FOUR COIN HOARDS were found during the eight seasons of excavation (1965–1972) in the Gymnasium area of ancient Corinth.\(^1\) Although the dates for the

\(^1\) The excavation was conducted by the University of Texas at Austin for the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Funds for the excavation were provided by the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Ford Foundation, the University of Texas at Austin, and numerous private donors. Professor James R. Wiseman, now of Boston University, directed the work; I am grateful to him for permission to publish these hoards. The most recent discussion of the excavation is by Wiseman, “Corinth and Rome I: 228 B.C.–A.D. 267,” (= Wiseman, 1979; see abbreviations below), with figure 2 locating the Gymnasium area on a map of ancient Corinth and figure 10 showing a plan of the area of excavation. Preliminary reports of the first five seasons were published by Wiseman, “Excavations at Corinth, the Gymnasium Area, 1965,” *Hesperia* 36, 1967, pp. 13–41; “Excavations at Corinth, the Gymnasium Area, 1966,” *ibid.*, pp. 402–428; “Excavations in Corinth, the Gymnasium Area, 1967–1968,” *Hesperia* 38, 1969, pp. 64–106; “The Gymnasium Area at Corinth, 1969–1970,” *Hesperia* 41, 1972, pp. 1–42; “Ancient Corinth, the Gymnasium Area,” *Archaeology* 22, 1969, pp. 216–225, and “The Fountain of the Lamps,” *Archaeology* 23, 1970, pp. 130–137. For summaries of the results of the later seasons see H. W. Catling, “Archaeology in Greece, 1971–72,” *JHS-AR* 18, 1972, p. 9; C. K. Williams, II, “Excavations at Corinth,” *Δελτα* 26, 1971, B’ 1 [1974], p. 96 and “Corinth Excavations,” *Δελτα* 27, 1972, B’ 1 [1976], pp. 223–224; and J. P. Michaud, “Chronique des fouilles en 1970,” *BCH* 95, 1971, p. 858 and “Chronique des fouilles en 1971,” *BCH* 96, 1972, p. 638. The photographs were taken by I. Ioannidou and L. Bartzioti and paid for by a grant from the Research Board of the Graduate School of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. I wish to thank the members of the Corinth excavation staff, particularly Charles K. Williams, II, Nancy Bookidis, and Joan E. Fisher, who always made me welcome at Corinth even when I arrived at inconvenient times.

Works frequently cited will be abbreviated as follows:

“Agora SW Hoard” = (published in) Edwards, 1937, p. 249


*BMC* = *Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum*, London 1873–

*BMCB* = W. Wroth, *Catalogue of the Imperial Byzantine Coins in the British Museum*, London 1908


*CNI* = *Corpus Nummorum Italicorum*, XI, Toscana (zecche minori), Rome 1929


burials of the earliest and latest hoards are more than 600 years apart, their discovery in a single area of controlled excavation warrants their publication together. Coin hoards found in excavations permit a comparison of their contexts and contents that is not often possible with hoards discovered under other circumstances. This comparison can
add to our understanding of the hoard and the architectural features surrounding it. A preliminary total of 2,256 coins was recovered from the excavation of the Gymnasium area; almost one third, 733 coins, belongs to the four hoards.2 Those not from the four hoards will be published later.

HOARD I: FROM THE TIME OF THE INVASION OF ALARIC THE GOTH

The earliest of the hoards has been published in a preliminary report of the Gymnasium excavations by James R. Wiseman.3 But my initial reading of the coins, given in Wiseman's article, was made before they were completely cleaned. I was able to read more details and correct some errors when I reread them in the summer of 1969. The following notes and catalogue supercede the information about the coins given in the preliminary publication.

The 18 AE II4 near the northwest corner of a protecting spur of the Epistyle Wall, a segment of the city wall in the Late Roman period.5 In addition, three other coins (appended at the end of the catalogue below) were found in this same corner. They were slightly removed from the hoard but may have formed part of the original group at the time of concealment. I have kept these coins separate from the others of the hoard because one of them, No. 21 of Constantius II, A.D. 341–346, has an earlier date of minting and smaller denomination (AE III) than this otherwise very consistent group of coins. This coin may be a stray lost near the hoard or it may be the oldest piece in the hoard.6

