

**Zeitschrift:** Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau = Revue suisse de numismatique = Rivista svizzera di numismatica  
**Herausgeber:** Schweizerische Numismatische Gesellschaft  
**Band:** 57 (1978)  
  
**Artikel:** The archaic coinage of Skyros and the forgeries of Konstantinos Christodoulos  
**Autor:** Balcer, Jack Martin  
**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-174369>

### **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:** 07.08.2025

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

THE ARCHAIC COINAGE OF SKYROS  
AND THE FORGERIES OF KONSTANTINOS CHRISTODOULOS\*

In 1900, J. N. Svoronos presented a coin (our plate 27, no. 46) which he attributed to the mint of the Dolopian pirates on the Aegean island of Skyros, struck between 500 and 469 B.C.; Σκῦρος, *Journal international d'Archéologie numismatique* 3 (1900), 39–46. Then, in 1911, he published a more extensive study of six different coins which he also attributed to the Dolopians and to the same period (Catalogue nos. 2, 10, 16, 21, 30, 38); Νομίσματα ἀρχαῖα τῆς νήσου Σκύρου, *JIAN* 13 (1911), 127–130. In 1920, however, Svoronos published a third article which revealed to the scholarly world the forgeries of the Athenian Konstantinos Christodoulos, and among those forgeries were copies of six Skyrian coins similar to those of the article of 1911, and the dies of a Skyrian tetradrachm; «C. Christodoulos et les Faussaires d'Athènes», *JIAN* 20 (1920), 97–107, 141–146, pl. A–Q. In this article, Svoronos promised a second and more extensive report on Christodoulos and his forgeries but unfortunately he died within a short time and the report never appeared. This article, however, did not settle the problems of Christodoulos' forgeries nor the questions of the attribution of silver coins to the late archaic mint on Skyros.

In his monumental work, *Traité des monnaies grecques et romaines* II.4 (Paris 1927), cols. 45–46, Babelon reviewed the problems of the Skyrian coins in the light of Svoronos' articles. First, he questioned the attribution of the coin of the 1900 article (no. 46) which, at present, can not be attributed to Christodoulos but which Babelon hesitated to assign to Skyros. Then Babelon questioned the coins of Svoronos' 1911 article (nos. 2, 10, 16, 21, 30, 38) for which he was also critical: «Toutes sont à fleur de coin, de la même fabrique, du même aspect; on les dit trouvées ensemble. Elles sont d'une technique incorrecte; le carré creux, irrégulier, mal construit, tendrait à les faire classer à l'époque archaïque et cependant leur aspect n'a rien d'archaïque.» With the knowledge of Svoronos' report of the Christodoulos forgeries, Babelon then stated: «...je crois qu'on ne peut hésiter à condamner au moins les plus grosses pièces. Seules, les petites divisions à partir du tétrobole, peuvent être considérées comme authentiques.»

\* I extend my deep appreciation to the following who assisted in the gathering of the materials for this study: Herbert A. Cahn, Münzen und Medaillen AG, Basel; Mary Comstock, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; G. K. Jenkins, British Museum, London; Georges Le Rider, Bibliothèque nationale, Paris; Leo Miltenberg, Bank Leu, Zürich; Otto Mørkholm, National Museum, Copenhagen; Mando Ch. Oeconomides, Ethnikon Mouseion, Athens; Martin Price, British Museum, London; H.-D. Schultz, Staatliche Museen, Berlin; Margaret Thompson and Nancy M. Waggoner, American Numismatic Society, New York.

The studies of Svoronos and Babelon should have settled the question of the authenticity of the Skyrian coins, but unfortunately they didn't. When Newell obtained for the American Numismatic Society a Skyrian tetradrachm (no. 2; the tetradrachm of Svoronos' article *JIAN* 13 [1911], no. 1), he appended a note to the box in which the coin rests: «Believed by some to be a forgery by Christodoulos.» Unfortunately, Newell's death cut short his plan to investigate the authenticity of the ANS tetradrachm and no further study has been made until the present. Brett, in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts Catalogue of Greek Coins (Boston 1955), 126, no. 9, cited only Babelon (as above) and not Svoronos' study of 1920<sup>1</sup>, yet noted the reservation concerning the authenticity of this coin. In contrast, H. Troxell (*The Norman Davis Collection* [New York 1969], 19), discussing the didrachm (no. 13) in that collection and citing Svoronos' 1911 *JIAN* article yet not the 1920 article, suggested «... that these rare Scyros coins, which have sometimes been questioned, are genuine.» Troxell based her suggestion upon the evidence of die linkage, which she believed to be an indication of authenticity. A third and similar didrachm (no. 15) is catalogued in the *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum*, Copenhagen, «Argolis – Aegean Islands», Vol. 17 (1944), 732, with citation to Svoronos' 1911 study but without reference to the question of authenticity. At the same time, other numismatists have rejected the Skyrian coins. L. Mildenberg, Bank Leu Ltd. Zürich, notes: «Several such coins have passed through my hands but I have never been able to find a real oxydation<sup>2</sup>.»

It is now important to check the corpus of 46 archaic silver coins attributed to the mint at Skyros and to re-examine the dies and the plaster casts of the «Skyrian» coins which Christodoulos struck. This study examines a catalogue of three tetradrachms, fifteen didrachms, eight tetrobols, nine diobols, and ten hemiobols; in addition to the tetrobol (no. 46), the subject of Svoronos' first study (*JIAN* 3 [1900]), which is distinct from the above corpus of coins attributed to Skyros all the plaster casts and the dies of Konstantinos Christodoulos (tetradrachms: Fig. 1, pl. 25 a–d; didrachms pl. 25 e; tetrobols pl. 27 f–i; diobols pl. 27, j–k).

Of Christodoulos' forgeries, we know very little beyond Svoronos' report of 1920 (*JIAN* 20). In that article, Svoronos noted that the Greek police had confiscated the materials of three workshops, in Athens, Piraeus, and Corfu (p. 98); and suggested that the forgeries were struck in these workshops between 1895 and 1914, and that by 1900, Christodoulos' forgeries had entered the national museums of Athens, Berlin, and Egypt. In 1967, Dodson («Counterfeits I have Known», *Coinage* 3.4 [April 1967], 20–23, 66, 68, 70 illustrations) reported that following Christodoulos' death in 1914, the dies and counterfeit coins seized by the Athenian police were not destroyed but were deposited in the Numismatic Collection of the National Museum of Athens for their safekeeping. Sometime later, about 1938, Nikolas Garyphallakis, a nephew of and an assistant to Christodoulos, approached the Greek courts to obtain the impounded

<sup>1</sup> Brett (p. 321) noted only pages 141–146 of Svoronos' *JIAN* 20 (1920) article and not the entire article nor the plates (pp. 97–103, pl. A–Q).

<sup>2</sup> Letter dated 8 November 1972.

dies. On January 5, 1939, by order of the Department of National Education and Cults (No. 112, 097/6520, dated 28 December 1938) and the Court of Misdemeanors, Konstantinos Konstantopoulos, then Director of the Numismatic Collection, released to Garyphallakis 13 ancient coins, 101 bronze and iron dies made by Christodoulos of ancient coins, and 8 pounds 10 ounces of counterfeit ancient coins. Garyphallakis was ordered not to use the dies returned. In turn, he agreed to conform to the regulations and to supply casts of each die in order to insure detection against violation of the law. Unfortunately, further information regarding the court orders is lacking. The police records and some of the court records were lost in a fire which occurred during the disturbances in Athens, December 1944.




Fig. 1

In spite of caution, Dodson reports, «the ghost of Christodoulos haunts the coin shops of Athens. The dies are still at work, producing rare coins ... a tenacious counterfeit gang has shown a remarkable ability to endure beyond the loss of their skilled engraver. In fact some of the coins of Garyphallakis are considered more dangerous than those of the old master, Christodoulos».



Unfortunately, my investigation of the matter in Athens in the summer of 1973 failed to produce further information. Svoronos' complete report of the matter never appeared, yet the possibility that some information in regard to this case may come to the light when the Svoronos Papers are opened and studied does remain. Mrs. Svoronos has recently deposited these in the Nomismatike Sylloge of the National Museum in Athens. Nevertheless, while the report is incomplete, we simply must assume that Svoronos knew more about the forgeries and Christodoulos than we do. In numismatic and historical questions, therefore, we must decide from the observable evidence with rational arguments. Consequently, we must first study the coins, the types and the dies and their linkages, the weights, and the patinas. Clearly, a scientific study of each coin as to metal and patina would prove extremely useful, but at the moment can not be obtained. Then, second, we must study the casts and dies reported by Svoronos to be the products of Christodoulos' workshops and determine their relationship to the corpus of the 46 coins noted above.

Svoronos' major arguments for the attribution of the seven coins in question (JIAN 3 [1900] and 13 [1911]) was first provenience and then type. In regard to provenience, coin no. 46 was found on Skyros, and the other six (nos. 2, 10, 16, 21, 30, 38) belonged to a private citizen of that island, from whom Svoronos obtained permission to publish the photographs. But he was not able to purchase these coins for the National Museum of Athens, then lacking funds, therefore they were ultimately purchased by the American Numismatic Society (nos. 2, 10, 16) and the Boston Museum of Fine Arts (no. 21), as noted in the Catalogue. Athens, however, did manage to obtain one of these coins, a diobol (no. 30), among several other Skyrian coins as the gift from a prominent Greek. For the British Museum diobol (no. 31), for example, there is no record of origin. This coin and others have been obtained through numismatic sales. And recently, a tetradrachm (no. 3) has appeared in a large hoard from Egypt, the Asyut Hoard<sup>3</sup>.

The question of provenience, however, is not always conclusive and must remain open. Nevertheless, due to the extensive die similarities and die linkages of Svoronos' Skyrian collection of six coins, and the plausibility of Svoronos' type attributions to Skyros, the JIAN study of 1911 should be accepted. In this instance, provenience as a factor in this study, should also be accepted. The Skyrian attribution of coin no. 46 of the JIAN study of 1900, however, ironically must remain in doubt. Svoronos' attribution of the motif of the two heraldic goats and fig leaf for Skyros is further confirmed by the evidence of what remains of a hoard from that island, IGCH no. 31<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> M. Price and N. Waggoner, *Archaic Greek Coinage: The «Asyut» Hoard* (London 1975), 49–50; see also Thompson IGCH no. 1644 and the reviews of «Asyut» by H. A. Cahn in SNR 56 (1977), 279–287 and C. M. Kraay in NC, vol. 137 (1977), 189–198.

<sup>4</sup> M. Thompson et al., *An Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards* (New York 1973) no. 31 Scyros, c. 1929, Burial: 5th cent. B.C., Contents 3+AR, Scyros: 2 didr.; 1 dr. (sic), Disposition: New York, Newell records the coins, purchased in 1929 from Seltman, as from Scyros hd. but gives no further information.

In 1929, Newell purchased three coins for the American Numismatic Society from Seltman which Seltman reported to be of a hoard found on Skyros. In this Catalogue the hoard coins are: didrachmae nos. 5 and 7 (8.36 and 8.58 g), and tetrobol no. 19 (2.73 g). Again, the provenience of these coins bearing the Skyrian type suggests their attribution to that island of the Northern Sporades, Skyros.

