

Zeitschrift: Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau = Revue suisse de numismatique = Rivista svizzera di numismatica
Herausgeber: Schweizerische Numismatische Gesellschaft
Band: 85 (2006)

Buchbesprechung: Excavations at Nemea III : the coins [Robert C. Knapp, John D. Mac Isaac]

Autor: Walker, Alan S.

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: 07.02.2026

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

KOMMENTARE ZUR LITERATUR ÜBER ANTIKE UND ORIENTALISCHE NUMISMATIK

Robert C. Knapp/John D. Mac Isaac

Excavations at Nemea III. The Coins

Berkeley 2005. xxxii + 290 pp., 20 figs., 32 Pls. Cloth bound. \$ 135.–
ISBN 0-520-23169-4(v.3)

This elegant volume marks a milestone in the publication of excavation coins. The detailed presentation of both the coins and the archaeological contexts in which they were found, and the history of the site, rather than simply listing the coins in a purely numismatic way, makes the understanding of the material much easier. The extensive commentaries on the circulation and use of the coins, as well as on some of their dates, is both welcome and thought provoking. A number of very useful plans showing the findspots of certain types of coins sets a standard for the future and would have been more than useful in many earlier final report volumes; such as those, to mention only a few, from the Athenian Agora, Corinth, Dura, Morgantina, Sardes and Troy. In short, this volume stands as a challenge to those responsible for the future publication of excavation coins from any other major Greek site.

Nemea's history is fairly straightforward. The major buildings at the site are the early Hellenistic temple (the Archaic temple was destroyed when the sanctuary was sacked c. 415/410), a heroön for the cult of Opheltes (initially from the first half of the 6th century), and an early Hellenistic stadium (replacing an Archaic one on the other side of the sanctuary). In addition there were a series of 'treasuries' or *oikoi* (initially built in the 5th century), a *xenon* or hotel building (later 4th century), and some houses (initially from the 5th century). For numismatic purposes it is important to note that after the sanctuary was destroyed in c. 415-410 it was apparently abandoned until the mid-4th century when a great deal of reconstruction work was carried out. This was completed by c. 300 BC, but by c. 275 the site was clearly in disrepair and in c. 271 the Games were permanently moved to Argos. In the third quarter of the century there are some further building works but by the end of the century many of the houses seem to have gone out of use; one, however, continued to be inhabited until the late 2nd century; Mummius may have helped with some construction in the *xenon* c. 146 and Mithradates VI apparently made a dedication in the sanctuary c. 100. There are traces of activities throughout the Roman period until the early 3rd century; but the site really seems to pick up again beginning in the second quarter of the 5th century when the sanctuary area was used by a community of Christian farmers (their basilica was built over the *xenon*). This community came to an end in the late 6th century (possibly in the early 7th) due to the Slavic invasions. The site seems to have once again been occupied during the 12th century but was again in decline and deserted from the late 12th until the

early 1260s when there is a very modest revival that lasted up to the 14th century. After that the site seems to have been definitively abandoned until the 19th century.

It is important to emphasize that since the modern excavations have up to now concentrated on the sanctuary area and the stadium, little is known about the ancient village of Nemea so that evidence for continuing human activity during periods when the sanctuary area was abandoned perhaps remains to be found (I bring up this point here specifically because some of the numismatic evidence for the Greek period points in that direction).

The book is divided into five sections. The first contains useful prefatory material on terminology and the site grid system. The second (pp. 1-180), ably written by RCK, contains the extensive commentary and catalogue for the 2124 Greek and Roman coins found at Nemea, ranging in date from the 5th century BC to the time of Constantine I. JDM was responsible for the third section (pp. 183-237), which consists of a concise and meticulous commentary on the catalogue of 1058 (plus 566 totally illegible) Late Roman/Early Byzantine, later Byzantine, Frankish and Venetian coins from Nemea. This is followed by a number of indices, including a subject index to the text and notes, a very extensive catalogue index and a complete concordance between the excavation coin numbers and their final catalogue numbers (note that missing coin numbers refer to coins that disintegrated or to items initially thought to be coins but which proved not to be). The catalogue index, which must have been done by computer, provides a few amusing entries, like those under horse, "bridled and frothing" and, rather astoundingly, "drawn by Helios in quadriga" (could this be an ancient rite during which, once a year perhaps, the four horses of the sun pile in the quadriga while Helios pulled *them?*).