2This is the total of the Corinth coin inventory numbers used for the excavations of the Gymnasium area. By year of excavation:
65-797–65-912 = 116
66-460–66-571 = 112
67-887–67-1143 = 257
69-341–69-777 = 437
70-271–70-277, 70-280–70-512 = 240
71-532–71-1350 = 819
72-4, 72-5 = 2.
While the total number of extant coins in the hoards is 733, including two coins in Lot 7113 not given inventory numbers, the total of Corinth coin inventory numbers used for the hoards is 740. The discrepancy is accounted for by coins which disintegrated in cleaning or objects given a coin number which were not coins.
3Hesperia 38, 1969, p. 92 and pl. 29:b for the findspot with the hoard in situ and pl. 29:c for all the obverses which are, from left to right in the top row, Nos. 12, 11, 6, 5, 15; in the second row, Nos. 10, 16, 8, 2, 4; in the third row, Nos. 3, 9, 7, 1, 18; and in the bottom row, Nos. 14, 13, 17 of the catalogue on pp. 151–153 below.
4The second largest of the four standard denominations in Late Roman aes coinage.
5For a discussion of the wall, its date and relation to the topography of Corinth, see Wiseman, Hesperia 38, 1969, pp. 87–92 and Hesperia 41, 1972, pp. 5–7, and Gregory, pp. 264–280. See, for the discovery and excavation of the hoard, Corinth Field Notebook 419, p. 130, and p. 75 for the three coins found near by.
6Supporting the association of the coin of Constantius II with the rest of the hoard are the remarks of K. M. Edwards (Edwards, 1937, p. 248) about a hoard from Corinth buried in the early 5th century after
The other 20 coins were all minted between A.D. 378 and 383. They are of the REPARATIO REI PUB[LICAE] issues of Gratian, Valentinian II, and Theodosius I. Only eight of the AE II coins are significantly more than 0.4 g. underweight. Despite corrosion, the other 12 cluster about the average weight of 4.92 g. determined for the coinage from Siscia.\footnote{A. Alföldi, \textit{Der Untergang der Römerherrschaft in Pannonien}, Berlin 1924, p. 10; Pearce, \textit{RIC} IX, p. xxxi.} Although the coins are sometimes difficult to read because of corrosion, they appear to have had only a little wear from circulation (where this can be determined despite the corrosion).\footnote{On the importance of distinguishing wear from corrosion on excavation coins, see A. Walker, \textit{\textquotedblleft Worn and Corroded Coins: Their Importance for the Archaeologist\textquotedblright}, \textit{JFA} 3, 1976, pp. 329–334.} Only the wear on No. 21 suggests that it spent a longer time in circulation than the others. The wear on the coins is consistent with the date for the concealment of the hoard suggested by the findspot. Wiseman suggests that the Epistyle Wall was built, with material from buildings destroyed in the earthquakes of A.D. 365 and 375, to protect this area of Corinth before the invasion of Alaric the Goth in 395/396.\footnote{The evidence for the dates of the earthquakes and Alaric’s invasion are collected by Wiseman (\textit{Hesperia} 36, 1967, p. 409, note 19), who dates the attack on Corinth to 395. Timothy E. Gregory (Gregory, pp. 269–270) and A. Beaton and P. Clement (\textit{op. cit.} [footnote 5 above], pp. 267–279) date the attack in 396; the evidence is based on Zosimus and is discussed by Paul A. Clement (\textit{\textquotedblleft The Date of the Hexamilion,\textquotedblright} \textit{Essays in the Memory of Basil Laouardas}, Thessaloniki 1975, pp. 159–164 and \textit{\textquoteright\textquoteright Alaric and the Fortifications of Greece,\textquoteright\textquoteright} \textit{Ancient Macedonia II [Papers Read at the Second International Symposium Held in Thessaloniki, 19–24 August 1973]}. Thessaloniki, Institute for Balkan Studies, vol. 155, 1977, pp. 135–137). I do not think that either 395 or 396 is certain and have therefore dated Alaric’s attack 395/396. Favoring a date just before Alaric’s invasion for the Epistyle Wall is Wiseman (\textit{op. cit.}, pp. 411–412 and \textit{Hesperia} 38, 1969, pp. 87–92). In \textit{Hesperia} 41, 1972, pp. 5–7, Wiseman adds the possibility that the wall was constructed shortly after Alaric’s raid in fear of other attacks. Although this could have happened, it is not as consistent with the date of the issues in the hoard and its secretion. Perhaps the outer, northern face of the Epistyle Wall was constructed first, followed by Alaric’s attack, and the construction of the southern face occurred later to strengthen the Corinthian defenses at the prospect of a return of the Goths or other attacks. Recent excavations at Isthmia have produced a hoard of 97 coins which confirms Alaric’s destruction of that site in 395/396 (Beaton and Clement, \textit{loc. cit.}). Gregory (p. 276) dates the Epistyle Wall to just before Alaric’s attack on the evidence of this hoard. The rest of the Late Roman Wall, into which the Epistyle Wall was incorporated, he dates after the retreat of Alaric, to the first two decades of the 5th century (p. 270).} This collection of 18 (or 21) coins was hidden in the wall either by a Corinthian defender or a Gothic invader and then not recovered. The later plastering-over of this part of the wall sealed in the coins.\footnote{Wiseman, \textit{Hesperia} 38, 1969, p. 91 and fig. 13.}

This Corinth hoard is remarkably similar to a hoard of 16 AE II coins found near Laurion in Attica.\footnote{V. Kallipolitis, \textit{Δελτιον} 19, 1964, B’ 1 [1966], pp. 73–74, pl. 72. Whether these were a grave offering or were hidden in an area of disturbed burials could not be determined.} With the exception of No. 21, minted at Cyzicus, both hoards...
COIN HOARDS FROM THE GYMNASIUM AREA AT CORINTH

consist of the same issues of the same emperors minted at almost all the same mints, with the representation of the emperors and mints in both hoards approximately the same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPERORS</th>
<th>CORINTH</th>
<th>LAURION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gratian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentinian II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodosius I</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siscia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thessalonica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantinople</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total identified mints</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although it is possible that two residents of Attica and Corinth both lost small hoards of very similar size and content by coincidence, it may be that these two similar hoards are connected in some way. It is possible that they may represent the currency in the possession of two of the Gothic invaders. This suggests that Alaric may have paid his troops during his invasion of Attica and Corinth with issues that had been minted more than ten years before. Alternatively, it may only mean that some of his forces seized a collection of these issues *en route*.

CATALOGUE: HOARD I

(Plate 37)

The Corinth Museum inventory number follows the catalogue number.

AE II, A.D. 378–383

*Obverse:* Bust of emperor, pearl diademed, draped and cuirassed, r.

*Reverse:* Emperor standing facing, head l., holding Victory on globe in l. hand, r. hand raising kneeling, turreted woman.