As Svoronos carefully noted, the obverse and reverse types of the six coins (JIAN 1911) strongly indicate a Skyrian origin: Two long horned, bearded goats heraldically opposed back to back, legs extended and forelegs bent under, heads arched toward upper center; between them, five- (or three-) lobed fig leaf up. Rev. Stellate design, two three-lobed fig leaves and two rays opposed; in center globule amid four globules; square incuse. The ancient evidence for goats upon Skyros is extensive, and refers to them as being famous no less proverbial, ἀἰξ Σκυρία<sup>5</sup>.

Athenaius 1.28 a: «Pindar in the Pythian Ode to Hieron (frag. 106 B 4), 'The Skyrian goats are most famous in the giving of milk.'»

3.540 d: «Klytos, a disciple of Aristotle in his work concerning Miletos, said that Polykrates the tyrant of Samos brought back many trophies from many places – hounds from Epirus, goats from Skyros, wild sheep from Miletos, and wild swine from Sicily.»

– «Alexis, in the third book of the Samian Annals, said that from many cities the things gathered at Samos by Polykrates included Molossian and Lakonian hounds, goats from Skyros and Naxos, and wild sheep from Miletos and Attica.»

Aelian NA 3.34: «They say the cows of Epirus give a most copious supply of milk, and the goats of Skyros a far more generous yield than any other goats.»

Eustathius Comm. Dionysius Periegeta 521: «How wonderous are the Skyrian goats.»

– Comm. Homer Odyssey 1569.44: «It is said that the Skyrian goats are most excellent in giving milk.»

Αἰξ Σκυρία: Suda sv; Stephanus Byzantius sv. Σκυρος; Zenobius 2.18; Diogenianus 2.33; Apostolius 1.61; Marcarius 1.58.

In 1717, Tournefort reported Skyros still plentiful of goats<sup>6</sup>, and in 1848, Graves noted about 15 000 sheep and goats on Skyros while the inhabitants numbered 2630 for the entire island<sup>7</sup>. The influence of the goat upon the Skyrian community in the late nineteenth century was witnessed by Lawson in 1899 who observed a pre-Lenten festival in which the young men of the island wore goat-skin capes and bronze goat-bells<sup>8</sup>. In 1909, Papageorgios published a photograph of the Skyrian goats, and their

<sup>5</sup> Collected by Svoronos JIAN 13 (1911), 128–129.

<sup>6</sup> J. Tournefort, *Relation d'un Voyage du Levant I* (Paris 1717), 448.

<sup>7</sup> T. Graves, «The Isle of Skyros», *Royal Geographical Society Journal* 19 (1849), 154.

<sup>8</sup> J. Lawson, «A Beast-Dance on Skyros», *Annual of the British School of Athens* 6 (1899), 125–127. R. Dawkins, «A Visit to Skyros», *BSA* 11 (1904–1905), fig. 1, a drawing of one of these «goat-men». Cf. K. Fielder, *Reise durch alle Theile des Königreiches Griechenland II* (Leipzig 1841), 83.

similarity to the goats upon the obverse types of the Skyrian coins in question is striking<sup>9</sup>.

The geography of Skyros is rugged and consequently lent to goat herding and a limited human population<sup>10</sup>, and was obviously one of the reasons why the ancient Dolopians turned to piracy. No doubt the troubled conditions within the Aegean during the Persian Wars also lent to their piracy<sup>11</sup>. The island, 208.1 km<sup>2</sup>, long (30 km NNW–SSE) and narrow (14 km), is roughly divided by the cultivated strip which stretches from the Bay of Achilleion and the Dolopian city of Skyros on the east coast to the western Bay of Kalamitza. In the northern region the water supply is poor and the entire southern section (814 m high) arid and unfruitful<sup>12</sup>. The name Skyros, itself, perhaps originally Σκύριος, is Greek meaning «stoney»<sup>13</sup>, and in the ancient lexicons Σκῦρος was explained as λατύπη («small stoned» or perhaps some kind of clay) and ἀργιλώδης («clayey»)<sup>14</sup>.

Of figs, and the fig leaf between the two goats, Skyros is notable but not as famous as for its goats. While the ancient evidence is lacking, modern reports bear witness to figs. Leake in his *Travels in Northern Greece* (1838) noted the production of grain, vines, and figs in the Achilleion plain (below the Dolopian city of Skyros)<sup>15</sup>. In 1854, Rhankaves noted that the plain between the two harbors of Achilleion and Kalamitza, the low lying isthmus, was covered with fig trees<sup>16</sup>. Papageorgios in 1909 also reported olives, vineyards, and figs<sup>17</sup>. And Mrs. Oeconomides, Ephor, Numismatic Collection, Athens, recently stated (May 1970) that she was struck by the number of fig trees on Skyros, and that not all of islands have fig trees (or certainly not in abundance).

<sup>9</sup> D. Papageorgios 'Ιστορία τῆς Σκύρου ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχαιοτατῶν χρόνων (Patras 1909), 17, see also his discussion of Skyrian goats, 18.

<sup>10</sup> Tournefort, *Relation d'un Voyage I*, 448, estimated about 300 families; and Graves RGSJ 19 (1849), 154, noted the entire population of Skyros to have been 2630 in 1848. C. Fredrich RE (1927), sv. Skyros, noted 3500 inhabitants. The Dolopian population in c. 475 B.C. may not have been greater.

<sup>11</sup> Piracy also noted c. 470 B.C. in Ionian Teos, R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *Greek Historical Inscriptions* (Oxford 1969), no. 30.

<sup>12</sup> British Naval Intelligence Division, *Greece III Geographical Handbook: Regional Geography* (1945), 403–405; also K. Bursian, *Geographie von Griechenland II.3* (Leipzig 1872), 390–394; A. Philippson, «Beiträge zur Kenntnis der griechischen Inselwelt», *Mitteilungen aus Justus Perthes geographischer Anstalt* no. 134, Vol. 29 (1901), 113–123 (see *Tafel 1*: southern mountains with ravines).

<sup>13</sup> A. Fick, *Vorgriechische Ortsnamen* (Göttingen 1905), 68. C. Fredrich R.E. sv. Skyros 2), claimed it as pre-Greek. An earlier name for Skyros was Χρύσα, a form of Ionic dialect, *Plut. Thes.* 27; *Steph. Byz.* sv. χρύσγη; see P. Graindor, *Histoire de l'île de Skyros jusqu'en 1538* (Paris 1906), 12–13, 22.

<sup>14</sup> Graindor, *Histoire de l'île de Skyros* 9; *Eust. ad Dionys. Perieg.* v. 250; *Schol. Pind. Pyth.* 5.93; *Hesych.* sv. Σκῦρος; *Etym. magn.* sv. Σκῦρος and 137.15 Ἀργινοῦσαι ἀργιλώδεις; *Suda* sv. Σκῦρος

<sup>15</sup> Vol. III (London 1835), 107.

<sup>16</sup> *Τὰ Ἑλληνικά I* (Athens 1854), 57; cited by Svoronos *JIAN* 3 (1900), 41, n. 3, see also n. 6.

<sup>17</sup> *Ἱστορία τῆς Σκύρου* 18.

While the fig was and is important to the island it does not seem to have been the emblem for Dolopian Skyros, as Svoronos claimed (JIAN 3 [1900], 41–42), but rather was secondary to the more famous goats. And these goats appear on each of the 45 coins as the prominent heraldic badge on the obverse types, in which the fig leaf is not always present. Therefore, the attribution of these coins with their goats and fig leaves to Skyros appears valid.

Of the tetradrachma denomination, three specimens (nos. 1–3) are noted (17.30–18.23 g) which bear obverse and reverse dies of similar motifs (Obv. two heraldic goats opposed back to back and five-lobed fig leaf, Rev. stellate, fig leaves and rays). Tetradrachm no. 1 A. 1–P. 1 (17.30 g) was published by Babelon (Tr. CCCII, 18) as a photograph of a plaster cast from the original, the location of which is now unknown. Consequently, a good quality photograph is unavailable, nor can one comment upon the patina. This specimen was struck upon a highly irregular flan which cracked extensively either during the initial cutting process of the flan and/or during the process of minting. The flan was a roughly shaped blank to start, and is similar to many of the Thracian flans struck in the late sixth century and early fifth century B.C. (e.g. Derrones and Ichnai), and simply as silver bullion generally cut and molded in blanks for minting and ultimately trade and export to Ionia and the Persian Empire (Syria, Mesopotamia, and Egypt). The group to which this coin belonged was sufficiently extensive to create the major flaw in the reverse die, thus we can speculate that a reasonable number of tetradrachms were struck from these dies.

Concerning this specimen, Robinson in his article «The Athenian Currency Decree and the Coinage of the Allies», *Hesperia*, Suppl. VIII (1949), 328–336, esp. 335, stated that Skyros struck «major» denominations during the first quarter of the fifth century until 470 B.C. and the Athenian occupation of that island. He further noted: «These coins have been condemned en bloc as modern forgeries; some at any rate (e.g., no. 18) appear to me to be genuine.» Babelon's coin no. 18 (778, 17.30 g «Comparer les coins faux, de la fabrique de Christodoulo, publiés par Svoronos») is specimen no. 1 of this Catalogue. The obverse of specimen no. 1, however, does appear similar if not the same as that of the tetradrachm (plate 25 a) from Christodoulos' workshop; and that tetradrachm (plate 25 a) appears to have been struck from the obverse die (Fig. 1) also from Christodoulos' workshop. We are, however, comparing the photographs of two plaster casts (no. 1 with a) with a poor photograph, as published in JIAN 20 (1920), of the confiscated dies. There is, nevertheless, all reason to assume that the obverse plate 25 a is the product of the obverse of the die Fig. 1; and that both are the products of Christodoulos.

Whether the obverse of tetradrachm no. 1 was struck from the obverse die (Fig. 1) is yet another question which is difficult to assess. Due to the nature of first the plaster casts and then second the reproduced photographs, which had been taken with light sources from different points, it is difficult to compare and to contrast the two obverses. Similarities do appear: the shapes and positions of the goats and the fig



leaf, and the small lateral line right from the shoulder of the left goat. A dissimilarity, however, may appear in the shapes of the horns; but this may solely be an illusion of the photographs. Perhaps more substantial arguments for dissimilarity rest with the following two observations. One, among the corpus of casts which Svoronos published as Christodoulos' forgeries all the flans are regular. None are irregular as is specimen no. 1. Two, the reverse die type of the confiscated die Fig. 1, illustrated among the «forgery» casts as illustrations b and c, is *not* that of specimen no. 1. The reverse type of specimen no. 1 is not included among the Christodoulos casts. Either Christodoulos had a reverse die of this type, an *argumentum e silentio*, or another explanation may hold. And that may be that specimen no. 1 is a genuine coin from which Christodoulos fashioned the obverse die (Fig. 1, pl. 25 a) and coupled this with the reverse die (Fig. 1, pl. 25 b–c) which he perhaps (see below) copied from specimen no. 2. In consideration of the nature of the irregular flan, this explanation may be true. Consequently, we return to the idea that specimen no. 1 may have been struck at Skyros and upon an irregular «Thracian style» flan. Yet, doubt remains.