Finally we have 32 plates of generally disappointing quality. The plates themselves are very nicely, even luxuriantly arranged, with convenient titles giving all minting authorities. Each coin is identified with its catalogue number (which is what one would expect), but also with its excavation coin number (also found in the catalogue) and with a completely superfluous plate number (which also appears in the catalogue text, rather than simply having an asterisk next to the catalogue number to indicate that the coin was illustrated). Thus, on pl. 18, we have an illustration of a coin of Pellene identified as Cat. 1555, C 3889 and w (= pl. 18, w); unfortunately, despite all those three numbers, the coin is 98% illegible. The whole point of illustrating coins from casts is that the uniform plaster surfaces can, when proper care is taken, be lit to ensure that all visible details on the coin are legible; and that the plates themselves are uniform. A good example of such plates, among many possible, are those in the Greek coin volume from the Agora, Agora XXVI, where there are 31 plates of coins illustrated from casts; all well-lit and clear, despite the often poor quality of the coins themselves.

The Nemea plates, in contrast, have illustrations that are often muddy and poorly lit (a few coins, primarily Byzantine and later, were photographed directly – they would have been greatly improved had they been taken from casts). Even worse; while it is true that illustrating excavation coins helps other excavators

identify what they find elsewhere, illustrating coins that are extremely worn, nearly worn flat or corroded into amorphous blobs serves no useful purpose whatsoever (unless, of course, the coin comes from a significant deposit – most of these poorly preserved coins do not). Returning to plate 18, I fail to see the point of illustrating coins a, c, v, w, x and z (with the eye of faith one can see the ram's head on the reverse of w, but, alas, it is illustrated upside-down). Coins like that appear on every plate. The exception that proves the rule is pl. 12 o (cat. 1001), which is nearly worn flat but is clearly of Hadrian (as BCD Corinth 608) rather than of Claudius as identified by RCK. If all such coins had been omitted, the space saved could have been used to print a full-sized map of the entire site (including the stadium area and the modern village) to replace the much too small and wholly inadequate plan given as fig. 1 on p. 12.

JDM's chapter is somewhat unexpectedly entitled "The Early Christian and Later Coin Finds from Nemea." 'Early Christian' stands in for what is usually termed elsewhere as 'Late Roman' and 'Early Byzantine' because, (p. xxx), "such usage is confusing and, at least at Nemea, counterproductive <why?>. Early Christian, designating the period from Constantine the Great to Phocas, is a chronologically, historically, and politically correct term." Politically correct? In any case, since this is the only jargon to be found in the catalogue, and has no affect on the text, we can ignore it. Its use does, however, result in a few oddities in the index of kings and rulers (pp. 249-250), which lists 'Roman Emperors' (Domitian – Licinius II; Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius and Galba, all of whom appear on coins of Corinth, have been omitted in error), 'Early Christian Emperors' (Flavia Helena - Phocas) and, finally, 'Byzantine Emperors' (Leo VI – Isaac II). Luckily, JDM's analysis of the material does not share this semantic eccentricity! He uses the numismatic evidence to delineate the final period of relative prosperity at Nemea in the early Byzantine period just prior to the Slavic invasion (though a few coins of Phocas may indicate that either the site was only abandoned in the early 7th century or that it had a very short-lived partial reoccupation at that time). The remaining discussion is primarily devoted to the imitative issues of Manuel I; this will be of great help to anyone working with excavation material from this period elsewhere in Greece. One can only admire the care JDM has taken to catalogue the coins in his section because they are, as usual, among the most unprepossessing, ill-preserved and ugly coins to be found in a Greek excavation (only 34 were worth illustrating, and at least 5 of those are nearly or completely illegible; Cat. 3089 is illustrated on pl. 32 about 1 ½ times natural size).