**AQUILEIA, R/IC IX, p. 100, no. 30a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 68-1405</td>
<td>25 mm. 4.06 g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ROME, R/IC IX, pp. 125, 126, no. 43a, d**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DN GRATIA–NVS PF AVG</th>
<th>REP[ARATIO–REI] PVB</th>
<th>SMRP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. 68-1406</td>
<td>24 mm. 4.55 g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. 63-1407  
DN GRATIA–NVS PF AVG  
26 mm.  3.49 g.  ↓  
REPARATIO–REI PVB  
SMRQ

4. 68-1408  
DN GRATIA–[NVS PF AVG]  
23 mm.  5.24 g.  ↓  
REPARATIO–REI PVB  
SMRQ

5. 68-1418  
DN THEODO–SIVS PF AVG  
24 mm.  4.23 g.  ↓  
REPARATIO–REI PVB  
SMRQ

6. 68-1417  
DN THEODO–SIVS PF AVG  
24 mm.  4.84 g.  ↓  
REPARATIO–REI PVB  
SMRT

Siscia, RIC IX, p. 150, no. 26a

7. 68-1409  
DN GRATIA–[NVS P]F AVG  
23 mm.  5.24 g.  ↓  
REPARATIO–[REI PVB  
*ASISC*

Thessalonica, RIC IX, p. 181, no. 37a, d

8. 68-1410  
DN GRATIA–NVS [PF A]VG  
25 mm.  4.04 g.  ↓  
[SMT]ES  
in field r. Δ

9. 68-1411  
DN GRATIA–NVS PF AVG  
24 mm.  6.01 g.  
REP[AT]IO–REI PV[B]  
[SMT]ES  
in field r. Δ

10. 68-1412  
DN THEODO–SIVS PF AVG  
24 mm.  4.26 g.  ↑  
REP[AT]IO–REI PV[B]  
SMT[ES]

11. 68-1419  
DN THEODO–SIVS P[AVG  
23.5 mm.  5.90 g.  ↑  
REP[AT]IO–REI PV[B]  
SMTES

Constantinople, RIC IX, p. 226, no. 54c

12. 68-1420  
DN THEODO–SIVS PF AVG  
26 mm.  3.98 g.  ↑  
REPARATIO–REI PVB  
CONSB

(mint mark illegible) Cohen, pp. 26–30

13. 68-1415  
DN VALENTINIANVS PF AVG  
24 mm.  4.81 g.  ↑  
REPARATIO–REI PV[B]

14. 68-1416  
DN VALENTINIANVS PF AVG  
22 mm.  4.28 g.  ↑  
REPARATIO–REI PV[B]

15. 68-1421  
DN THEODO–SIVS PF AVG  
23 mm.  5.04 g.  ↑  
REPARATIO–REI PV[B]

16. 68-1413  
DN GRATIA–[NVS PF AVG]  
24 mm.  4.82 g.  ↓  
REPARATIO–REI PV[B]

17. 68-1414  
DN GRATIA–[NVS PF AVG]  
23 mm.  4.74 g.  ↓  
REPARATIO–REI PV[B]

Illegible (Gratian, Valentinian II or Theodosius I)

18. 68-1422  
21 mm.  4.50 g.  ↓  
REPARATIO–REI PV[B]
The following were found close to the hoard: 

Same as No. 11 above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>DN THEODO-[SIVS PF AVG]</th>
<th>REPARAT[IO]-REI PVB</th>
<th>SMTEς</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>68-1333 23 mm. 5.05 g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Same as No. 15 above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>DN THEOD[O-SIVS PF AVG]</th>
<th>REPAR]ATIO-[REI PVB]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>68-1334 21 mm. 4.42 g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSTANTIUS II, A.D. 341–346

CYZICUS, LRBC, no. 1306

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>DN CONSTAN-[TIVS PF AVG]</th>
<th>VOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bust of Emperor, pearl diadem,</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>draped and cuirassed, r.</td>
<td>MVLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in wreath</td>
<td>SMKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>AE III</th>
<th>15 mm. 1.71 g.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>68-1335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOARD II: FROM THE LATER 6TH CENTURY

On October 30 and November 1, 1971, a large concentration of coins mixed with at least 45 other objects was excavated on the east side of the bath-fountain complex (Fountain of the Lamps). The base projected over the edge of the pool and was in line with a number of other blocks which also overlapped the pool’s edge. The hoard lay just below the top of the swimming pool, on and inside its east edge, extending southward beside and under some of the blocks in line with the marble base and eastward on the edge of the pool in the exedra. Its western boundary was defined by one of the late rubble walls built early in the reign of Justin II. Smaller concentrations of coins were scattered near by to the

---

12 For the name, “Fountain of the Lamps”, see Wiseman, Hesperia 38, 1969, pp. 75–78 and note 22. The possibility that this complex is the Fountain of Lerna mentioned by Pausanias, II.4.6, is suggested by Wiseman (Wiseman, 1979, pp. 511–512). For the location of the bath-fountain complex in the ancient city of Corinth, see Wiseman, 1979, fig. 2 and idem, Hesperia 41, 1972, fig. 1 opp. p. 1. The most recent plan of the area of excavations is Wiseman, 1979, fig. 10.

13 Period 7 of this use of the area, according to the report of Williams, Δελτα 27, 1972, B' 1 [1976], p. 224; see also Wiseman, Hesperia 41, 1972, pp. 23–24. Once the pool was silted in, the rubble walls were built and the area became a rubbish dump. The hoard was deposited in its findspot before the dump fill covered the walls and before the construction of a large lime kiln within the exedra. The findspot of the hoard is located in grid squares M/N–35 of figure 4 in Wiseman, Hesperia 41, 1972, p. 10. The excavation of the main part of the hoard was recorded in Corinth Field Notebook 537, pp. 43 and 46, Basket 53, Lots 7007 and 7113 (for objects other than coins in the hoard). Pottery from the dumped fill was plentiful around and above the hoard. The greatest concentration of coins was in an area about 0.75 m. in diameter, 0.02 m. below the edge of the pool; the approximate elevation above mean sea level was 46 m. The hoard was first recorded in pp. 40–41, Baskets 49 and 50, Lot 7007, but when the size of the hoard was observed, most of the deposit (matrix) in which it was found was excavated with a separate pottery basket. It was, at the most, about ten centimeters thick but was recovered from elevations between ca. +45.60 and +45.35 m.
south and east, slightly above and below the elevation of the large concentration. These do not differ in content from the main body of the hoard and were found in the same dumped fill. They have all been incorporated in the catalogue below.\textsuperscript{14} No evidence of a container for the hoard could be observed; the pottery in the area consisted of only non-joining sherds which could never have been united into a vessel to hold the hoard. Why then was the hoard not recovered by those who filled in this region, and how did it come to be spread in a thin lens over a fairly wide area? It seems impossible to consider the findspot of the hoard as the place in which it was originally concealed. It covers too large an area and would have been open to view by all passersby. A natural displacement, such as that caused by an earthquake, appears to be a more likely explanation. The hoard may have been hidden at first above the pool, probably near the top of the semidome of the exedra, easily reached from the high ground east of it. At some later date, a major earthquake might have destroyed at least the portion of the semidome concealing the hoard, throwing it down to the pool below, and spreading it in the manner in which it was found.\textsuperscript{15} Earth and debris from behind the semidome perhaps fell after the hoard and covered it. The whole area was leveled off later with dumped fill, possibly debris from cleaning after the same earthquake, before the construction of the lime kiln in the exedra.