In that Skyros had to import silver to strike its autonomous issues, and in that it did overstrike Akanthian and other issues, it is possible to conceive that the Skyrian mint masters obtained Thracian bullion and even blanks for their mint. While a neutron-activation analysis for the Skyrian coins is not presently available to reveal a reasonable scientific analysis of the silver, the patina of the Skyrian coins, the silver surfaces, and the silver granulation do not compare to the patina of Athenian coins struck from Laureion silver<sup>18</sup>. Thus, the source of silver bullion for Skyros<sup>19</sup> would have been Siphnos, yet its mines were controlled by Aegina and Samos (amidst bitter warfare) and became inoperative at the beginning of the fifth century B.C. due to Siphnian overdevelopment and the subsequent inundation of the shafts by the sea<sup>20</sup>. Silver imported from the Carthaginian controlled mines at Iberian Tartessos or from Persian controlled Cyprus would have been very unlikely.

Specimen no. 2 A. 2–P. 2 supports the thesis of the Skyrian importation of Thracian silver, if not as bullion and blanks certainly as minted coins. The striking of this specimen by two new dies reveals a greater care in the minting process than with specimen no. 1 A. 1–P. 1. The new Skyrian dies followed the established Skyrian motifs but the die cutter executed the design with care to reduce the thickness of the type's lines and to engrave the bodies of the goats with care and finesse as to the

<sup>18</sup> The ores from the ancient shafts of Laureion contained between 5 and 11 % lead, which became a valuable product in itself; a miniscule trace of gold which was never developed, approximately 0.12 g (two grains) Troy weight per ton of lead (0.10 scruples); and silver at 1.86 kg (60 ounces) per ton of lead which the Athenians managed to refine to 97.8 % pure; G. Marinos and W. Petraschek, *Laurium* (Athens 1956), 12–23, 223–225 (in Greek).

<sup>19</sup> Thracian silver contained 0.12 % gold and 0.84 % copper; C. Kraay, «Gold and Copper Traces in Early Greek Silver», *Archaeometry* I (1958), 1–5.

<sup>20</sup> Hdt. iii. 57. Siphnian silver contained up to 2.5 % copper and over 0.2 % gold; C. Kraay and V. Emeleus, *The Composition of Greek Silver* (Oxford 1962), 14, 33; J. Bent, *Aegean Islands* (Chicago 1966), 38–40.



rendition of the muscles and the heads. The undertype of this tetradrachm is that of Akanthos, slightly off center and to the right by eleven degrees of the vertical axis of the Skyrian overtype<sup>21</sup>. The Skyrian exergue rests above and off center from the Akanthian pearled exergue with its floral design raised up with globules at the end of each petal-segment. Desneux suggested, following von Sallet, that the floral design below the exergue is a bucranial form, but it is a cautious and reserved interpretation<sup>22</sup>. It could also be the Akanthian «honeysuckle» flower. The Skyrian exergue also cuts across the Akanthian pearled exergue which extends to the circular beaded border. This beaded border, slightly smashed by the overstriking, belongs not to the Skyrian die and its own beaded border but to the Akanthian undertype and much of it is preserved. The line on the right, which crosses both the Skyrian and the Akanthian exergues or base lines is a flaw in the Skyrian die and not part of either type. This flaw indicates a moderate production of tetradrachms from these dies also.

To the upper left of the coin, the line of the hairy rump of the Akanthian lion is visible; as are the heavy hairs of the lion's main to the upper right, which extend down to the digits of the lion's left paw which rests upon the Akanthian bull's rump and the base of its tail (Fig. 2 a). In the upper zone there is no evidence of an




Fig. 2 a

Akanthian flower ☉ which occasionally appears upon the Akanthian tetradrachms. This Akanthian undertype is similar to that referred to by Desneux as Type E. 3 (no. 34 D 32–R 32) struck on the Attic-Euboeic standard<sup>23</sup>. This Akanthian type (Fig. 2 b) bears a lion to the right and a bull to the left. The right forepaw of the bull

<sup>21</sup> At the end of the sixth century B.C., Torone (Terone) at the end of the Sithonian peninsula issued a flourishing series of tetradrachms (17.00–17.36 g) and tetrobols (2.13–2.47 g) for a period of twenty years, and occasionally overstruck Akanthian tetradrachms (16.61 g); B. V. Head, *Historia Numorum* (Oxford 1911), 206–207; H. Gaebler, *Die antiken Münzen von Makedonia und Paenionia* III.2 (Berlin 1935), 114.

<sup>22</sup> J. Desneux, *Les tétradrachmes d'Akanthos* (Brussels 1949), 31.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid. 63; «A propos de la chronologie du monnayage d'Akanthos», *Revue Belge de Numismatique* 98 (1952), 113–115.




Fig. 2 b

is painfully bent under, at a very acute angle, with the lion forcibly arched upon the bull, his rump and his back very arched, and with his left forepaw grasping the base of the bull's tail. Beneath the pearly exergue exists the floral motif raised high with two globules. The reverse bears a quartered square incuse. And under the Skyrian incuse square (Fig. 2 a) with the two fig leaves, the two rays, and the five equal globules are traces of that Akanthian quartered square incuse cutting across the Skyrian type in juxtaposition, at the same angle as are the obverse dies. An example of this undertype is Akanthos 17.10 g Berlin (Fig. 2 b). The patina of specimen no. 2 is a black, metallic finish.

The utilization of Akanthian tetradrachms by Skyros to overstrike was a sound choice as they did not require recutting or remelting to conform to the Attic-Euboeic weight standard adopted. In analysis, the weight of 129 specimens of Akanthian tetradrachms range between 16.28 and 17.97 g, with a cluster between 16.90 and 17.50 g, and a peak at 17.00–17.15 g<sup>24</sup>. Consequently, specimens nos. 1 and 2 of the Skyrian tetradrachms (17.30–17.31 g) fall within the average range of Akanthian weights, and within the average weights of Attic-Euboeic tetradrachms in general. As Svoronos' catalogue of Christodoulos' forgeries does not include Akanthian coins of any denomination, we may assume that both late archaic tetradrachms (nos. 2 and 3) from Akanthos overstruck with the Skyrian types are authentic.

In this case, the Skyrian types also appear to be authentic. The obverse die of specimen no. 2 is distinctly not that of Christodoulos' tetradrachm (pl. 25 d) to which it has often been compared. The forelegs of both goats differ significantly in position. The forelegs of the left goat on specimen no. 2 project forward and up and turn under acutely. Those of Christodoulos' coin project forward but slightly down and do not turn acutely but simply down. The legs of the right goat (no. 2) extend down while those of Christodoulos' goat bend acutely. Similarly, the fig leaf of specimen no. 2 is thin petaled and ribbed, while that of Christodoulos is heavy petaled and not ribbed. In addition, the beard of the left goat on specimen no. 2 slants forward, that of Christodoulos' left goat slants backward. Again, it appears, that Christodoulos (pl. 25 d) copied the obverse type of tetradrachm no. 2. A comparison of the reverse types produces a similar observation. The reverse of

<sup>24</sup> Ibid. 39.

specimen no. 2 P. 2 bears thin rays and petals while those of Christodoulos' reverse of Fig. 1, illustrations b and c are thick. It is clearly not the reverse of specimen no. 1 P. 1. That punch die bears thin petioles between the two fig leaves with two pairs of globules in apposition. P. 2 does not have the petioles, and the four globules are almost within a square area with one globule (as illustrated here, the lower) slightly askew. While Christodoulos' reverse die bears the same position of the four globules (one slightly askew), the rays and fig leaf petals significantly differ in width and do not present clearly defined, sharply delineated edges to the rays, petals, or globules. While this may be a problem of the photographs of the plaster casts of Christodoulos' coins, the die (Fig. 1) seems to bear these wide, ill delineated features; and thus bears credence to the belief that Christodoulos' reverse die of Fig. 1 did not strike specimen no. 2. Christodoulos may have copied the type, simple to execute, or have molded it for his die.

Tetradrachm no. 3 A. 3–P. 2 (18.23 g) is similar to specimen no. 2. It is an Akanthian tetradrachm overstruck with Skyrian types; of which the reverse (P. 2) is the same as that of tetradrachm no. 2, while the obverse type differs slightly. In the case of the type of A. 3, the head of the left goat is lower than that of the right goat, while on type A. 2 the right head is lower. In addition, the fig leaf of A. 3 does not compare with that of A. 2, the petals are in a dissimilar pattern. Tetradrachm no. 3 is undoubtedly genuine. It belongs to the recently uncovered (1968 or 1969) Asyut hoard, found at Asyut (ancient Lykoupolis) approximately 300 km south of Cairo. The great test mark struck through the lower obverse type bears witness to the rather common ancient Egyptian (no less Persian) testing of Greek coins, and to testings which markedly dominate the recorded 870 (of the rumored approximately 900) archaic silver coins of the Asyut hoard. Martin Price and Nancy M. Waggoner, *Archaic Greek Coinage: The «Asyut» Hoard* (London 1975), 119, date the burial of the hoard to c. 475 B.C., and suggest the date c. 480 for the Skyrian tetradrachm. Price and Waggoner also suggest the date c. 500–480 for the Akanthian undertype with the floral symbol and its two globules in the exergue. Unfortunately, the coin is now «lost» in commerce, and the patina and the types can not be properly studied; and the photograph in this Catalogue is poor. Although the hoard was not uncovered scientifically by proper archaeological methods, in fact uncovered by three Egyptians who divided the coins and then sold them, the hoard is ancient and uncontaminated by modern forgeries. The weight of the coin, however, is unusual. Tetradrachm no. 3 weights 18.23 g, and is exceedingly heavy, 0.26 g heavier than the heaviest Akanthian tetradrachm recorded by Desneux; and heavier by 0.53 g than the heaviest complete Akanthian tetradrachm in the Asyut hoard. Twenty-seven Akanthian tetradrachms from this hoard (excluding the Skyrian overstrike, tetradrachm no. 3) range between 16.09 and 17.70 g, with a cluster at 16.55–17.45 g, and a peak at 17.20–17.25 g. This unusual weight, however, should not condemn the coin. As tetradrachm no. 2 (A. 2–P. 2) appears genuine and as tetradrachm no. 3 (A. 3–P. 2) which must be considered genuine bears the same reverse, the above argument is sustained, that P. 2

is an ancient Skyrian reverse type from which Christodoulos patterned his reverse die (pl. 25 b-c; Fig. 1).

The Akanthian obverse undertype is similar to that of tetradrachm no. 2, and is approximately 170 degrees to the left of the vertical axis of the Skyrian type. The Akanthian lion facing right grapples with the bull facing left. The lion's back is outlined as are the hairs of his mane and the digits of his left paw which grasps the rump and the base of the bull's tail. The Akanthian beaded border is also visible above the lion. Unfortunately, neither an Akanthian flower in the upper zone nor the exergue motif can be detected. On the reverse are the lines of the Akanthian quartered




Fig. 3

square incuse (Fig. 3). Although the Akanthian obverse type on tetradrachm no. 3 is faint, it appears to be similar to the Akanthian obverse type on tetradrachm no. 2. This type, Price and Waggoner note, is similar to that of the Akanthian tetradrachms nos. 183-187 in the Asyut hoard, which are among the latest of the Akanthian tetradrachms in that hoard, and are just prior to the advent of the «Akanthian flower», the rosette in the upper obverse field, c. 480 B.C. Therefore, following Price and Waggoner's revisions for the dating of Akanthian tetradrachms (esp. Desneux's Type E 3 [no. 34 D 32-R 32]), the two Akanthian tetradrachms in question are to be dated late within the period c. 500-480 B.C.