Before turning to RCK's extensive chapter on the Greek coins, a word needs to be said on how the coins have been catalogued (while the description given here concerns the Greek coins, JDM's coins are listed in a very similar fashion). The Greek coins are, as usual, geographically arranged. Each group of coins is described by type, with its metal (and denomination for some of the silver), its date (usually taken from one of the standard references) and a citation to one or more reference works. Then each coin appears with its catalogue number; its excavation coin number; a site-grid reference to where it was found; the die axis, diameter and

weight; a plate reference (if illustrated); the date of whatever pottery was found with it; and, sometimes, notes indicating whether it was previously published in an excavation report or if there are legend or minor type variants. The inclusion of the contextual material is very useful, though since the sanctuary was heavily disturbed by farming in late antiquity the unfortunate result is that many of the coins are found in mixed levels; but there are some apparently meaningful deposits (in an unexpected lapse, there is no deposit list included in this book; rather, well groups or groups from intact strata are simply included, *or not*, in footnotes, making them very difficult to find or use).

RCK begins with a very careful summary of both the archaeological history of the site and its buildings and what is known about Nemea from ancient literary sources and inscriptions. He also emphasizes the havoc late antique farming caused to much of the site's stratigraphy, mixing 5th century BC coins with 5th century AD pottery; another good point he makes (p. 18) is that in its heyday, the sanctuary was regularly cleaned, thus precluding the build-up of useful stratified levels. RCK then embarks on a discussion of the kinds of coins found at Nemea. There are only two possible hoards; a group of small silver coins that seem to be offerings that were ritually buried in the late 5th century (a *Wappenmünzen* obol of Athens, a Aeginetan stater, an obol of Phlious, and two hemiobols and a tetartemorion of Sicyon – discussed on p. 19, but only identified when again mentioned on p. 34 in fn. 133) and a group of mid 2nd and early 3rd century Roman bronzes from Corinth and Argos apparently hidden in the roof of the bath building and dispersed when it collapsed (once again, discussed on p. 19, but only listed in fn. 243 on p. 61). RCK quite rightly concludes that the coins found in Nemea provide a true random sample of the coins then in circulation, free from any distortion caused by the presence of large numbers of similar pieces from hoards, and thus can be used for general conclusions about chronology (though Nemea is remarkable for the large number of silver coins found there).

Since to be lost coins have to be available, RCK makes the cogent observation that the vast majority of coins at Nemea come from mints no further than 75 km away (this pattern seems to be true for virtually every excavated ancient Greek site); at Nemea they are primarily from mints such as Corinth, Sicyon, Argos and Phlious that produced extensive coinages. He then goes on to highlight the importance of coins for dating at Nemea; the few pieces that came to light in wells and pits (five well groups are listed, by catalogue number only, in fn. 75, pp. 21-22; for the well in L 17, see below), as well as a coin of Philip II that was deliberately placed in the wall of the xenon, thus supposedly dating its construction to the third quarter of the 4th century (p. 22 and fn. 76; curiously, the coin in question, Cat. 56, is said to have been found in a 'modern' context! Could this be a misprint?). Despite the lack of relevant stratigraphy for so many coins at Nemea, their findspots do show patterns that illustrate the way the site was used at different periods. As RCK emphasizes, while later farming did mix up the vertical stratigraphy, it probably did not move the coins very far horizontally (i.e. we may not have stratigraphic evidence for when the coin was dropped, but we can be fairly confident its findspot is very near where it was originally lost).