\textsuperscript{14}Because of the size of the area over which the hoard was spread, it could not be excavated together but was recorded with different pottery baskets and context lot numbers. Thus, the concentrations of coins near the hoard are really only the extension of it into areas excavated at different times. In a test excavation through the hoard area on September 20, 1971 coins had already been encountered at about the same level as the bulk of the hoard; this test is recorded in Corinth Field Notebook 528, p. 61, Basket 35. This was later grouped with the deposit of Corinth Field Notebook 537, pp. 51, 63, 65 and 67, Baskets 58, 59, 64, 66 and 69, from directly south and east of the area of the large concentration of coins at about the same elevation, into Lot 7012, which includes 51 coins (Nos. 7, 13, 18, 53–57, 78, 84, 94, 96, 98, 99, 139–143, 147, 173, 194, 200, 238, 280–285, 319, 325, 558–576 of the catalogue below and No. 36 of the catalogue of other objects in the hoard, immediately following). There are channels in the upper surfaces of the poros blocks that form the edge of the pool in the hoard area; although the earth filling them was no different from that surrounding the rest of the hoard, they were excavated separately as recorded, \textit{ibid.}, p. 45, Basket 52, Lot 7008, which contained ten coins (Nos. 4, 47, 48, 66, 92, 135, 148, 526–528). The final group associated with the hoard was removed from the fill of a square cutting in the edge of the pool in the hoard area, which was excavated separately and recorded, \textit{ibid.}, p. 66, Basket 67, Lot 7011, even though the earth was not different. It included two coins (Nos. 116 and 557 in the catalogue below, and also No. 15 of the catalogue of other objects in the hoard). Because of the area over which the hoard was dispersed, it is not impossible that a stray coin or coins may have been included in the catalogue. But comparison with other contemporary hoards has not revealed any specimens unlikely to have been part of the original group.

\textsuperscript{15}Analogous circumstances are suggested to explain the findspot of a similar group; see “Agora SW Hoard”, of which Edwards writes that the coins “were scattered on the pavement at one end of the shop, where they had fallen seemingly from some receptacle above. The excavators of the Agora believe that this whole section was destroyed by an earthquake and abandoned in haste. The proprietor then fled in a panic, leaving his money in the money-drawer, from which it fell with the upper structure of the shop and was scattered on the floor below. The inference is clear.” Scranton (\textit{Corinth XVI}, p. 8) associates this hoard with an earthquake recorded for the year 551. But since this hoard contained five palm-tree nummi, it seems likely that it was associated with a later earthquake, which might also be the same one that I suggest scattered Gymnasium Hoard II.
At first some of the coins in the hoard were collected individually. But, as its full extent became apparent, most were grouped in large find envelopes and cleaned before being given individual coin numbers. Thus we cannot now know how many coins were originally excavated, but a total of 579 have survived cleaning. Only 200, or slightly more than one third of these, however, are attributable. The reasons for the poor condition of the coins include the wetness of the Fountain of the Lamps, which speeds the corrosion of bronzes, the wear on many of the coins, and the careless minting techniques employed at the time the coins were issued. The following is a summary of the contents of the hoard:

**GREEK:** 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coinage</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philip II of Macedon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikyon</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LATE ROMAN, first half of 4th century:** 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coinage</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constantine I, A.D. 341–346</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine II, A.D. 321–324</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Constantine, A.D. 335–337</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Second half of 4th century:** 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coinage</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theodosius I, A.D. 379–388</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadius, A.D. 393–395</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emperors of A.D. 383–395</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**First half of 5th century:** 41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coinage</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period of Theodosius II, A.D. 425–450</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentinian III, A.D. 425–455</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** In the filling of one of the find envelopes in the field, the number of coins put in was counted as 252. When cleaned, there were 115 coins and one bronze droplet (Corinth coin inventory numbers 71-778–71-893), or almost a 55% loss in cleaning. Since this was the only count made in the field, it cannot be known if the loss was the same for the rest of the hoard. From the condition of the pieces which survived cleaning, however, it is more than likely that what was lost was not legible. The original count in the field may also have included fragments of green earth and pebbles from the corrosion products around the hoard coins. A similar percentage of survival for a hoard of about the same date is reported for “Kenchreai”, pp. 89–91, and also for the “Agora SW Hoard” from Corinth, where the excavator reported 900 coins and only 460 survived cleaning. The coins that were put separately into envelopes in the field were assigned numbers at the end of each day with the rest of the excavation coins, while the ones that were collected in groups were not assigned numbers until later, after they were cleaned. This circumstance explains the great variation in the Corinth coin inventory numbers assigned to the hoard coins. Of those collected individually, only two were lost in cleaning (71-544 and 71-546).

