and accordingly 1–5 to Naxos. The selection of Naxos, Milne stated, is based upon the Ionic influence on the style of the reverse dies, the Euboeic-Attic standard and the importance of viticulture to the Naxian economy.

To the nine tetradrachms which bear the grape-cluster obverse may be added a didrachm (9) and three tetrobols (10–12) which bear similar grape-cluster obverse types (omitted in Milne's discussion). The obverse of 9 bears the single grape-cluster within a circular beaded border, a type common to 1 and 2, with a reverse type of the Corinthian helmet, the reverse die of 4. This reverse type links the didrachm to the tetradrachms 1–5. Unfortunately, it is difficult to ascertain the former reverse type on the didrachm over which the helmet type was struck. The former type does not appear to be that of the known reverse types of the specimens noted above and attributed to Peparethos.

Of the tetrobols, number 10 bears an obverse with the single grape-cluster and the reverse with a lion's head left. The obverse of number 11 has a second form of the

single grape-cluster and its reverse a Phrygian cap (?). And in 12 the obverse bears a third form of the single grape-cluster and the reverse a kantharos. The reverse type of 12 recalls the kantharos held by Staphylos who appears on the reverse of 8. The kantharos motif of 8 and 12 need not reflect the known canting badge of Naxos, the kantharos bound with ivy and grape-clusters¹⁰, but rather relates the Peparethian viticulture with the Dionysiac cult and the figure of Staphylos, the son of Dionysos and Ariadne and the legendary founder of Peparethos.

Milne decided that the tetradrachms should be distributed among three mints. This, however, may not be a valid conclusion. Although there is no die linkage among the three groups of die combinations as noted and the obverse types are dissimilar, no conclusive argument exists. Numerous late sixth - early fifth century issues contemporary with these in question indicate wide stylistic variations in the central canting badge of the obverse die (e. g. Athens)¹¹. To accept one die because of the inscription of the mint but to reject the others because they bear no inscription, yet display the common obverse motif, is an unconvincing argument. It is especially so when one notes that numerous states issued coins within the same decade, some of which bear inscriptions and others which do not. This is notable in the late sixth-early fifth centuries¹². The common motif of the obverse dies of the tetradrachms, didrachm and tetrobols and the similarity of the technique of the die engraving strongly suggest that all twelve coins were produced at the same mint.

Milne's question of the relationship between the provenance of the coinage and its attribution does raise a valid point, but why reject totally the correlation between provenance and attribution? If, as Wroth suggested, the tetradrachms bearing the grape-cluster canting badge on the obverse are issues from one state, and the letters ΠΕ denote the ethnic inscription and the name of the mint, then it is possible to accept the attribution of Peparethos for all specimens.

Milne is correct in stating that the grape motif was a common Aegean form. This argument, however, would as easily support the attribution of these series to Peparethos. If, as Milne stated, Naxos wished to mark her claim to independence, why would she use the grape-cluster motif rather than her previously used and well-recognized obverse canting badge, the kantharos bound with ivy and grape-clusters? The Ionian states which issued «revolt series» to mark their claim for independence from Persia in 499 B. C. did not change their national canting badges as obverse motifs but added the palmette form which was common to all states concerned¹³. Similarly, the coins of Melos minted at the time of her struggle against Athens in 416 bear the distinctive Melian apple, not a new badge¹⁴. Milne, in attempting to compare the coinage in question with the Ionian Revolt issues and the Melian issues, failed to evaluate properly the change in the obverse motif. This change is not at all similar to the revolt issues of Ionia or Melos which use the national canting badge to mark their claims to independence. When Naxos did secede from the Confederacy and was at war with Athens, a series of revolutionary coins may have been issued to mark the event.

The points noted above, however, are not evidence to warrant considering that the series in question were issued from the Naxian mint at this time.