Of the Skyrian didrachms, there are fifteen specimens (no. 4-18) (7.63-8.68 g) of three distinct groups struck from four obverse dies (A. 4-7) and two reverse dies (P. 3-4). The four obverse dies bear the Skyrian motif of the two goats heraldically opposed with a fig leaf between (similar to the obverse dies of the tetradrachms), with slight modifications to each of the four dies. The reverse dies with the basic incuse square contain the stellate design of two three-lobed fig leaves, rays, and globules (also similar to the reverse dies of tetradrachms). The first group contains didrachm no. 4 A. 4-P. 3. The two goats are similar to those represented on the tetradrachms: heraldically opposed, with short horns, beards inward, and the rendition of their bodies in three sections. The five-lobed fig leaf between is simple. And the entire motif is within a linear rectangle, although the upper and side lines are obliterated

except for the lower left side which remains noticeable. This obliteration of lines may indicate that several coins were struck before this specimen, in the process of which the lines were filled and barely left their impression. Two important features, however, must be noted: the right leg of the right goat which bends backward, and the «bone» shaped object beneath the chin of the right goat. This styled leg does not appear upon the right goats of the obverses A. 6 and A. 7 which do compare closely to A. 4. Nor does the «bone» shaped object of A. 4 appear on A. 6 or A. 7, although a slight rise of silver is noticeable on didrachm no. 9 (A. 7) and on didrachm no. 17 (A. 7). The nature of the cast of no. 18 (A. 7) prevents a careful observation, yet a remnant may also be visible there. The object of these didrachms, no. 9, 17, and 18, however, does not appear to be in the same location as the «bone» shaped object of didrachm no. 4. In that the position of the forelegs of the right goat of didrachm no. 4 (A. 4–P. 3) differ from the position of the forelegs of the right goat of didrachm no. 7 (A. 6–P. 4) and didrachms nos. 9–18 (A. 7–P. 4) we must consider the obverse type A. 4 distinctly different from A. 6 and A. 7 to which there is similarity. The reverse die of didrachm no. 4 (P. 3) is clean, with no flaws either across the fig leaf or the ray nor with the break of the side of the incuse adjacent to the flawed fig leaf; flaws which do appear on the reverse die P. 4 of the didrachms nos. 5–15 (A. 5–7).

Didrachm no. 4 (A. 4–P. 3) is, therefore, unique, although a plaster cast of the obverse type (pl. 25) is included among Svoronos' publication of Christodoulos' forgeries. Clearly the cast is not that of A. 6 or A. 7. which are very similar to A. 4 (nor of the dissimilar A. 5). The cast is of the type A. 4; and, in fact, more detail appears on the cast (pl. 25 e) than upon the didrachm no. 4; specifically the fore and rear legs of the right goat, the two vertical sides of the linear rectangle, and the «bone» shaped object beneath the chin of the right goat. This observation suggests that the obverse type of the cast was produced either immediately before or immediately after didrachm no. 4. Unfortunately, there is no plaster cast of the reverse of plate 25 e, the Christodoulos forgery, therefore, it can not be compared with the reverse of didrachm no. 4 (P. 3). But in that P. 3 is similar in form to P. 4 yet does not contain the flaws of P. 4, it is possible to consider P. 3 distinct from P. 4. Reverse P. 3, therefore, may be Christodoulos' version of P. 4, a reverse type very easy to duplicate. Consequently, we may consider didrachm no. 4 A. 4–P. 3, 7.97 g Berlin, a forgery struck by Christodoulos.

The eleven other didrachms, nos. 5–6 (A. 5–P. 4), nos. 7–8 (A. 6–P. 4), and nos. 9–18 (A. 7–P. 4), which are not of the type A. 4 nor of plate 25 e, may be considered authentic archaic Skyrian coins. The second group (A. 5–P. 4) bears the common two goats heraldically opposed, but with a three-lobed fig leaf raised high with a long petiole and the central lobe of the leaf which separates the heads of the goats. This type differs from A. 5 and A. 7 in that the entire motif is encircled with a beaded border rather than within the linear rectangle (a beaded border which is also borne on the tetradrachms). In addition, below each goat is a «rose cluster», similar



to that identified as the Thracian Pangeion rose (cf. Aineia, Dikaia-of-the-Eretrians, Akanthos, Stagira, Eion, «Letai», Aegai, and the Bisaltai). The left rose is composed of a central globule and seven encircling and small globules, the right rose of a central globule and eight encircling and smaller globules. The use of the Pangeion rose may relate to the suggested source of Skyrian silver and coins for overstriking, the Thracian region. On both specimens, the obverse is a dull silver-gray, with course granulation. This produces the illusion of six legs for each goat, which is the result of lineal striations from the center to the edges due to the course granulation. The two coins also bear the flaws common to the obverse die A. 5 in the 0, 40, and 200 degree positions. In both cases, the punch was driven well into the flan to cause the edges beyond the square incuse to rise in scyphate fashion. Mrs. Oeconomides notes re. specimen no. 6 (A. 5–P. 4) «the obverse has a gray patina, no crystalization, unclear due to a ‚melted‘ effect of the metal. The reverse is the same but clearer <sup>25</sup>.» M. Ch. Oeconomides also notes that the patinas of the other Skyrian coins in Athens (no. 17, 23, 30) are similar to this (no. 6) didrachm. The surfaces of didrachm no. 5 (A. 5–P. 4) are similar. The reverse die bears the basic incuse square containing the stellate design of two three-lobed fig leaves, rays, and globules and remains the constant feature and the link for all eleven specimens; and, fortunately, markedly and clearly broke down with the common minor flaws becoming major in the process of minting.

A third group of didrachms nos. 7–8, utilizing reverse die P. 4 (which progressively deteriorated in this group in comparison with A. 5–P. 4), adopted a new obverse die A. 6 with the familiar heraldic goats flanking the five-lobed fig leaf (A. 6–P. 4). The rendition of the goats and the fig leaf are, however, unique to the catalogue of didrachms. The bodies of the goats are carefully engraved with no distinct line between the rump and the torso. The goats are beardless and short horned. In contrast to the Christodoulos type, the forelegs of the right goat extend forward, bend, and slant backward slightly. Nor is there a «bone» shaped object beneath the chin of the right goat. In addition, the fig leaf between the two goats bears two distinct base lines within the bottom lobes which give the illusion of a seven-lobed leaf. In this type, the Pangeion roses are absent as is the beaded border replaced with the linear rectangle as borne upon A. 7. Reverse P. 4 was continued in use, and the flaws increased in size over those of A. 5–P. 4, and thus this group after A. 5–P. 4 and before A. 7–P. 4.

Group A. 7–P. 4 contains ten didrachms. The obverse A. 7 bears the common Skyrian motif, the heraldic goats flanking a five-lobed fig leaf within a linear rectangle. The forelegs of the right goat project forward and bend (unlike Christodoulos' die pl. 25 e, A. 4). The fig leaf bears three thin central petals and two wide base petals, without ribbing (unlike A. 6). The bodies of the two goats are formed by three sections (similar to Christodoulos' A. 4) and are not finely rendered as the goats of

<sup>25</sup> Letter dated 20 June 1973.

A. 6 which do not bear the distinct line between the rump and the torso. The reverse P. 4, continues the marked flaws noticeable upon the earlier reverses of A. 5 and A. 6. Upon A. 7, the flaws of P. 4 increase and spread into the left lobe of the reverse fig leaf. Specimen no. 9 (A. 7–P. 4) bears this flaw as the familiar ovoid form and the obliteration of the tip of the same left lobe, specimen no. 10 continues the same with a gradual spreading of the obliteration of the lobe tip, and specimen no. 11 bears a further spread of the same obliteration, in addition to several other cracks in the incuse field. The reverse die continues to deteriorate as the flaw increasingly encroached upon the fig leaf and a new break occurred on the edge of the incuse square at the tip of that leaf. By specimen no. 13, new flaws appeared to the left of the second reverse fig leaf which became larger and larger on specimens nos. 16 and 17, and crossed the opposed ray. Specimen no. 15, struck late in this group, bears upon its obverse both the upper and lower lines of the linear rectangle and extensive cracking on the edges of the flan. Concerning the patina of specimen no. 15, O. Mørholm, Keeper, National Museum, Copenhagen, notes: «the patina of our coin from Skyros seems perfectly normal. On the obverse between the heads of the goats there is a small patch of brownish patina<sup>26</sup>.»

Although this catalogue of Skyrian didrachms is small and incomplete, the pattern revealed by the use of P. 4 for A. 5, A. 6 and then A. 7 indicates progressive deterioration of the punch die but no overlap of striking. This evidence indicates a longer use of the reverse punch than that of the three obverse anvil dies, a pattern of minting which is also indicated among the tetradrachms from the neighboring island of Peparethos, and may be contemporaneous<sup>27</sup>. In the case of Skyros, the use of a single reverse die for three obverse dies indicates a prolific but brief period of minting, probably of one or two years duration.

Among the specimens of group A. 7–P. 4, three coins were overstruck nos. 9, 10, and 13 (8.10–8.32 g). Specimen no. 9 bears the marks of a beaded border in the upper right quadrant of the obverse die and the line of a square incuse along the edge of its Skyrian incuse square (fig. 4). Specimen no. 10 also bears the marks of a beaded border both on the right and on the left sides of the obverse die and the faint lines




Fig. 4

<sup>26</sup> Letter dated 27 July 1973.

<sup>27</sup> J. Balcer, «Peparethos: The Early Coinage Reconsidered», RSN 46 (1967), 25–33.

of a square incuse within the field outside the Skyrian incuse. In addition, the marks of hairs or feathers are noticeable extending to the beaded border on the right side of the obverse (Fig. 5). Specimen no. 13 also bears the marks of a beaded border to




Fig. 5

the right, to the bottom, and to the upper left of the obverse and the corner lines of a square incuse upon the reverse in diagonal apposition to the Skyrian incuse (Fig. 6). The three undertypes are extensively obliterated and undiscernible, yet common to all




Fig. 6

three are the beaded border, the incuse squares, and the weights of the Attic-Euboeic standard for coins which were not cut for reminting. The three may have originated in a single foreign mint. Unfortunately, a search for this undertype has proved fruitless<sup>28</sup>. This reverse type, however, does not appear among the photographs published by Svoronos of Christodoulos' forgeries and, therefore, we may discount their being of Christodoulos' workshops and consider them authentic. Consequently, the square incuses suggest a date of the sixth and early fifth centuries B.C. For this period, the combination of beaded border, incuse square, and Attic-Euboeic standard is not common, but does suggest an origin in the Thracian Chalkidike.