**Note:** Water continues to flow from the Fountain of the Lamps, which, if it is not drained off, floods the pool area well over the level at which the hoard was found; see Wiseman, Hesperia 41, 1972, p. 23. M. Thompson (The Athenian Agora, II, Coins from the Roman through the Venetian Period, Princeton 1954, p. 102) comments on the crude minting technique of the nummi of the “Vandalic” coinage. Edwards (Corinth VI, p. 11) contrasts the number of illegible and legible “Vandalic” nummi from the Corinth excavations. Other hoards have similar large numbers of illegible nummi; see “Korinth”, pp. 138 and 157, a hoard of 626 coins of which only 273 could be attributed, and “Agora SW Hoard”, with 900 coins originally counted, which had only 460 after cleaning of which 245 were legible. Many of the “Vandalic” issues are now considered early Byzantine nummi; see Hahn, I and II, passim.
Second half of 5th century: 8  
Marcian, A.D. 450–457  
Leo, A.D. 457–474  
Zeno, A.D. 474–491  
Aelia Zenonis, A.D. 475–476  

**Byzantine, folles:** 5  
Justinian I, Constantinople, A.D. 527–532  

Antioch, A.D. 527–528 and A.D. 564–565  
Justin II, Constantinople, A.D. 573–574  

Nicomedia, A.D. 565–578  

half-folles: 3  
Justin II, Cyzicus, A.D. 574–575  
Thessalonica, A.D. 569–570 and 574–575  

**decanummia:** 3  
Justin I or Justinian I, A.D. 518–565  
Justinian I, Constantinople, A.D. 549–550  

Nicomedia, A.D. 561–562  

pentanummia: 10  
Justin I or Justinian I, A.D. 518–565  

Constantinople, A.D. 518–565  
Justinian I, Constantinople, A.D. 542–552  

Carthage(?), A.D. 537–538  
Justin II, A.D. 567–575  

nummi: 113  
Anastasius I, A.D. 491–518 or Justinian I, A.D. 527–565  
Justin I, A.D. 518–527  
Justinian I, A.D. 527–565  

Carthage, A.D. 539–540 and 547–552  
Ostragotic king: Baduila, A.D. 541–552  
Asymmetrical alpha  
Domino Nostro  
Palm tree  
Victory to l.  
Monogram  

Legible and partially legible  TOTAL: 200  

LATE ROMAN, AE II fragments  
AE III clipped to AE IV  
AE III fragments  
AE IV  
AE IV halves  
Anastasius through Justin II, half-follis  
decanummium  
pentanummia  
nummi  

Illegible  TOTAL: 379
Greek coins of Philip II and Sikyon are not unusual in these late hoards.\(^\text{18}\) Their fairly well preserved condition (see Pl. 38:4) is a clear indication that they were picked up in Corinth and had not been in regular circulation for 800 years or more. These coins and the bronze scraps found with the hoard, appended to the end of the catalogue, probably circulated with the worn nummi, many of which, if they had ever been struck, were so used that the types had been completely obscured.\(^\text{19}\) It is noteworthy that all the metal objects with the hoard are fragmentary. The collector of our hoard was apparently a scavenger at Corinth collecting what metal he could find. The bronze droplets might have come from one of the earlier bronzeworking areas in Corinth.\(^\text{20}\) The iron and lead scraps were probably found in this scavenging but the glass mosaic tessara may have been included with the hoard during excavation because of its greenish, bronze-like color. The 4th-century Roman coins in the hoard may have continued in circulation for up to 200 years but others, including some of the legible ones, may also have been chance finds from Corinth.\(^\text{21}\) Many of the large-denomination coins have

\(^\text{18}\) Bronzes of Philip II were included in another hoard from Corinth, along with two other Greek coins of Athens and Corinth (Mattingly, p. 229), and in a hoard from north Greece ("Volo", p. 44, no. 1). Margaret Thompson has reported an example of bronze of the same type as No. 1, inscribed with Alexander’s name, in the American Numismatic Society collection. It is possible that this coin could be one of his rare issues of this type. Sikyonian coins were in two other hoards from Corinth, “Agora SW Hoard” and “South Stoa Hoard”. The latter included three other Greek coins, two of Corinth and one of Rhodes. Other late hoards with Greek coins in them include the following:

- Corinth, “Roman Wall Hoard” with one of Messene and “Korinth” (p. 144), no. 1, of Athens.
- Isthmian Sanctuary of Poseidon, “Isthmia” with one of Corinth.
- Athens, Kroll, p. 308, nos. 93 and 94, both of Athens.
- Farther northwest, “Dalmatia” (p. 269), seven Greek coins including one each from Asia Minor, Ceos, Chios and Erythrae.

\(^\text{19}\) Other late hoards which contained somewhat similar objects include “Isthmia” with two small bronze pieces, “Zacha” (p. 159) with 60 crumbling metal fragments, and “Volo” (p. 1) with nine specimens which were not struck, 20 very thin “tapped” pieces, and about 100 slivers of brittle metal.


\(^\text{21}\) Worn, 4th-century bronzes are common in late hoards:

- 13 “Korinth” (p. 144, nos. 2–15)
- 31 “Roman Wall Hoard”
- 10 “Agora SW Hoard”
- 3 “South Stoa Hoard”
- 86 Mattingly, pp. 229–230
- 7 “Isthmia Hoard”
- 3 “Kenchreat” (pp. 91–92, nos. 2–4)
- 10 “Zacha” (pp. 180–182, nos. 1–10)
- 97 “Yale” (pp. 159–168, nos. 1–97)
- 75 “Volo” (pp. 45–52)
- 5 Kroll, p. 308, nos. 95–99
- 400 “Dalmatia”
- 4 Walker, p. 45, BCB 1–4
been clipped or cut up into fractions. The Late Roman AE IV coins which were halved were probably then equal to the standard nummus of currency after the Anastasian reform. 22 This likelihood suggests that currency circulated by weight and not stamped type at the time of the burial of the hoard. 23