To divide the five series of tetradrachms among three mints according to suspected Ionian influence upon the style of the reverse dies, when the obverse dies indicate a close correlation in style and bear the canting badge of the state, is also unrealistic. Similarly, the Euboic-Attic standard of tetradrachms 1–7 further suggests the same origin of at least these coins and lends no support to Milne's suggestion that 6 and 7 be attributed to Thessaly and 1–5 to Naxos.

If then the grape-cluster series were of Peparethian origin when were they issued? Wroth suggested that they were minted during the early fifth century: 1 no later than c. 500–490, 2: c. 490, 3: c. 490–485, 4: c. 485–480, 5: c. 480, 6: c. 480, 7 is not noted by Wroth, and 8 c. 480–470. Although these dates have been widely accepted, notably by Head, an earlier dating may be more probable¹⁵. A. Baldwin Brett's suggestion of the dates c. 530–500 appears to be more in keeping with the distinctive archaic style of the reverse dies¹⁶. The inclusion of tetradrachm 7 in the Taranto Hoard, buried c. 490, would date the tetradrachms (excluding 8) and the didrachm to the period c. 500¹⁷. The Kos Hoard which contained three Peparethian coins, one archaic Athenian tetradrachm and one early Mendeian tetradrachm would not be at variance with this earlier dating.

The reverse die of 2 and 3, the lion-capped head of Herakles, dated by Wroth c. 490–485 is similar to the archaic head borne on the obverse die of a double-stater from Dikaia-by-Abdera in Thrace (pl. I 13 [London 18.36 g.]) which is dated to the period 510–500 B.C.¹⁸. Among the Peparethian tetradrachms, the figure of the winged male («Agon» or «Boreas») is that of a young man in the archaic style. The distinctly archaic profile with the typical «bull's eye», a long pointed nose descending from the forehead, the long «sixth-century» style tresses, the torso turned to accommodate a full front chest with an emphasis upon the pectoralis and rectus abdominus musculature, the return of the waist to profile form, the protruding buttocks and the prominent thighs and calves compare closely with the archaic portraits of 2–3, 6, 7 and 8. The head of the lion-capped Herakles (2–3) echoes the «bull's eye», the forward jutting beard and the wry smile of late archaic portraiture. The figure of Staphylos (8), although rather clumsy, in essence is similar to that of the elegant «Agon/Boreas» in its rendition. The long tresses flow over the left shoulder and down the back, the head is in archaic profile, the chest turned forefront while the waist is returned to profile form. Similarly, the dolphin-rider (6–7) wears the long archaic tresses. In comparison, the archaic head on the Dikaian double-stater bears the similar archaic «bull's eye», the wry smile and the prominent jutting beard.

The discussed extensive linkage among the tetradrachms, didrachm and tetrobols from Peparethos which bear the similar grape-cluster obverse types indicate a short period of minting. The distinctive archaic style noted in the reverse types indicate, therefore, that they were produced within a period of a few years. A revised dating may then be c. 500 B.C. Milne's suggestion that the silver tetradrachms (1–5) marked the

Naxian secession from the Delian Confederacy and the Naxian claim for independence from Athenian domination in 467 B. C., thus may no longer be considered.

In conclusion, the silver tetradrachms, didrachm and tetrobols which bear the grape-cluster canting badge on their obverse and the several archaic reverse types are to be attributed to the mint at Peparethos and to the period c. 500. After 500, Peparethos discontinued minting coins, as did a number of the Aegean states during the fifth century. Not until the mid-fourth century did Peparethos again issue coins, and then in bronze which bore the bearded head of Dionysos upon the obverse and the wreathed kantharos, thyrsos or grape-cluster with the inscriptions ΠΕ or ΠΕΠΙΑ upon the reverse.

CATALOGUE

Tetradrachms

Series I. Obv. single grape-cluster.

1. Rev. «Agon» or «Boreas» running r.

pl. I, 1

a) London 16,91 g.