Of the tetrobol denomination (2.68–3.10 g), there are eight specimens struck from two obverse and two reverse dies, and without linkage. Six tetrobols nos. 19–24 (A. 8–P. 5) were struck late within a brief period of time as the reverse die for each bears the same pronounced flaws without progressive deterioration. The obverse


<sup>28</sup> I wish to thank M. Thompson and N. M. Waggoner, The American Numismatic Society, for their diligent search for this undertype.

type bears the traditional two goats and the three-lobed fig leaf on a long petiole, similar to A. 5 of the didrachms. The obverse surfaces are dull and granulated and the reverse struck with the punch and heavy blows to bend the flans upward, also similar to the didrachms nos. 5–6 (A. 5–P. 4). The type of the obverse is unique in that the fig leaf bears only three petals, and that the two base petals are marked by long indentation. Within Svoronos' collection of Christodoulos' forgeries there are two paster casts (pl. 27 f–g) which compare very closely if not exactly to this obverse die A. 8. While the photograph of cast plate 27 f is not very clear, nor is the plaster cast, the photograph and the cast of g are clearer than that of plate 27 f; this may indicate that the obverse die A. 8 is a Christodoulos product. Unfortunately, there is no obverse P. 5 in Svoronos' article. Nevertheless, the evidence indicates that the tetrobols nos. 19–24 (A. 8–P. 5) may be Christodoulos' forgeries. The similarities of these tetrobols with the didrachms nos. 5–6 (A. 5–P. 4), however, not only in type but also in the form of the flan, continue to suggest that the two types (A. 5 and A. 8) are authentic and contemporary. Doubt as to Svoronos' cast of Christodoulos plate e–f and their relationship to obverse A. 8 must remain (see below).

A second series of tetrobols nos. 25–26 (A. 9–P. 6, 2.68 g) bear the heraldic goats flanking a five-lobed fig leaf, in a similar style to the other types but were rendered with an arched back and an extremely thin neck. The reverse is also different, and markedly so, than the other reverse dies. The five-lobed leaf is neither the traditional reverse stellate design nor the familiar five-lobed fig leaf of the obverse types. H.-D. Schultz, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, noted in correspondence: «Der Tetrobol (Nr. 22) ... ist, wie es scheint, aus gutem Silber und gibt keinen Anlaß, seine Echtheit zu bezweifeln<sup>29</sup>.» Nevertheless, both the obverse (A. 9) and the reverse (P. 6) types are unusual and are also found among the Christodoulos casts (pl. 27 h–i). While the photograph of the obverse illustration h is unclear, the long thin necks are prominent and the reverse illustration i compares closely with P. 6. These peculiarities of the types – the thin necked goats and the unusual reverse fig leaf – and their comparison to the Christodoulos casts (pl. 27 h–i) condemn these two (nos. 25–26) tetrobols. It is to be noted that the cast, illustration i, was modeled upon a punch die, similar to the style of the die of Fig. 1 and not upon a coin. This is also true of casts illustrations b–c, which we considered Christodoulos types from that die of Fig. 1 and not authentic. We may, therefore, conclude that Christodoulos struck these. In his attempt to strike acceptable tetrobols, Christodoulos probably used ancient silver to strike tetrobol no. 26.

Nine diobols nos. 27–35 (0.85–1.496 g) also exist which are difficult to distinguish as to the obverse and reverse types. Careful study of the types indicates that the diobols were struck from three obverse dies and two reverse dies, all of which interlink, and which include a Christodoulos anvil die A. 12 (pl. 27 j) and a punch die P. 8 (pl. 27 k) and, therefore, seemingly condemn all nine diobols. Nevertheless,

<sup>29</sup> Letter dated 8 May 1973.

some doubt remains. The three obverse dies A. 10–12 bear the protomes of two goats facing; and differ significantly in the fineness or the coarseness of the features and in the size of the four globules, one above the heads, another above the knees, and two below the knees. Obverse A. 10, nos. 27–31, bears the protomes of the two goats facing, the left with two long curved horns and the right with a single (?) horn, which extend to the border of fine beads. Between the heads at the level just above the base of the horn is a small globule. Just above and between the knees is a larger globule; and beneath each knee is a third and fourth globule, the left slightly higher than the right. A single line exergue crosses the base of the type just above the beaded border. Obverse A. 11, nos. 32–35, is similar but without (?) the exergue. The globules between the heads and the knees are smaller than those of A. 10. A trace of the fine beaded border remains, especially upon no. 33. Obverse A. 12, nos. 34–35 bears the two protomes, but with the horns up, curved slightly back and almost abutting. There is no globule between them. The faces are coarse, the knees of the right goat slightly higher than the left, and there is an exergue of  cross hatch with a beaded border. In spite of the poor quality of illustration j of Christodoulos' cast, A. 12 is the type of this cast j.

The reverse dies P. 7–8 bear a quatrefoil pattern of four opposed rays within an incuse square, and P. 8 globules between the rays. This is a variation of the reverse types P. 1.5 without the fig leaves. Flaws develop progressively from diobol no. 27 to no. 30. On diobol no. 31 of A. 10, the new reverse P. 8 appears of a similar type but with four small globules between the rays and close to the central globule. This reverse links A. 10 with A. 11, as upon diobols nos. 31–33, and links A. 11 with A. 12 upon diobol no. 34. Diobol no. 35, A. 12, however, differs from no. 34 in that the reverse does not bear the flaws which begin upon specimen no. 31 and progressively develop to no. 34. This reverse type is also noted among the Christodoulos casts illustration k, which may have the flaws on the left side, was illustrated here. Nevertheless, the poor quality of Svoronos' photograph prevents a careful analysis.

If these observations are correct, then A. 12 and P. 8 may be Christodoulos' types, and these should condemn their linked types A. 10 and A. 11, and P. 7. Yet, there is reason to consider A. 10 and P. 7 as authentic (see below). The extensive die linkage (A. 10 with P. 7 and P. 8; A. 11 with P. 8; and A. 12 with P. 8) and the marked flaws within the reverse dies (P. 7 noticeable between specimens nos. 27 and 28; and P. 8) indicate an extensive production of diobols beyond those noted here. While the dies of these diobols do not compare to those of the didrachms as do the tetrobols (A. 5 and A. 8), the technique of the minting of the diobols compared to that of the tetrobols is similar. The reverse punches (P. 7–8) were heavily struck upon the flans which are cracked. In regard to specimen no. 31, G. K. Jenkins, Keeper, British Museum, notes: «in most respects the surface seems quite normal with only a little blackish encrustation of the reverse. There are a few characters around the edge of the flan. The general shape of the flan is somewhat scyphate. I can not see any signs of



overstriking<sup>30</sup>.» For all of the diobols, the obverse faces are slightly convex and the edges of the reverse faces beyond the incuse square flare up in scyphate fashion as noted among the didrachms nos. 5–6 (A. 5–P. 4) and the tetrobols nos. 19–24 (A. 8–P. 5).

Of ten hemiobols nos. 36–45 (A. 13–15 – P. 9–11; 0.35–0.44 g), there are three groups for study and each with a distinctive yet unclear obverse type and a distinctive reverse type. The obverse types bear the protome or a head of a horned goat (A. 13–15) and the reverse types bear a five-lobed fig leaf (P. 9), three-lobed fig leaf (P. 10), and the quatrefoil-globule (P. 11), each within a square incuse. While each obverse and each reverse type can be compared with the types of the larger Christodoulos denominations (hemiobol A. 15–P. 11 does compare to diobol A. 12–P. 8), these hemiobols do not appear to be Christodoulos forgeries. Svoronos did not publish the dies or coin casts of these hemiobols, although Christodoulos did strike denominations as small as the tritetartemorion<sup>31</sup>. We may assume, therefore, that the hemiobols are authentic.

One additional tetrobol assigned to Skyros by Svoronos but not a Christodoulos forgery, however, does remain suspect, illustration no. 46 (A. 16–P. 12). During a visit to Skyros in the 1890's, this silver tetrobol 2.76 g (now in Paris) was brought to Svoronos and he, at first, attributed the coin to the Rhodian city of Kameiros because of the obverse fig leaf<sup>32</sup>. Imhoof-Blumer, however, studying a plaster cast of the coin responded: «Je ne crois pas que la pièce d'argent de g. 2,72 (sic) puisse être attribuée à Kameiros. J'opinerai plutôt pour Korkyra<sup>33</sup>.» This attribution, Svoronos confirmed by a study of the Corcyrean coins in the National Museum in Athens. But shortly thereafter, his opinion changed. The observations of Prof. Meliarsakes, Director of the Botanical Museum, University of Athens, after studying plaster casts of the coin, noted that the leaf-type «more or less is a fig leaf, although it has only two side-lobes. Yet in the case of fig trees, they have leaves in the form of that of the plaster cast. For no other leaf do I find similarities<sup>34</sup>.»

Svoronos then rejected Imhoof-Blumer's attribution to Corcyra, and preferred to assign the coin to Skyros whence it was found. His argument was based upon five points. First, the thick border on the obverse was similar to the contemporary coins of Kyme on neighboring Euboea<sup>35</sup>. Second, the «curious and rare weight of 2,76 g» was common to Euboean Chalkis and the Euboean colonies in the Thracian Chalkidike,

<sup>30</sup> Letter dated 23 July 1973.

<sup>31</sup> Svoronos, «Synopsis de Coins faux de Christodoulos», JIAN 20 (1920), 102–107, 141–146.

<sup>32</sup> Svoronos JIAN 3 (1900), 39.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid. 39–40.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid. 40 (in Greek).

<sup>35</sup> Svoronos cites Head HN 453; BMC Cent. Greece pl. xxiv, 20 and E. Beulé, *Les Monnaies d'Athènes* (Paris 1858), 19.

and that Skyros lay between <sup>36</sup>. In addition, Svoronos noted that the ancient legends indicate Skyros to have been a Chalkidian colony. Third, the fig was the emblem of ancient Skyros since it was so common to the island. This was further supported by his argument that the fig leaf appears «only on the coins of Idyma in Karia and on the island of Rhodes near Karia», and that the Dolopians were originally Karians. Fourth, the reverse «star» recalled ancient navies and winds which wrecked ships, and namely that of the Dioskouroi who were shipwrecked by winds on Skyros <sup>37</sup>. Fifth, that the Athenians seized Skyros in 469 B.C. (sic) and, therefore, ended minting. By this, Svoronos implied that the coin being archaic could have been an issue of the autonomous Dolopians prior to 469 B.C. <sup>38</sup>.

The five arguments, however, are not convincing. First, in that the coins which Svoronos refers to as being from Euboean Kyme are actually Athenian «Wappenmünzen», and in that they have a heavy border has little bearing upon the coins of Skyros. Second, the Attic-Euboeic weight was utilized by Skyros but, as Svoronos states, also elsewhere. The historicity of Chalkidian colonies in the north has been doubted, yet if historical also has little bearing upon the question of type attribution. The Skyrian types are not Euboean. Third, the fig tree is indeed common to Skyros but the emblem of fame and proverb was the goat and not the fig. The assignment of the Karian fig to Skyros as based upon the legend of Karian settlers from fig areas is also unsound. Fourth, Svoronos' argument for the star of the Dioskouroi is ingenious but not valid: the four-rayed star can not be attributed to the legends of the Dioskouroi by the analogy of stars to sky, sky to winds, winds to shipwrecks, shipwrecks to the Dioskouroi.

Svoronos, of course, based his arguments on the original premise of provenience, and rejected Imhoof-Blumer's suggestion of Corcyra in that it was too distant from Skyros. While provenience is a factor to consider, perhaps we should begin again with Imhoof-Blumer's suggestion of Corcyra. Unfortunately, however, the Corcyrean coins readily do not appear to be similar <sup>39</sup>, thus the Corcyrean attribution may also be untenable.