The latest certainly datable coins in the hoard belong to the reign of Justin II. On Plate 38, the follis No. 144 shows some wear from circulation, more in fact than that of Justinian I, No. 90 (Pl. 37), of A.D. 527–532. The two half-follis of Justin II, Nos. 147 and 148, of A.D. 574–575 are much more worn and too poorly preserved for photography. No. 147 has been halved. With a few exceptions the coins of later date are worn and cut, suggesting that they circulated for quite a while before they were buried with the hoard. Despite the wide range of the dates of the coins in the hoard, it should not be considered the savings of several generations. The wear and small size of the coins suggest instead that it is a currency hoard and that the currency of late 6th-century Corinth included small bronze scraps as well as struck coins of any type whatsoever. While it would be reasonable to date the burial of the hoard by the date of its latest coin, to the end of Justin II’s reign in 578, other, historical considerations make a date in the 580’s, at the time of the Avaro-Slavic invasion, more likely. 24 Given the apparent

23 Compare “Kenchreai” (p. 101).
24 D. M. Metcalf (“The Slavonic Threat to Greece Circa 580: Some Evidence from Athens,” Hesperia 31, 1962, pp. 134–157) analyzed coin deposits from Athens; Kroll, pp. 301–309 is an additional hoard. Scranton (Corinth XVI, pp. 8 and 27) summarized the literary and archaeological evidence for the Avar and Slav attack on Corinth, which he dated A.D. 586–587. The date of ca. 580 for the attack on Athens, with that on Corinth following shortly thereafter, appears to fit better with the dates of the latest coins in the relevant hoards. Two hoards, “Isthmia” and “Kenchreai”, plus another group (R. L. Hohlfelder, “A Small Deposit of Bronze Coins from Kenchreai,” Hesperia 39, 1970, pp. 68–72) and another hoard possibly from the Peloponnessus (Walker, pp. 41–42 and 45–47), have also been associated with this attack. Other, unpublished 6th-century hoards may also be related to the Slavic invasion. These include a hoard from Palaiochori in the Peloponnessus mentioned by A. Bon (Le peloponnesse byzantin jusqu’en 1204, Paris 1951, p. 17, note 3), two from the ancient Odeon at Patras and one from Olympia found in 1911 (all three in the Athens Numismatic Museum and mentioned under “Korinth” [p. 139, note 4]), and other hoards from Olympia mentioned under “Zacha” (p. 164, note 9): “F. Adler in Olympia, Ergebnisse der von dem deutschen Reich verausgelittenen Ausgrabung, Berlin, 1897, p. 97, refers without further description to two hoards of small bronze buried one in 565 and the other in 576. R. Weil in the same volume, pp. 128, 129, notes that Olympia has yielded more than 20 hoards, most from late antiquity . . . . He classes the hoards of small bronze under three groupings: 1) hoards of Justinian I without coins of the German kingdoms; 2) hoards of Justinian with Vandalic and Ostrogothic pieces; and 3) hoards reaching down to Justin II.” The excavation coins from Olympia were published by A. Postolakas, Νομίσματα ἐν τῷ Ἑλληνικῷ Νομισματικῷ Μουσείῳ κατατεθέντα ἐτεὶ ἐκαθημερικῷ ἀωτῷ–ἀωτῷ, Athens 1885, pp. 57–66, but, unfortunately, with no distinction drawn between hoards and chance finds. The late 5th- through 6th-century coins from the early excavations at Olympia are summarized under “Zacha” (pp. 164–165), based upon the report of Postolakas. It is also possible that some hoards dated earlier in the 6th century were hidden at the time of the Slavic invasion, much later than the latest datable coin in them. Kroll (p. 307, note 28) suggests that “Zacha” dates later than 550, and Hahn appears to date it after 597–601; see footnote 29 below. The archaeological evidence for the Slavic invasion at Corinth is collected by G. R. Davidson (“The Avar Invasion of Corinth,” Hesperia 6, 1937, pp. 277–240), who dates it in 588. This is not consistent with the date of the latest datable coins in the hoards which have been associated with the invasion and appear to place it in the
scarcity of newly minted coins, suggested by the hoard’s contents, the absence of dated coins later than 575 is not unexpected.

I have left the discussion of the date of the nummi in the hoard until after that of the larger, dated denominations because their small size and poor quality present certain problems. Five, Nos. 153–157 of the 12 examples with a palm tree on the reverse, are as well preserved as the latest coins in the hoard. On Nos. 158–164 the palm tree is clearly legible, although the obverse is corroded. Such nummi have been shown to belong to a standard type of a palm tree with six fronds and three dots, two above and one below, on each side at the bottom of the trunk. This type has been attributed to the mint of Carthage in the reign of Maurice, A.D. 597–601.25 If this were correct, our hoard ought then to have a burial date of ca. 600 at the earliest, 15 or more years later than the Slavic invasion with which it has been associated.26 The argument linking the palm-tree-reverse nummi with the mint of Carthage under Maurice is founded on his use of the palm tree and three dots on Carthaginian issues of pentanummi with his name on the obverse.27 No. 153 with two partially legible letters on the obverse might well read M]AV[RIC. The inscription, however, is open to other interpretations.28 In addition, hoard evidence weakens the attribution to Maurice. Seven other hoards containing nummi of palm-tree reverse have been published, all of which are associated with the Slavic invasion.29 It seems likely from the fresh condition of the palm-tree

25Hahn, II, p. 124, no. 134. This attribution might just be possible if the coins were minted from the beginning of Maurice’s reign in 582 and the Slavic invasion occurred after 582. The small size of the flans of these coins often preserves only a part of the type, which can result in the identification of two- and four-frond palm trees and fewer or no dots at all.

26The literary sources and numismatic evidence place this invasion early in the 580’s; see the works by Huxley, Metcalf, Kroll, and Scranton cited in footnote 24 above.

27Hahn, II, pp. 72–73, 124, nos. 130 and 131.