Head NC 1891, pl. I. 3; Hill *JHS* XVII (1897) pl. II. 2; Wroth *JHS* XXVII (1907) pl. IV. 1; Babelon *Traité* 4², 759, pl. CCCI. 9.

b) Paris 17,08 g.

Babelon *Traité* 1², 1860; 4², 759, pl. CCCI. 8.

2. Rev. Head of Herakles l.

pl. I, 2

a) London 17,17 g.

Head NC 1891, pl. I. 4; Wroth *JHS* XXVII (1907) pl. IV. 3; Babelon *Traité* 4², 765, pl. CCCII. 2; Hill NC 1920, pl. XIII. 13; Weber II, 2957.

b) Boston 16,76 g.

Brett *BMFA* Cat. 935.

c) Babelon *Traité* 1², 1862.

d) Svoronos *JIAN* VIII (1905) 4, pl. XI. 22, 17,15 g.

Series II. Obv. triple grape-cluster.

3. Rev. Head of Herakles l. (rev. 2).

pl. I, 3

a) London 16,59 g.

Head NC 1891, pl. I. 5; Wroth *JHS* XXVII (1907) pl. IV. 5; Babelon *Traité* 1², 1862; 4², 762, pl. CCCII. 3.

- b) Sir Hermann Weber II, 2596, 17,23 g.
 - c) J. Hirsch Sale 21, Munich 1908 (Weber), 2248, 16,79 g. Jameson 1110.
 - d) Naville-Ars Classica Sale 1 (Pozzi) 2070, 16,82 g.
4. Rev. Corinthian helmet r.
pl. I, 4
- a) London 16,43 g.
Head NC 1891, pl. I. 6; Wroth *JHS* XXVII (1907) pl. IV. 6; Babelon *Traité* 4², 762, pl. CCCI. 12.
 - b) Svoronos *JIAN* VIII (1905) 2, pl. XI. 20, 16,50 g.
Babelon *Traité* 1², 1864, pl. CCCI. 13; Pozzi 2071.
 - c) Wroth *JHS* XXVII (1907) pl. IV. 4, 16,75 g.
Weber II, 2958; Jameson 2043.
 - d) Naville-Ars Classica Sale 1 (Pozzi) 2072, 14,47 g.
5. Rev. Rosette.
pl. I, 5
- a) ANS 17,27 g.
Svoronos *JIAN* VIII (1905) 3, pl. XI. 21; Wroth *JHS* XXVII (1907) pl. IV. 7;
Jameson 2042; Babelon *Traité* 1², 1865; 4², 764, pl. CCCII. 1 (Pozzi 2073).

Series III. Obv. grape-cluster and four dolphins l.

6. Rev. Dolphin-rider l.
pl. I, 6
- a) London 16,78 g.
Wroth *JHS* XXVII (1907) pl. IV. 8; Babelon *Traité* 4², 760, pl. CCCI. 10.

Series IV. Obv. grape-cluster with star bursts.

7. Rev. Dolphin-rider l. (rev. 6).
pl. I, 7
- a) Jameson 1109 a, 17,07 g.
Babelon *Traité* 4², 761, pl. CCCI. 11; Babelon RN XVI (1912) pp. 16–17,
pl. III. 1; Hess-Leu (16. April 1957) pl. VIII.
Ex Taranto Hoard 1911, S. P. Noe NNM 78, 1052.

Series V. Obv. capped grape-cluster with ΠΕ (double-struck).

8. Rev. Seated Staphylos l.
pl. I, 8
- a) London 14,28 g.
Wroth *JHS* XXVII (1907) pl. IV. 2; Babelon *Traité* 4², pl. CCCI. 7.

Didrachm

Series VI. Obv. single grape-cluster.

9. Rev. Corinthian helmet r. (rev. 4).

Overstrike; beneath square field within beaded border, central motif unknown.

pl. I, 9

a) Berlin 8,06 g.

Imhoof-Blumer SNR XIV (1908) p. 159, pl. VI. 18.