In analysis of the 45 coins listed in the Catalogue we find three tetradrachms nos. 1-3 (A. 1-3 - P. 1-2) which are attributed to the late archaic mint at Skyros. The possibility does remain, however, that tetradrachm no. 1 (A. 1-P. 1) may be a Christodoulos forgery. Until this coin can be located and studied at first hand, or

<sup>36</sup> JIAN 3 (1900), 41, citing F. Imhoof-Blumer, «Le système monétaire euboïque», *Annuaire de la Société Française de Numismatique* 6 (1882), 89-105, in *Monatsber. k. Preuß. Akad. Wiss.* (1881), 657-674.

<sup>37</sup> Svoronos cited Sophocles Skyrioi see L. Campbell, *Sophocles II* (Oxford 1881), frgs. 507-510, but no references to the Dioskouroi; Dionysius Periegeta 521 which does not refer to the Dioskouroi; and the editor's note to A. Lebègue, «Notes sur Skyros», *Revue archéologique* 25 (1873), 175, n. 1. identifying a relief on Skyros as that of the Dioskouroi.

<sup>38</sup> JIAN 3 (1900), 40-44.

<sup>39</sup> Babelon, *Traité* 2.4.1, pl. CCLXXXIII, nos. 9-25: Corcyra - rev. eight-rayed star, and stellate fulmen or double stellate fulmen.

more information surfaces as to Christodoulos' forgeries, little more can be said. Of the twelve didrachms nos. 4-15 (A. 4-7 - P. 3-4), specimen no. 4 can be labeled a Christodoulos forgery while specimens nos. 5-18 (A. 5-7 - P. 4) may also be attributed to the late archaic mint at Skyros. The types appear similar and are, no doubt, contemporary. Of the seven tetrobols nos. 19-26 (A. 8-9 - P. 5-6) all seem to be, at first instance, Christodoulos forgeries. The two tetrobols nos. 25-26 (A. 9-P. 6) with the unusual obverse type of two thin-necked goats and the reverse type of a single five-lobed fig leaf appear markedly dissimilar from the authentic coins, and are similar to the Christodoulos casts illustrations h-i, to condemn these easily as Christodoulos forgeries. Tetrobols nos. 19-24 (A. 8-P. 5), in contrast, are extremely similar to the types of the authentic tetradrachms and didrachms. Although the obverse type (A. 8) does appear among Svoronos' collection of Christodoulos forgeries, illustrations f-g, and that should condemn these five, words of caution must be raised. In addition, one must question the basis upon which Christodoulos chose the tetrobol denomination for Skyros if, indeed, all seven are forgeries. As noted below, the tetrobols do conform to the system of Attic-Euboeic weights for the Northern Sporades, but did Christodoulos know this? Why did he not choose, instead, the drachma denomination of 4.36 g? This leads one to suspect, although there is no concrete evidence, that among the extant tetrobols there are authentic late archaic Skyrian coins, which are difficult if not impossible to isolate, given the nature of the casts and the Svoronos photographs. This doubt also raises the question of the existence of authentic coins among the Christodoulos plaster casts. If this could be considered, then we may suspect the casts of illustrations f-g. Two other possibilities, however, do remain. One, did Christodoulos fashion his dies for casts f-g from authentic Skyrian tetrobols, and so well that we can not detect the differences? Or too, is there an authentic Skyrian tetrobol (or tetrobols) from which Christodoulos patterned his dies and which is now unknown to us?

This problem raises a third possibility, and the solution may rest with Svoronos' article of 1911, JIAN 13. And this possibility seems to answer the problem at hand, best of all. In that collection of six Skyrian coins, four can not be attributed to Christodoulos: tetradrachm no. 2, didrachm nos. 10 and 16, and hemiobol no. 38. The question now arises, are tetrobol no. 21 and diobol no. 30 authentic or are they Christodoulos forgeries? Or, to rephrase the question, did Christodoulos strike Skyrian forgeries before or after Svoronos' 1911 article? As far as we can tell, Skyrian coins had not been isolated nor published before 1911. We may assume, therefore, that Christodoulos patterned his dies for didrachm no. 4 (A. 4-P. 3) after the tetradrachms nos. 10 and 11, both of which were struck from the authentic Skyrian dies A. 7-P. 4. Similarly, Christodoulos' obverse for tetradrachm illustration d appears to have been patterned after tetradrachm no. 2 (A. 2-P. 2). At the moment, it is impossible to determine the origins of Christodoulos' tetradrachm plate 25 a, Fig. 1; whether it was patterned after an authentic coin similar if not the same as tetradrachm no. 1 (A. 1-P. 1) or whether it was Christodoulos' interpretation of tetradrachm no. 2

(A. 2–P. 2) and the actual dies for tetradrachm no. 1. Again, our suspicion of specimen no. 1 is raised. Consequently, we return to the question of the authenticity of tetrobol no. 21 which, would appear by this analysis of Svoronos' 1911 article to be authentic, as would diobol no. 30. Tetrobols nos. 19–24 (A. 8–P. 5) probably are, therefore, genuine late archaic coins from Skyros. Either plate 27 f–g are casts of authentic coins or are Christodoulos' forgeries which are impossible to differentiate from the originals due to the nature of the plaster casts and the photographs. We may, however, still consider tetrobols nos. 25–26 (A. 9–P. 6) to be Christodoulos' forgeries and as his interpretation of tetrobol no. 21 from Svoronos' article of 1911. And it is possible that Christodoulos may have seen the actual coins of that 1911 article, about the time of publication, and have modeled his dies from them rather than from Svoronos' plates. How Christodoulos may have seen the six coins is another question but does not imply a relationship between Christodoulos and Svoronos. In that the National Museum in Athens could not buy the coins, they did circulate in the market. This evidence does indicate that the forgeries no. 4 (A. 4–P. 3) and nos. 25–26 (A. 9–P. 6) were probably struck after 1911, and before the death of Christodoulos in 1914.

This analysis now raises a question about the nine diobols nos. 27–35 (A. 10–12 – P. 7–8). If diobol no. 30 (A. 10–P. 7) is authentic, then we must consider that the Christodoulos casts plate 27 j and k are copies of authentic Skyrian diobols or are Christodoulos inventions based upon the dies of no. 30. The latter possibility appears most cogent especially when one attempts to analyze the corpus of diobols, extremely poor in detail, with the difficult to interpret photographs of the casts. But just which diobols are authentic and which are Christodoulos' remains a problem. We may assume that diobols nos. 27–30 (A. 10–P. 7) are authentic. Diobols nos. 31–33 (A. 10–P. 8, A. 11–P. 8) remain questionable, and diobols nos. 34–35 (A. 12–P. 8) may be Christodoulos forgeries.

Of the ten hemiobols nos. 36–45 (A. 13–15 – P. 9–11), no. 38 was included in Svoronos' study of 1911; and all may be considered authentic. In addition, tetrobol no. 46 is genuine but not Skyrian.

The suspicion that tetrobols nos. 19–24 (A. 8–P. 5) are genuine now leads us to consider the nature of the Skyrian hoard, IGCH no. 31. Didrachms nos. 5 and 7, as argued above, are genuine; and in obverse type didrachm no. 5 (A. 5–P. 4) is similar to the tetrobols in question nos. 19–24. The argument of the similarity of type coupled with the argument that tetrobol no. 18 (A. 8–P. 5) is genuine indicate that the tetrobol no. 16 (A. 8–P. 5) from the Skyrian hoard is also genuine and not a Christodoulos forgery. Consequently, the hoard as such may be considered genuine.

As a forger of ancient Greek coins, specifically of late archaic Skyrian coins, Christodoulos demonstrated his skill. He copied authentic Skyrian types, maintained their motifs, sustained the Skyrian Attic-Euboeic weight system (see below), apparently used ancient silver for his forgeries, and has confused the numismatic community for over a half of a century. He apparently patterned his didrachm no. 4 (A. 4–P. 3) after the didrachms nos. 10 and 16 (A. 7–P. 4), and copied well the obverse type of the



heraldic goats and the fig leaf within a linear rectangle yet bent the right goat's forelegs backward; and for some reason produced a die which bore that strange «bone» shaped object. The reverse is almost an exact copy of the original but without the telltale flaws. Tetrobols nos. 25–26 (A. 9–P. 6) in comparison, however, reveal the artistic liberties which Christodoulos took in designing his dies, the unusual obverse thin-necked goats and the unique reverse of the single five-lobed leaf within an incuse square. Our confusion, nevertheless, still remains as to the origins of tetradrachm no. 1 (A. 1–P. 1), tetrobols nos. 19–24 (A. 8–P. 5), and diobols nos. 31–33 (A. 10–P. 8, A. 11–P. 8) and nos. 34–35 (A. 12–P. 8). These types are very similar to Christodoulos' types yet there is substantial reason to question their origins and to suggest their genuineness. As suggested above, Christodoulos copied the coins of Svoronos' article of 1911; and in November of 1913 the numismatic collection of Berlin purchased didrachm no. 4. We may, therefore, pinpoint the years 1911–1913 as those during which Christodoulos designed and struck his «Skyrian» forgeries.

In 1927, Babelon published three Skyrian coins which now can not be located but which are Christodoulos' work, tetrobol no. 25 (Babelon 781), or suspected forgeries, tetradrachm no. 1 (Babelon 778) and diobol no. 32 (Babelon 783). The other forgery and three other suspected coins were obtained by national collections from numismatic sales: tetrobol no. 26 (Hirsch 32, 520); and the questionable diobols no. 31 (Mavrogordato 1949), no. 33 (Glendining 4 Oct. 1957, no. 137), and no. 34 (Hirsch 32, 522). Didrachm no. 4 also initially appeared in commerce (Egger Nov. 1913). Diobol no. 35, ANS, is unlisted. From these data we may conclude that several Christodoulos forgeries have been in commerce and in private collections. Babelon also published the genuine hemiobols nos. 37, 39, 43, and 45 (784.26, 784.25, 784.24, and 785) and the questionable tetrobol no. 20 (780), and these too seem to be in private collections and commerce. Didrachms nos. 8, 12, 14, and tetrobol no. 24 are known to me only through sales catalogues and their present locations are unknown. In that Mildenberg reports having examined Skyrian coins also indicates that a number of genuine and/or forged Skyrian coins exist which have not been located. The observations concerning the developed flaws and the suggestions of a sizable corpus of both ancient and Christodoulos coins are reaffirmed.