28Adelson and Kustas (under “Zacha”, p. 165, note 13) report that A. Postolakas, on one of the coins with the palm-tree reverse from the Olympia excavations, read GEL AMER, which, if verified, would associate the palm-tree-type nummi with the Vandal king Gelimer, A.D. 530–534. Although this is somewhat early, it is still more appropriate to the date of the other dated hoard coins. The inscription on No. 153 could then read GEL]AM[ER. I have read No. 153 twice and both times thought I could see an A and not a D, but I cannot be certain of the second letter which appears closest to an E without the central bar and with very short bars at the top and the bottom. This could clearly be the remains of N, M, or V as well as other letters. Nor do I know if the two letters are the start of the inscription, its middle, or end. If it is the first, DN would be a more likely reading. Postolakas’ reading of Gelimer’s name has not been confirmed. Hahn records in his catalogue seeing palm-tree reverses in the Athens numismatic collection and does not mention such an obverse reading. It is possible that Postolakas misread one of the examples but it may also be that Hahn did not happen to see the coin which Postolakas read. In addition, the palm tree would not normally be associated with Gelimer’s coinage. His epigraphic coins have reverse types of letters or monograms (Hahn, I, p. 132, nos. 12 and 25), and the larger-denomination bronzes which are attributed to him, although his name does not appear on them, contain a horse’s-head reverse type (Hahn, I, p. 132, nos. 22–24).

29There were five examples in the “Agora SW Hoard”; four in “Kenchreai” (p. 98, nos. 83–86); 24 in “Zacha” (pp. 199–200, nos. 418–440 and pl. XXX where the fresh condition of no. 423 can be seen; see
reverse nummi in these hoards that they were first minted during the reigns of Justin II or Tiberius II.\textsuperscript{30} Perhaps Maurice minted only pentanummia with the palm-tree reverse, adopting the type from nummi minted by his immediate predecessors.

The notes on the various issues of nummi in the catalogue of the hoard below refer to other details about their date and attribution. In general, the nummi that are not corroded show as little wear as the larger, dated denominations of Justinian I and Justin II, suggesting that they were minted during the period of their reigns and not much earlier. Their large number in comparison with the few late 5th-century monogram types of Marcian, Leo, Zeno and Aelia Zenonis, only eight of which could be identified, is consistent with the late 6th-century date of the hoard.

The peculiar location of this hoard is clarified by two other Corinthian hoards, one of 56 bronzes, the other of 20, which were discovered with two skeletons in the room of a building west of the Lechaion Road. The two individuals had apparently been killed when a severe earthquake resulted in the collapse of the building in which they were found; the latest datable coins in the hoards were of Justin II.\textsuperscript{31} This discovery helps to

\textsuperscript{30}See footnote 25 above. If it should turn out that Hahn in correct in his attribution of the palm-tree reverse type to late in the reign of Maurice, A.D. 597–601, it would necessitate a rethinking of the burial of Gymnasium Hoard II and the others now related to the Slavic invasion of the early 580's (footnotes 24 and 25 above). It might be that the invasion created a mood for hoarding, but few coins of larger denomination were circulating at Corinth. Therefore, the collector of the Gymnasium hoard had to make do with nummi minted after the reign of Justin II, which he continued to collect until the earthquake (on this hypothesis to be dated after 597–601) scattered the hoard over the pool area. I think, however, the dated coins in a number of similar hoards are sufficient evidence to favor the minting of the palm-tree reverses before the Slavic invasion.

\textsuperscript{31}O. Broneer, “Area North of the Basilica,” \textit{AJA} 30, 1926, pp. 52–53; Scranton, \textit{Corinth} XVI, pp. 8 and 16. All but eight coins of the 56 in Coin Hoard 1925-1 disintegrated in cleaning. These include three attributed to Justin II, A.D. 565–578, one attributed to Justinian I, and four nummi: three with legible
confirm the hypothesis that our hoard was found where it had been scattered by an earthquake. From this evidence, it seems likely that soon after the Avars and Slavs sacked Corinth, there was an earthquake of very destructive force. The date of the earthquake is in the 580's and not ca. 570. This earthquake, because of the dating of the nummi with the palm-tree reverse, would now appear also to have been the one that resulted in the final destruction of the West Shops at Corinth in which “Agora SW Hoard” was found, and not the earlier, documented one of 551.

The number of the nummi in Gymnasium Hoard II is the equivalent of 11.3 folles. The larger denominations in the hoard are the equivalent of 7.785 folles, and the earlier Greek and Roman coins are estimated at 4.475 folles. The total coins of the extant hoard are equal to 23.56 folles or 942.4 nummi. It is clear, however, that the weight of the follis was changed at various times. The folles of Justinian I, Nos. 90 and 92, are close to their ideal weight of 18.19 g. (corrosion has greatly reduced the weight of No. 91). Late in the reign of Justin II, the ideal weight of the follis was 13.64 g., which weight Nos. 144 and 145 approach. Consequently, instead of counting the number of the various denominations in the hoard, an estimation of the hoard’s value may be gained by measuring its weight, even if corrosion, cleaning and losses during cleaning may have significantly reduced it. The sum of all the coins whose weight is given in the catalogue below is 152.52 g. The rest of the coins in the hoard were weighed in groups whose total is 233.91 g. (excluding the two nummi, Nos. 578 and 579, concreted to the iron nail). Thus the weight of all the coins in the hoard is 386.43 g. The bronze scrap weighs 55.03 g., resulting in a total weight of 439.46 g. for all the bronze in the hoard.

busts, one with monogram reverse, and two with cross-potent reverses. All 20 coins in Coin Hoard 1925-2 disintegrated. I am grateful to Nancy Bookidis for supplying this information.