Findspots are illustrated on four excellent plans of the sanctuary (*figs. 5-8*) and on one of the stadium (*fig. 9*, unfortunately without the grid overlay), and some of the conclusions drawn are fascinating. This is especially true for the stadium where the concentrations of coins from Corinth, Sicyon, Argos, Phlious and Kleonai seem to indicate where people from those cities sat as spectators! The stadium must have only been used during the Games, unlike the main sanctuary area, which would have had visitors year round, and RCK makes a convincing case for a primarily local audience since far fewer ‘foreign’ coins (i.e. those from places further than 75 km away) were found there than in the sanctuary as a whole. As for why coins should be found in the stadium, RCK reminds us that the Games took place in full summer and that the sellers of snacks and liquid refreshment would have been active in the stands. Mysteriously, four chalkoi of Polyrrenion in Crete turned up on the east side of the stadium in the ‘Argive section’ around the judges’ stand; these are, presumably, the record of a Cretan visitor who attended the games with his Argive hosts. Equally curious is the fact that five silver coins were found in the stadium – unfortunately RCK does not tell us which ones they are. Finally, the numismatic evidence seems conclusive that the stadium was abandoned *c.* 275/270 and not reused.

A very welcome survey of the use of coined money in sanctuaries appears on pp. 32-36. Officials had to meet expenses, charge fees and collect offerings, while visitors would need to pay for accommodations, buy food and souvenirs, and pay for sacrifices or votive offerings.

On pp. 36 through 49 RCK gives us a long but not altogether convincing discussion on how bronze coins circulated. Ancient travellers needed to carry low value bronzes to pay for daily needs as well as a store of higher value silver or gold coins, which were a convenient way of carrying large sums that could be exchanged for smaller denominations as the need arose (in an unfortunate misprint on p. 37, the bronze chalkous is valued at “...one-eighth or one-twelfth of a *drachma*, depending on the coinage system in use”, for *drachma* read *obol* – or for one-eighth read one-forty-eighth and for one-twelfth read one-seventy-second!!).

RCK suggests that there were two types of travellers in ancient days, those who were going to a specific place («destination travel») and those going from place to place over a long term, perhaps as merchants or as visitors to a number of religious sites («peripatetic travel»), and that their use of bronzes would be different. The first group might go directly to Nemea to attend the Games, stopping relatively infrequently and spending little of the money they had brought with them; they would be more likely to have retained the ‘foreign’ bronzes they had brought from home, which might then be spent at Nemea. The peripatetics, however, would spend the low value bronzes brought from home during their trip, replenishing them by exchanging high value silver for local bronzes in the cities they came to. For example, if two travellers set out for Nemea from Boeotia, one going as directly as possible and the other taking side trips to Euboia, Athens, Corinth and Argos, the first might leave a few central Greek coins as traces of his visit to Nemea, but the second might come to the site with a money bag filled mostly with Argive bronzes he had gotten on his last stop.

RCK expands his discussion by suggesting that coins from certain towns that had a special relationship with Nemea would be more likely to appear there. These were the towns that had *theorodokoi*, the men who accommodated the heralds, *theoroi*, who were sent out from Nemea to announce the Nemean Games: people from these towns were perhaps more likely to go the sanctuary than those from other places. RCK tells us that «...in 19 of 32 cases in which a town known to mint bronze during the 4th century BC is represented in the *theorodokoi* lists, a coin turns up at Nemea (Fig. 15 and Table 2).» I think this may be pushing the evidence, especially for the coins of the nearby Arkadian towns of Pheneos, Kleitor and Stymphalos, which one might anyway expect to find at Nemea. Another problem is that while he speaks of «19 of 32 cases», according to the map and the table it seems actually to be at most only 14 of 27 (and 3 of the 14 are represented by coins minted later than the 4th century).

In a short section RCK discusses the coins of Argos and Kleonai that bear reference to Nemea (note that Olympia/Elis *did not* have a coinage prior to 471 as stated by RCK on p. 49, and that Delphi *did* produce Roman provincial issues with types referring to the Pythian Games, as BMC 24, 32, 35-40). There are quite a few pieces from Argos celebrating the myths surrounding the origin of the Games as well as many carrying symbols of Nemea, such as the wild celery wreath that crowned the victors or the club of Herakles. For Kleonai, a whole series of coins issued in the later 4th century must, as RCK shows (p. 51 and, more exhaustively, on p. 53), have been issued while Kleonai controlled the Games (AE chalkoi with Head of Herakles/KΛΕΩ in celery wreath, BMC 9-10 and Cat. 1857-1887; curiously, none of the larger bronzes of the same series or any of Kleonai's 5th century silver obols has been found at Nemea).