Of the 45 Skyrian coins, both authentic and Christodoulos forgeries, the weights conform to the Attic-Euboeic mean:

	Attic-Euboeic		authentic Skyrian
tetradrachms	17.49 g	17.31–18.23	(nos. 2–3)
didrachms	8.72 g	7.63– 8.68	(nos. 5–18)
tetrobols	2.98 g	2.71– 3.10	(nos. 19–24)
diobols	1.45 g	0.85– 1.18	(nos. 27–30)
hemiobols	0.36 g	0.35– 0.44	(nos. 36–45)



	questionable attribution		Christodoulos forgeries	
tetradrachms	17.30	(no. 1)	—	
didrachms	—		7.97	(no. 4)
tetrobols	—		2.68	(nos. 25–26)
diobols	1.34–1.39	(nos. 31–33)	1.29– 1.496	(nos. 34–35)?
hemiobols	—		—	

The weights conform not only within the Attic-Euboeic system utilized among the markets of Attica and Euboea to the south of Skyros, but also conform to the Corinthian standard and system to the north of the island in the Thracian Chalkidike and farther south beyond Attica in Corinth, in that there are no obols (0.70 g) but tetrobols and diobols (at standards of 2.80 and 1.40 g). This Attic-Euboeic system, adopted throughout the Northern Sporades (cf. Peparethos: tetradrachms [14.28] 16.43–17.27; didrachm 8.06; and tetrobols 2.52–2.79 g)<sup>40</sup>, utilizes the weight standards established by Corinth's northern colony Potidaia, which also influenced several states within the Chalkidike: Kapsa, Kithas, Tinde, Dikaia-of-the-Eretrians, Aineia, and Serme. Potidaia struck tetradrachms upon the Attic-Euboeic system (16.04–17.70 g), tetrobols (2.16–2.86 g), and diobols (1.09–1.36 g) in conformance with Corinth's standards (2.66–2.81 and 1.30–1.37 g)<sup>41</sup>. Certainly the facile exchange of the Skyrian coins no less the Peparethian coins also from the Northern Sporades (both within the Corinthian and Attic-Euboeic systems) was prevalent among the states of the Chalkidike, Euboea, Attica, and Corinth; a system of weight exchange which had been developing in that area since the early sixth century B.C.

In 594/593 B.C., the Athenian Solon had suggested that the Athenians, in order to increase trade, seek greater commercial ties with the friendly ports of Euboea and the Thracian Chalkidike, with the neighboring ports of Thessaly and Macedonia, and also with Corinth, her port at Kenchreai and the western trade transported over the Corinthian *diolkos* to Magna Graecia and Sicily. Consequently, Solon drafted laws which altered the weights and measures systems (not coins) in Attica to a mina of 437 g which corresponded with the system used in Corinth, Euboea, the Thracian Chalkidike, and the coastal regions of Thessaly and Macedonia<sup>42</sup>. Attica's earlier system, based upon the mina of 617 g, had corresponded to that of Aegina and the

<sup>40</sup> See note 27.

<sup>41</sup> J. Alexander, «The Coinage of Potidaea», *Studies Presented to David Moore Robinson II* (St. Louis 1953), 201–210, considered the tetrobols as drachms. Cf. Head HN 212; Babelon, *Traité I.* 2.1147–1149; Gaebler, *Die antiken Münzen III.* 2. 103.

<sup>42</sup> Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 10; see C. Kraay, «An Interpretation of *Ath. Pol.* ch. 10», *Essays in Greek Coinage Presented to Stanley Robinson* (Oxford 1968), 1–9; K. Kraft, «Zur Übersetzung und Interpretation von Aristoteles, *Athenaion Politeia*, Kap. 10 (Solonische Münzreform)», *Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte* 10 (1959/60), 21–46; «Zur Solonischen Gewichts- und Münzreform», *JNG* 19 (1969), 7–24; and E. Lévy, «La réforme solonienne des mesures, poids et monnaies à propos d'une controverse récente», *Schweizer Münzblätter* 23 (1973), 1–6.

Cycladic Islands over which Aegina held a commercial domination. But Solon sought northern grains and timber and the products of the Corinthian emporia as developed by Periander over the products of Aegina and the Cyclades. Into this system fit the islands of the Northern Sporades: Skiathos, Peparethos, Ikos, Halonnesos, and Skyros. Consequently, the later coinage of Peparethos (c. 490 B.C.) and Skyros utilized this double system: Attic-Euboeic weights and the Corinthian denominations of tridrachms (staters: 8.42 g which passed as Attic didrachms), and fractions, notably the diobols and hemiobols, rather than Attic weight obols (0.63–0.72 g). During the archaic period, Corinthian fractions were relatively common with a substantial output of staters. Few fractions, however, can be attributed to the period after 480 B.C.<sup>43</sup>

The silver for the Skyrian coins was obtained from Thrace, certainly from Akanthos, and probably originally from the Pangeion district. In comparison, Peparethos utilized a tetradrachma reverse type, the head of Herakles (Series I.2 and II.3), similar to that of Thracian Dikaia-by-Abdera c. 515–490 B.C.; and overstruck a didrachm (Peparethos didrachm Series VI.9) from Methymna on the island of Lesbos (cf. Babelon *Traité* XV.19, no. 615). This Methymnian didrachm probably first circulated in Thrace during the period c. 510–490 B.C., and then was carried to the Northern Sporades and to Peparethos. The evidence clearly indicates the involvement of the peoples of the Northern Sporades within the commerce of greater Thrace. Similarly, the Skyrian tetradrachm no. 3, was probably first carried to Thrace, then eastward and ultimately on to Egypt.


An important factor of the Skyrian coins is the interlinkage of the dies among the didrachms nos. 5–18 (A. 5–8 – P. 5), with their distinct flaws and progressive deteriorations, which indicate a brief period of minting, and also the similarity of obverse and reverse types which compare among the several die-types for which no linkage appears. This further suggests a brief period of minting and perhaps between one and three years with relatively significant numbers of each denomination. Surprising are the number of fractions, especially hemiobols, which survived.

It is tantalizing to consider the Skyrian coins as belonging to the several years prior to Kimon's attack against the Dolopian pirates, however, there is neither discrete nor tenuous evidence to consider the date c. 478–475 B.C.<sup>44</sup>. Price and Waggoner suggest that the Aegean coins of the Asyut hoard had been gathered by c. 480 B.C. and then buried in Egypt shortly thereafter, c. 475 B.C. The evidence

<sup>43</sup> C. Kraay, «Hoards, Small Change and the Origin of Coinage», *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 84 (1964), 87.

<sup>44</sup> Thuc. i. 98.2; Ephoros FGtH 70: Pap. Oxyr. XIII. 1610, fr. 6.45–46; Diod. Sic. xi. 60.2; Plut. Thes. 36.1, Kim. 8.3–6; Nepos Cim. 2.5; for the date c. 475 B.C., see B. Meritt et al., *The Athenian Tribute Lists* 3 (Princeton 1950), 160; if Themistokles did witness the Athenian siege of Naxos, c. 470 B.C., as argued by R. Lenardon, «The Chronology of Themistokles' Ostracism», *Historia* 8 (1959), 37. Yet, there is no evidence for Lenardon's date for the siege of Skyros, 477/476 B.C. Lenardon's argument for the siege of Naxos as c. 470 B.C., negates J. Smart, «Kimon's Capture of Eion», *JHS* 87 (1967), 136–137, that Kimon besieged Skyros in 469/468 B.C.

of the Asyut hoard, consequently, rejects any consideration that the Skyrian coins were minted during the Dolopian conflict with Kimon and the Athenians. In addition to this evidence of the Asyut hoard, a *terminus ante quem* for the Skyrian coins can be further established with Kimon's direction of the naval forces of the Delian Confederacy against the Dolopian pirates who inhabited the island c. 475 B.C. After Kimon's siege of the Dolopians' fortress, he enslaved the inhabitants, removed them from the island, and then settled Athenian colonists at the city of Skyros. Although a colony, Athenian Skyros did not become independent, nor a member of the Delian Confederacy<sup>45</sup>, but remained an overseas extension of Athens until 404 B.C. when the island fell to the control of Sparta. Consequently, the archaic coins would have been struck prior to c. 475 B.C. and about c. 480 as based upon the evidence of the Asyut hoard. A *terminus post quem* is also determined for the Skyrian coins by the



evidence of the Asyut hoard and the re-dating of the Akanthian tetradrachms (the undertypes to the Skyrian tetradrachms nos. 2–3), to late within the period c. 500–480

<sup>45</sup> Nor did Skyros join the Second Athenian League, as did Skiathos, Peparethos, and Ikos; IG II<sup>2</sup>. 43 +; M. Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions II* (Oxford 1948), no. 123.

B.C.<sup>46</sup>. In final analysis, the hoard evidence strongly suggests a date c. 490–480 B.C. for the operation of the mint at Skyros, and perhaps more accurately c. 485–480 B.C. This date is also supported by the following: the late archaic obverse types, the late archaic types of the didrachma undertypes, the Pangeion «roses» of the late archaic period, the extensive production of fractional coinage similar to the Corinthian production of fractions during this period, and the similarity of fractional denominations (tetrobols) to the coinage of neighboring Peparethos c. 490 B.C.<sup>47</sup>. In light of the evidence from the Asyut hoard and the suggested date c. 485–480 B.C. for the late archaic silver coins of Skyros, it is possible to re-examine the Skyros hoard (IGCH no. 31) of three coins (nos. 5, 7, 19) which bear few marks of circulation. Although the report of the hoard is incomplete, and a final analysis impossible to report, the possibility is suggested that the coins minted by c. 480 B.C. may have been «buried» c. 475 B.C. during the military campaigns of Kimon and the Delian confederates against the Dolopians of Skyros<sup>48</sup>.

<sup>46</sup> My now outdated study, «The Persian Occupation of Thrace, 519–491 B.C.: The Economic Effects», *Actes de II<sup>e</sup> Congrès international des Etudes du sud-est Européen*, Athènes 1970, Vol. II (Athens 1972), 241–258, reflects the state of scholarship concerning late archaic coinage in the northern Aegean prior to the publication of *Archaic Greek Coinage: The «Asyut» Hoard*.

<sup>47</sup> J. Balcer, «Peparethos: Further Notes», *SNR* 54 (1975), 33–36.

<sup>48</sup> This study raises several new problems. A thorough examination must be undertaken of the remainder of the plaster casts of the Christodoulos forgeries and of Christodoulos' obverse and reverse dies of the Pyrrhus and Arsinoë tetradrachms (*JIAN* 20 [1920], Fig. 1–2). This will reveal more information as to Svoronos' study of the casts, as to Christodoulos and his forgeries, and as to the coins in the numerous public and private collections which relate to these forgeries. One can hope that the Svoronos Papers will enlighten us as to the numerous problems now raised about Christodoulos, no less Skyros.

# CATALOGUE

## *Skyros* Attic-Euboic Standard

Two long horned, bearded goats heraldically opposed back to back, legs extended and forelegs bent under, heads arched toward upper center; between them, five-lobed fig leaf up.

Rev. Stellate design, two three-lobed fig leaves and two rays opposed; in center globule amid four globules; square incuse.

All specimens illustrated

c. 485–480 B.C.