Tetrobols

Series VII. Obv. single grape-cluster.

10. Rev. Head of lion l.

pl. I, 10

a) London 2,52 g.

Series VIII. Obv. single grape-cluster.

11. Rev. Phrygian cap (?).

pl. I, 11

a) London 2,34 g.

Imhoof-Blumer *Griechische Münzen* (1890) p. 542, 55, pl. I. 38.

Series IX. Obv. single grape-cluster.

12. Rev. Kantharos.

pl. I, 12

a) London 2,79 g.

Fitzwilliam (Grose II) 7328; Hill NC 1920, pl. XIII. 14.

DIE LINKAGE

Obv.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Rev.												

RESUME

Zur Diskussion steht eine Gruppe früher griechischer Silbermünzen, die auf der Vorderseite eine Traube aufweisen. Erstmals seit dem Fund von Kos 1891 bekannt, wurden sie von Head und später von Wroth Cyrene zugeschrieben, später von Hill in die makedonische Chalkidike und von Svoronos nach Skione gelegt.

Auf Grund des 1906 vom Britischen Museum erworbenen Tetradrachmons mit der Inschrift ΠΕ, das auf Skopelos, dem antiken Peparethos, gefunden worden war, schrieb Wroth die ganze Gruppe Peparethos zu.

Schließlich stellte Milne 1941 diese Münzen erneut zur Diskussion. Er legte alle Tetradrachmen mit Ausnahme des Exemplars mit ΠΕ nach dem kykladischen Naxos; das Exemplar mit ΠΕ wies er an Peparethos, den Rest der Gruppe an eine thessalische Münzstätte. Als Datum gab er das Jahr 467 an, als Naxos sich gegen den attisch-delischen Seebund erhob. Die Theorie von Milne wurde nie akzeptiert, aber auch nie widerlegt.

Der Autor beweist mittels Stempelverbindungen, daß diese Münzen eine einzige Gruppe bilden und aus einer einzigen Münzstätte stammen müssen. Für die Herkunft von Peparethos ist das «redende» Exemplar 8 schlüssig. Gegen eine Zuschreibung an Naxos spricht auch das Motiv der Traube: die traditionelle Vorderseite der naxischen Statere zeigt einen bekränzten Kantharos.

Als Datum der gesamten frühen Münzprägung schlägt der Autor das letzte Jahrzehnt des 6. Jahrhunderts vor. Einen wichtigen Hinweis dafür gibt das im Fund von Taranto (vergraben etwa 490) vorgekommene Exemplar 7. Stilistische Vergleiche der Reversdarstellungen von Peparethos mit Motiven anderer archaischer Münzen Nordgriechenlands, besonders mit Dikaia, bestätigen diese Datierung.

Zusammenfassung von S. Hurter

NOTES

¹ J. G. Milne, «A Group of Coins Attributable to the Revolt of Naxos in 467», *NC* 5th S., XX (1940), pp. 76–88.

² B. V. Head, «Archaic Coins Probably of Cyrene», *NC* 3rd. S., XI (1891), pp. 1–11; Sidney P. Noe, *Bibliography of Greek Coin Hoards* (2nd ed.), *NNM* 78 (1937), 273.

³ W. Wroth, «Greek Coins Acquired by the British Museum in 1891», *NC* 3rd. S., XII (1892), pp. 20–21.

⁴ G. F. Hill, «Notes on Additions to the Greek Coins in the British Museum, 1887–1896», *JHS* XVII (1897), pp. 79–80.

⁵ I. A. Svoronos, Νομίσματα Μακεδονίας (Σκιώνης), Κυζίκου καὶ Κῶ, *JIAN* VIII (1905), p. 339–343.


⁶ Wroth, «Peparethus and its Coinage», *JHS* XXVII (1907), pp. 90–98. Both Babelon, *Traité* I. 2 (Paris: 1907), 1860–1865, and Head, *HN* (London: 1911), p. 312, accepted Wroth's attribution of these coins to Peparethos.