The only real problems I have come in RCK's last section (pp. 57-61). First, on the basis of the L 17 well deposit, he tries to push back the start of the Corinthian Pegasos/Trident and the Sicyonian Dove/*san* chalkoi into the last quarter of the 5th century. On p. 22 he writes that, «the debris in the well in Section L 17 shows a layer with materials of the late 5th century directly beneath a layer with coins of the late 4th century BC.», and identifies the coins (in fn. 75 on p. 21) as being Cat. 772 (a badly preserved P/T), Cat. 1263 (a Sicyonian dove/*san* in quite good condition) and Cat. 1592 (a rather nice Argive obol of the late 5th century). In the catalogue, the context pottery found with all three coins is described as being «4c BC.» However, on p. 57 the description of this well has changed:

«...material discovered near the top of the well makes <the> closing date in all likelihood the late 4th or early 3rd century BC. Proceeding down, the excavators found a distinct change in the fill; in that fill was found a saltcellar of the late 5th century BC. In that same fill were three coins: Cat 1263 (C 908, Sikyon, bronze, dove/*san*, 365-330 BC. [Warren Group 2]), Cat. 1592 (C, 1020, Argos, silver, before 421 BC), and Cat. 772 (C 1097, a bronze Pegasos/Trident of Corinth, ca. 248 [Price dating]). The excavators tentatively, but reasonably, assigned this level to the time of the destruction of the Sanctuary during the Peloponnesian War.»

How did three coins that are described as being found with 4th century pottery on p. 22 and in the catalogue suddenly get into a late 5th century level on p. 57? In fact, what we really have is that a 5th century silver coin and two 4th century bronzes were swept up with some miscellaneous 5th and 4th century sherds and were dumped into a well during the clean-up operations in the sanctuary during the 3rd quarter of the 4th century. This well simply can not be used for re-dating the bronzes of Sicyon or Corinth into the late 5th century.

On p. 60, and elsewhere, RCK suggests that the history of the site, specifically the period of renewal between the rebuilding of the sanctuary in the 330s and the transfer of the Games to Argos c. 271 (with the subsequent partial abandonment of the site) requires that a number of coins hitherto dated in the late 3rd or 2nd centuries be re-dated to the 4th or very early 3rd. He believes this because he feels that since they have been found at Nemea they must have been dropped during the late 4th and early 3rd century when the Games were held there. This is totally unconvincing, especially since plenty of coins that unquestionably date to the later 3rd -1st century have been found at Nemea (see p. 24, Fig. 6, which shows the find spots of no less than 94 coins dating between c. 271 and 44 B.C.)! The coins whose dates he wants to change to the late 4th or early 3rd century on p. 60 are:

1) Pholegandros (*cat.* 1979)

Normally dated to the 2nd-1st century BC but found with late 4th – early 3rd century pottery. For a more legible specimen, see Monnaies et Médailles 76, 1991, 794 (there dated to the 3rd century, which seems more likely than 4th century).

2) «Ainianes» (*cat.* 118)

Cited on p. 60 as being «traditionally dated 168-146 BC » and being BMC 17 (with a head of Athena); in the catalogue, however, it is described as having a head of Zeus to right and given a reference to Rogers 137 (since that has a head to left and is too big, it must really be Rogers 136). That coin has the traditional date of c. 302-286, perfect for Nemea. However, the coin from Nemea is actually *Late Roman*: a typical laureate, draped and cuirassed bust can be made out on the obverse, combined with a Victory left on the reverse and a mintmark beneath the exergual line!