### *Tetradrachms*

- |   |          |   |
|---|----------|---|
|   | A. 2     | Thin features, heads apart, right head lower than left, fig leaf skewed to right; exergue; beaded border.   |
| 2 | P. 2     | Thin fig leaves and rays, no petioles; equal globules.  |
|   | a) 17.31 | ANS; Svoronos JIAN 13 (1911), 1; Hamburger 98, 1933, 803; compared to but not forgery by K. Christodoulos, Svoronos JIAN 20 (1920), pl. I, 279 (see pl. 25 b); also p. 101, fig. 3 for Christodoulos' reverse die (see Fig. 1 and pl. 25 c–d). Overstrike upon Akanthos tetradrachm, cf. J. Desneux, Les tétradrachmes d'Akanthos no. 34 D 32–R. 32.  |
|   | A. 3     | Similar to A. 2, but head of left goat lower than right, fig leaf skewed to left; beaded border.  |
|   | P. 2     | Same die.   |
| 3 | a) 18.23 | Commerce. Asyut hoard, IGCH no. 1644; Martin Price and Nancy M. Waggoner, <i>Archaic Greek Silver Coinage: The «Asyut» Hoard</i> (London 1975) 49–50, pl. XIII. 233; compared to not forgery by Christodoulos, Svoronos JIAN 20 (1920), pl. I, 279 (see pl. 25 b); also p. 101, fig. 3 for Christodoulos' reverse die (see Fig. 1 and pl. 25 c–d). Overstrike upon Akanthos tetradrachm, cf. J. Desneux, Les tétradrachmes d'Akanthos no. 34 D 32 R 32. |

### *Didrachms*

- |        |         |  |
|--------|---------|--|
|        | A. 5    | Two goats, three-lobed fig leaf between bodies and heads of goats, beards inward (?), large ears back; long petiole; beneath goats two Pangeion-type «rose clusters»; surface coarsely granulated, goats appear to have six legs; beaded border. |
| 5<br>6 | P. 4    | Two three-lobed fig leaves and two rays opposed; in center five small globules, attached to two short petioles; pronounced flaw.   |
|        | a) 8.36 | ANS (Skyros hoard, IGCH no. 31).   |
|        | b) 8.40 | Athens.  |
|        | A. 6    | Two goats, five-lobed fig leaf between bodies, goats with short horns, ears back, tails up, beardless, rendition of body in two sections; two base lines to bottom lobes of fig leaf; linear rectangle.  |
|        | P. 4    | Same die, pronounced flaw continues to develop at fig leaf.  |



- 7 a) 8.58 ANS (Skyros hoard, IGCH no. 31).
- A. 7 Similar, rendition of body in three sections; five-lobed fig leaf with three thin central petals and two wide base petals without ribbing.
- P. 4 Same die, pronounced flaw continues to develop, new flaw develops across rays, side of incuse breaks.
- 8 a) 8.53 Hamburger 98, 1933, 804.
- 9 b) 8.10 Boston; Brett 936. Overstrike.
- 10 c) 8.20 ANS; Svoronos JIAN 13 (1911), 2; Nav. Ars Class. X, 1925, 627. Overstrike.
- 11 d) 8.25 Paris; Babelon 779.
- 12 e) 7.72 Hamburger 98, 1933, 806.
- 13 f) 8.32 Norman Davis Collection 126. Overstrike.
- 14 g) — Glendining July 1964, 94.
- 15 h) 8.01 SNG Copenhagen 732.
- 16 i) 7.63 ANS; Svoronos JIAN 13 (1911), 2a; Nav. Ars Class. IV Grand Duc Alexandre 1928, 655; Hamburger 98, 1933, 804.
- 17 j) 7.72 Athens.
- 18 k) 8.68 Svoronos JIAN 13 (1911), p. 128. 2, pl. III. 15; Jameson 2122; Hess-Leu 14 April 1954, 133.

#### *Tetrobols*

- A. 8 Two goats; three-lobed fig leaf between bodies and heads, long petioles; beaded border (similar to A. 5 without roses).
- P. 5 Two three-lobed fig leaves and two rays opposed; large central globule, four small globules; die flaws.
- 19 a) 2.73 ANS (Skyros hoard, IGCH no. 31).
- 20 b) 2.76 Babelon 780; Pozzi (Nav. Ars. Class. I) 2050.
- 21 c) 2.90 Boston; Brett 937; Svoronos JIAN 13 (1911), 3.
- 22 d) 2.71 Berlin; Hirsch 32, 1912, 519.
- 23 e) 3.10 Athens.
- 24 f) 2.92 Hamburger 98, 1933, 807.

Obverse and reverse dies similar to forgeries by Christodoulos, cf. Svoronos JIAN 20 (1920), pl. I, 282, of similar obverse die (see pl. 27 f–g).

#### *Diobols*

- A. 10 Protomes of two long horned goats facing, single large globule between knees, small globule beneath each knee; exergue; beaded border.
- P. 7 Quatrefoil from center globule within square incuse, developing flaws.
- 27 a) 0.85 ANS.
- 28 b) 1.10 ANS.
- 29 c) 1.18 Boston; Brett 938.
- 30 d) 0.95 Athens; Svoronos JIAN 13 (1911), 4.

#### *Hemiobols*

- A. 13 Oval protome of goat with two «horns» upward.
- P. 9 Five-lobed fig leaf up, petiole; incuse square.
- 36 a) 0.40 ANS.
- 37 b) — Babelon 784. 26.

- 38 c) 0.39 Svoronos JIAN 13 (1911), 5.  
 39 d) – Babelon 784. 25.
- A. 14 Stylized goat, «pear-shaped» torso, two thin lines from bottom, two sets of parallel lines to left, «horn» from upper right.  
 P. 10 Three-lobed fig leaf up; incuse square.
- 40 a) 0.44 ANS.  
 41 b) 0.37 ANS.  
 42 c) 0.43 ANS.  
 43 d) – Babelon 784. 24.  
 44 e) 0.35 Berlin; Hirsch 32, 523.
- A. 15 Head of long horned goat facing right, heavy features (cf. A. 12).  
 P. 11 Quatrefoil from center globule within square incuse (cf. P. 8).
- 45 a) – Babelon 785.

### *Christodoulos Forgeries*

#### *Didrachm*

- A. 4 Two goats, five-lobed fig leaf between bodies, goats with short horns, beards inward, «bone»? under chin of right goat, rendition of body in three sections; plain bottom lobes of fig leaf; linear rectangle.  
 P. 3 Two three-lobed fig leaves and two rays opposed; in center five small globules, attached to two short petioles.
- 4 a) 7.97 Berlin; Egger Nov. 1913, 541; forgery by Christodoulos, cf. Svoronos JIAN 20 (1920), pl. I, 280 (see pl. 25 e).

#### *Tetrobols*

- A. 9 Two goats, thin necks, forelegs raised high, bodies curved; five-lobed fig leaf between and to the ends of muzzles, long petiole; simple, low, plain border.  
 P. 6 Five-lobed leaf up within square incuse.
- 25 a) – Babelon 781.  
 26 b) 2.68 Berlin; Hirsch 32, 1912, 520.

Both forgeries by Christodoulos, cf. Svoronos JIAN 20 (1920), pl. I, 281 for obverse die (see pl. 27 i).

#### *Diobols*

- A. 12 Course features to heads, large globules above and below knees; cross hatched exergue; beaded border.  
 P. 8 Quatrefoil from center globule, dots between leaves, within square incuse; flaw.
- 34 a) 1.29 Berlin; Hirsch 32, 522.  
 35 b) 1.496 ANS; probable forgery by Christodoulos, cf. Svoronos JIAN 20 (1920), pl. I, 284 (for obverse die see pl. 27 j, and for reverse die see pl. 27 k). The possible interlinkage of diobols 31–35 with Christodoulos' dies A. 10–P. 8 may condemn specimens 31–33.

## *Doubtful pieces*

### *Tetradrachm*

- A. 1 Heavy features, heads abut, beard inward, thick-lobed fig leaf; exergue; beaded border.  
P. 1 Thick fig leaves with petioles and rays; center globule larger than others; pronounced die flaw.
- 1 a) 17.30 Babelon 778; compare forgery by Christodoulos, Svoronos JIAN 20 (1920), pl. I, 278; also p. 101, fig. 3 for Christodoulos' obverse die (see Fig. 1 and pl. 25 a).

### *Diobols*

- A. 10? Protome of two long horned goats facing, single large globule between knees, small globule beneath each knee; exergue; beaded border.
- 31 [ P. 8 Quatrefoil from center globule, dots between leaves, within square incuse; flaw.  
a) 1.34 London; Hirsch 32, 1912, 521; Nav. Ars Class. IV Grand Duc 1922, 656; Mavrogordato 1949.
- A. 11 Similar, very small globule above and below knees; no exergue; beaded border.  
P. 8 Same die.
- 32 a) — Babelon 783.
- 33 b) 1.39 Boston; Brett 87; Glendining 4 Oct. 1957, 137.

### *Tetrobol*

- A. 16 Three-lobed, heavily veined leaf (fig. ?); heavy plain border.
- P. 12 Triangular stellate pattern, three rays from central globule and three smaller alternating globules; in triangular incuse.
- 46 a) 2.76 Paris; Babelon 782; Svoronos JIAN 3 (1900), 39; JIAN 13 (1911), pl. III, 20.

## *Die Linkages*

### *Tetradrachms*

	Obv.	Rev.
	Fig. 1, _____ plate 25 a: Christodoulos	Fig. 1: Christodoulos _____
1	A. 1 _____ plate 25 b: Christodoulos	P. 1 _____ Fig. 1, plate 25 c-d: Christodoulos _____
2	A. 2 _____	P. 2 _____
3	A. 3 _____	P. 2 _____

### *Didrachms*

	Obv.	Rev.
	plate 25 e: Christodoulos	
4	A. 4 _____	P. 3 _____

5-6	A. 5	P. 4
7	A. 6	P. 4
8-18	A. 7	P. 4

#### *Tetrobols*

	Obv.	Rev.
	plate 27 f-g: Christodoulos	
19-24	A. 8	P. 5
	plate 27 h: Christodoulos	plate 27 i: Christodoulos
25-26	A. 9	P. 6

#### *Diobols*

	Obv.	Rev.
27-30	A. 10	P. 7
31	? A. 10	P. 8
32-33	A. 11	P. 8
34-35	A. 12	P. 8
	plate 27 j: Christodoulos	plate 27 k: Christodoulos

#### *Hemiobols*

	Obv.	Rev.
36-39	A. 13	P. 9
40-44	A. 14	P. 10
45	A. 15	P. 11

#### *Survey*

of the photographs of the dies and of the plaster casts made from the *forgeries* of Konstantinos Christodoulos; Svoronos JIAN 20 (1920), pl. I.

#### *Tetradrachms*

		Svoronos
A. 1 (?)	= plate 25 a, Fig. 1	= 278 obv.; also fig. 3, obv. die 278 A.
	plate 25 b	= 279 obv.
	plate 25 c-d, Fig. 1	= 278 rev., 279 rev.; also fig. 3, rev. die 278 B.

#### *Didrachms*

A. 4	= plate 27 e	= 280.
------	--------------	--------

*Tetrobols*

	plate 27 f-g	= 282-283.
A. 9	= plate 27 h	= 281.
P. 6	= plate 27 i	= 285.

*Diobols*

A. 12	= plate 27 j	= 284 obv.
P. 8	= plate 27 k	= 284 rev.

*Location-Index of Specimens Illustrated*

ANS New York	2, 5, 7, 10, 16, 19, 27, 28, 35, 36, 40, 41, 42.
Athens	6, 17, 23, 30.
Berlin	4, 22, 26, 34, 44.
Boston	9, 21, 29, 33.
Copenhagen	15.
London	31.
Paris	11, 46.
Asyut hoard	3.
Babelon, <i>Traité</i>	1, 20, 25, 32, 37, 39, 43, 45.
Glendining	14.
Hamburger	8, 12, 24.
Hess-Leu	18.
Norman Davis Collection	13.
Svoronos JIAN	38.





*Christodoulos: a-e and 4. Doubtful 1*




8




15




9



16





10




17



11





18




12



19




13



20




21



14



22





*Christodoulos: f-k: 25, 26 and 33, 35. Doubtful: 31, 32, 33 and 46*