⁷ Milne discussed only the tetradrachms referred to as Series I, II, III and V.


⁸ I am grateful to H. A. Cahn and L. Mildenberg for their suggestion: «The two wreaths in the hand of the winged youth may indicate ἄγων as the personification of fight, and especially athletic competition. But the wings and especially the winged sandals (feet) indicate rather 'one of the winds' as Kraay (C. M. Kraay and M. Hirmer, *Greek Coins* [London: 1966], p. 336) cautiously puts it. Zephyros and Notos seem not to occur on coins or objects. Thus Boreas remains. 'Agon' or 'Boreas' would perhaps be the best solution.» Cf. the bronze «Agon from Mahdia», Musée du Bardo, G. Hafner, *Geschichte der griechischen Kunst* (Zurich: 1961), p. 381, fig. 395.

⁹ R. R. Holloway, «The Crown of Naxos», *Museum Notes* X (1962), pp. 1–8.


PLATE I




I





2




3




4



5







6




7



8



9



10




11



12



13



¹⁰ E. Babelon, «Trouvaille de Tarente (juin 1911)», *Rev. num.* 4^e Sér., XVI (1912), pp. 1–40. The tetradrachm from the Taranto Hoard has been considered a forgery on the basis of the irregular beaded border and the heaviness of the beads; cf. O. E. Ravel, *Numismatique grecque – Falsifications* (London: 1946), p. 81. The die linkage, however, authenticates this specimen.

¹¹ Kraay, «The Archaic Owls of Athens: Classification and Chronology», *NC* 6th S., XV (1956), pp. 43–68.

¹² Anepigraphic issues within an ethnic epigraphic sequence, Samos, Class II (482/1–478/7 B. C.), John P. Barron, *The Silver Coins of Samos* (London: 1966), pp. 49–50, pl. viii. 12; Mende, Group I, 1, 2, 3, 14 (510–480 B. C.), Noe, *The Mende (Kaliandra) Hoard*, *NNM* 27 (1926), p. 10. Ethnic epigraphic issues within an anepigraphic series: Kolophon, Period I, A. 6, C. 11 (c. 525–c. 490 B. C.), Milne, *Kolophon and Its Coinage*, *NNM* (1941), pp. 31, 33. Cf. Kraay, «Archaic Owls of Athens», *NC* 6th S., XV (1956), p. 62.

¹³ P. Gardner, «The Coinage of the Ionian Revolt», *JHS* XXI (1911), pp. 151–160.

¹⁴ Milne, *The Melos Hoard of 1907*, *NNM* 62 (1934); Kraay, «The Melos Hoard of 1907 Re-examined», *NC* 7th S., IV (1964), pp. 1–20, *N.B.* p. 2, n. 3.

¹⁵ Head, *HN*, p. 312; *Principle Coins* (London: 1959), p. 8.

¹⁶ A. B. Brett, *Catalogue of Greek Coins* (Boston: 1955), p. 126.

¹⁷ W. P. Wallace, «The Early Coinage of Athens and Euboea», *NC* 7th S., II (1962), p. 35, n. 2; Kraay, «The Early Coinage of Athens», *NC* 7th S., II (1962), p. 421. The Taranto Hoard is perhaps several finds and not a single hoard, Paulo Orsi, «Di un insigne tesoretto di aurei persiani e siracusani rinvenuti ad Avola (Sicilia)», *Atti e memorie dell'Istituto Italiano di Numismatica* III. 1 (1917), p. 29.

¹⁸ J. M. F. May, «The Coinage of Dikaia-by-Abdera, c. 540/35–476/5 B. C.», *NC* 7th S., V (1965), pp. 13–16, pl. I. 13. Peparethos perhaps borrowed the «head of Herakles» type for the reverse of 2–3 from Dikaia-by-Abdera, and the «dolphin-rider» type for the reverse of 6–7 from Tarantum.