3) Oiniadai (*cat.* 155)

BMC 6-14 usually dated c. 230-168. This coin is worn almost completely flat so that it must have circulated for a very long time before it was dropped (it is reminiscent of late Hellenistic bronzes found in 2nd or 3rd AD century contexts in the Athenian Agora). If it arrived in its present state in Nemea in the 4th, or even the early 3rd century, it would have had to have been struck generations earlier! Or are we to think that it arrived, brand new in the late 4th century and continued to circulate *in Nemea* for one hundred years or more before being dropped? In fact, the actual date of these coins is c. 219-211.¹

¹ See H. BLOESCH, *Griechische Münzen in Winterthur I* (1987), p. 173 and CRAWFORD, *RRC* p. 32, who discusses coins of this type that were overstruck by Canusium in c. 210.

4) Lebadeia (*cat.* 216)

«usually dated ca. 146-27 BC....BMC...1-2...this was found in Section E 19, where coins dating from as late as the 2nd to 1st century BC are not otherwise found.» This is no reason for re-dating such a rare coin of such late style.²

Another coin erroneously re-dated to the late 4th or early 3rd century in the catalogue is:

5) Thespiai (*cat.* 232)

«ca. 338-315»; and in fn. 276, «He³ identifies the female head as Arsinoe III, comparing her portrait on a Ptolemaic coin of 211 BC. Thus he suggests a date of ca. 210-208 BC for this coin. The Nemea evidence argues for the earlier date.» Alas, there is no evidence from Nemea; but see Agora XXVI, 607 for an example found in a deposit of the 80s and the citations to one found in Corinth in a pre-146 well deposit and for another overstruck at Sicyon c. 200 B.C. The fact that the female head is clearly modelled on Arsinoe III's portrait completely excludes RCK's revised date.⁴

Also on p. 60 RCK speculates that there are religious connections behind the discovery of 22 coins of Lokris at Nemea; he thinks that since the Zeus of Nemea was worshipped in a grove at Opeus people may have travelled between the two sites. This idea is supported by Professor S. Miller, the excavation director who thinks pilgrims from Lokris brought the coins to Nemea. Unfortunately, both RCK and Miller chose to disagree with JDM's comment, cited in fn. 238, that coins of Lokris are commonly found in Corinth, Central Greece and parts of the northern Peloponnesos, and that the widespread circulation of these coins has nothing to do with religious ties. Not only that, while RCK suggests Lokris was «not a prolific mint», it actually did strike a very considerable silver and bronze coinage – her stater issues were larger than those of any Peloponnesian mint save Olympia and Sicyon (and infinitely larger than those of Argos), and there is much anecdotal evidence that her bronzes circulated widely and, as JDM already mentioned, are frequently found in Thessaly, Central Greece and the Peloponnesos. The suggestion (again p. 60) that a single coin of Antioch found at Corinth might relate to religious travel should not have been made.

² For this coin type, see Triton IX, 1, Jan. 2006 (The BCD Collection of the Coinage of Boiotia), lot 175 and its accompanying notes.

³ A. SCHACHTER, A Note on the Reorganization of the Thespian Museia, NC 1961.

⁴ For good illustrations of a series of these coins, see Triton IX.1, (as n. 2), p. 112.

The catalogue itself is very clearly laid out and truly easy to use. I have a few comments and corrections:

- 54, this looks like it might possibly be an early Celtic imitation;
 127-128, for OITAΩN read OITAIΩN; 128bis read Ω for ω;
 147, rather Tegea than Argos Amphiloichicum;
 160, hemidrachm, not drachm;
 191, obol; 217-219, all obols;
 220, stater; 221, obol; 227, this apparently has a 5th century context;
 239-240, both hemidrachms;
 439, not Corinth – it shows a bust right and is probably a tremendously worn Ptolemy III, as 1999-2001;
 1535, c. 90s-60s B.C.;
 1562, a plated *hemidrachm*, not a drachm, and dated far too early – surely of the 2nd half of the 3rd century;
 1563, plated hemidrachm of the 3rd quarter of the 1st century, not of the first half of the 2nd; 1573, obol;
 1582, a fascinating coin, apparently completely unknown – it is almost certainly not Lakonian, the obverse bust looks more like Hera than Apollo, but, unfortunately, I, and several other experts I have shown it to, are unable to suggest what it might be;
 1590, there are no symbols on the reverse of this coin;
 1639-1642, trihemiobols, not obols, c. 260s/250s not 350-228 and with Θ on the obverses, not a pellet;
 1643, triobol, c. 260s/250s;
 1759, read AI for AP;
 1765-1776, for *tetartemorion* (¼ obol) read *tritartemorion* (¾ obol), but, in fact, they are more likely reduced weight obols! –
 1769-1776 date to the 270s-250s;
 1780, delete the top line of the reverse description note; 1780-1782, of the early 1st century;
 1783-1784, should follow 1785-1786 and all date to the late 3rd- early 2nd century;
 1787-1800, all late 3rd – early 2nd century;
 1801, triobol, c. 80s-50s BC; 1802-1810, all late 3rd – early 2nd century;
 1811, Hera not Zeus on the reverse; 1819, Ares on the reverse, not a woman holding poppies;
 1827, late 4th or early 3rd century; 1828-1834, early to mid 3rd century;
 1906, from Lokris rather than Troizen (see Cat. 161 ff.); 1910, dates c. 480-470;
 1911, astonishingly, this lovely coin lacks the expected reference to Williams' corpus – it is Williams 93 (O.62/R.55) and was struck in Tegea in the 460s – alas it comes from modern fill!;
 1939, the appearance of this very rare coin of Antinoos at Nemea is fascinating, but its late context tells us nothing – similar pieces have apparently turned up as chance finds from Kleonai and Phlious;

1943, probably dates to the 360s/350s; **1944-1947**, all probably dated from the 320s-270s; **1947**, the monogram is rendered incorrectly; **1958** given the diameter of 18 mm this coin is probably a variant of BMC 8 rather than BMC 7;

1963, footnote 327, the reference to Agora XXVI p. 247 is correct but no coin of this type is described there, the SNG Cop reference is to a larger denomination and the date is the first half of the 4th century;

1965, delete the note about monograms on the reverse since they do not appear on this coin type (perhaps they were meant for 1966 but they do not appear on that coin either); **1966**, not c. 50-25 BC but 4th-3rd century (it appears to lack the monograms that characterize the later issue and surely belongs to the much more common early type, as BMC 15-16 rather than BMC 25).

A *gamma* has been used for a *pi* in either the notes or descriptions of **131, 231, 1642, 1643, 1765, 1769, 1771-1773, 1775 and 1834**.

Aside from those already noted there are a number of minor errors and misprints. On pp. xxx and 22, and in the captions of figs. 6 and 8, the foundation date of Roman Corinth is misprinted as 46 BC rather than 44; Oinoi is not in Galatia but on the island of Ikaria off Samos.

To summarize, I certainly have my disagreements with some of the theories and suggestions made in this book, but I do want to emphasize that none of them can take away the great value it has for archaeological numismatics. Both RCK and JDM should be congratulated for their efforts and for the immense amount of information they have provided in such concise and clear fashion. I am quite sure that the continuing excavations at Nemea will produce further evidence for the numismatic history of the site, especially for those periods when there was reduced activity after c. 271. The fact that numbers of coins from the 3rd through the 1st century BC. have been found scattered over the site might well indicate that markets were held: simple tables and tents would leave no archaeological traces, but the occasional dropped coin could hint of their presence. It would also be wonderful if this publication would serve as a model for the excavators of Corinth and Argos (among other places). A complete republication of ALL the coins from Corinth (they now can only be found in the long out-dated Corinth VI from 1933, covering the coins from 1896 to 1929, and in a multitude of scattered excavation reports for coins found since then) in the manner of the Nemea volume, complete with a site history and useful plans, would be enormously useful. The recent publication of the first volume of the Halieis excavation final reports, with a list of all the provenances for the coins found but not the commentary on them (that is reserved for a future volume) compares very unfavorably with what we have here. No archaeologist or numismatist working on coins from the Peloponnesos can afford to be without this book.

Dr. Alan S. Walker
c/o LHS Numismatik
CH-8001 Zürich