Scantons (Corinth XVI, index s.v. earthquake) dates it to 570. Documented Byzantine-period earthquakes are listed by V. Grumel, Traité d’études byzantines, I, La chronologie, Paris 1958, pp. 476-481. The relevant recorded earthquakes occurred in 568, 580/581 (the third year of the reign of Tiberius), 583, 584/5, 588, 601, 611 and 618. The first is too early and the last two are too late, but any of the others might have been locally severe at Corinth, resulting in the spreading of Gymnasium Hoard II over the pool area and the death and burial of the two individuals whose pockets contained Corinth Hoards 1925-1 and 1925-2. An unrecorded earthquake during the same period could also have had the same results. See footnote 30 above.

The M on the reverse of the follis indicates that it was worth 40 nummi, the K on the half-follis is for 20 nummi, the I on the decanummium is for 10 nummi, and the E on the pentanummium is for 5 nummi. Fragments of the larger denominations are counted at their fractional value: thus No. 87 = 2.5 nummi, No. 89 = 1 nummus, No. 93 = 3 nummi, Nos. 146, 147 = 10 nummi each, No. 320 = 5 nummi, and No. 327 = 1 nummus. I have estimated the earlier coins as follows: Nos. 1-4 = pentanummia for a total of 20 nummi, Nos. 6 and 8 = 1 nummus each, and the rest through No. 58 = 2 nummi each. (Thus, Nos. 1-58 may have been valued at a total of 126 nummi.) Nos. 59-65 = 1 nummus each or 7 nummi, No. 287 = 2 nummi, Nos. 288-290 = 1 nummus each, Nos. 291 and 292 = 2 nummi each, No. 293 = 1 nummus, Nos. 294-299 and 300-312 = 2 nummi each, and Nos. 313-318 = 1 nummus each. This is a total of 179 nummi, or 4.475 folles, for the pre-Byzantine coins in the hoard.

Compare the values of the Kroll hoard at 54 folles and “Korinth” at 15.5 folles, as counted by Walker, p. 42, note 5.

See the summaries in Hahn, I, pp. 19-27 and II, pp. 14-17.
For the years A.D. 570–578 and for 580–614, the ideal weight of the follis was 13.64 g.37 Dividing the total weight of the coins in the hoard by this figure gives the coin value as 28.34 folles, while that of all the bronze (coins plus scrap) is 32.22 folles. During the years just mentioned, there were 24 folles in a pound; from 570 to 578, it required 30 pounds of bronze to equal 1 gold solidus, which dropped to 25 pounds for the years 580–614. The present weight of the bronze in the hoard is about 1 1/3 pounds, which was worth slightly more than a thirtieth or a twenty-fifth of a gold solidus at the time the hoard was collected and buried.

CATALOGUE: HOARD II
(Plates 37, 38)

An asterisk beside the number indicates that the coin is illustrated. The Corinth Museum coin inventory number follows the catalogue number. Where the denomination is not named, it is a nummus or the equivalent.38 Where the weight and die position are omitted, either the obverse or the reverse is illegible.

MACEDON

PHILIP II, 359–336 B.C.
Traces of head of youth r. [ΦΙΑΙΩΝ] Horseman riding r. SNGCop 609 or
1. 71-1272 15 mm. 2.69 g. 612

GREECE

SIKYON, 4th–2nd centuries B.C.
Dove flying l. [Σ] in olive wreath BMC 92
2. 71-1178 14 mm. 2.08 g. *
Traces of beak and head of dove flying r. Symbols or letters illegible cf. BMC 94–105
3. 71-749 13 mm. 2.09 g. *
Dove flying l. Tripod lebes in olive wreath BMC 146
*4. 71-1214 18 mm. 2.36 g. *

CONSTANTINE I, A.D. 341–346

NICOMEDIA

[DNCONSTANTI-I NVS PF AVG] VN MR below $\text{SMN}$ LRBC 1148,
Head r., veiled Emperor veiled, standing r. 1152, 1155
5. 71-754 AE III 14 mm. 1.20 g. *

CONSTANTINE II, as Caesar, A.D. 321–324

DN F[CL CONSTANTI]NVS NOB [C IO]VI CONS-[ERVATORI Cohen 133
Bust r. Jupiter standing l., holding Victory on globe in r. hand; eagle with wreath l.
on ground
6. 71-778 quartered AE III

37 Hahn, II, pp. 15–16. Between 578 and 580, the follis was raised to an ideal weight of 18.19 g. as it had been earlier under Justinian I.
38 Also called a minimus; see Hahn, I, pp. 23–27, “Yale”, pp. 148–155, and “Kenchreai”, p. 90, note 4 for the distinction in the usage of the two terms.
COIN HOARDS FROM THE GYMNASIUM AREA AT CORINTH

HOUSE OF CONSTANTINE, A.D. 335–337

GLORIA EXERC-IT[VS

Bust r. Two soldiers, between them a single standard

7. 71-1277 AE III 16 mm. 0.79 g. /
8. 71-1181 halved AE III (reverse legend illegible)
9. 71-973 AE III (obverse and reverse legend illegible)

THEODOSIUS I, A.D. 379–388

DN THEO-DIV[IS PF AVG] VOT X MVLT X Cohen 68
Bust r. In wreath
10. 71-882 AE IV 13 mm. 1.00 g. /

ARCADIUS, A.D. 393–395

CONSTANTINOPLE

DN ARC]ADI–V[IS PF AVG SALVS REI [PVBLICA]E below CON LRBC 2193
Bust r. Victory dragging captive l. † to l.
11. 71-751 AE IV 15 mm. 0.85 g. ‡

VALENTINIAN II, THEODOSIUS I, OR ARCADIUS, A.D. 383–392

Bust r. Two Victories holding wreath 39
12, 13. 71-1242, 71-1320 AE IV

THESSALONICA

Bust r. Camp gate 40
14. 71-886 AE IV 11 mm. 0.71 g. ‡

(obverse illegible)
15, 16. 71-1241, 71-1196 AE IV the latter, clipped

THEODOSIUS I, ARCADIUS, OR HONORIUS, A.D. 393–395

Bust r. SALVS REI–PVBLIC[AE Victory dragging captive l.
17. 71-1124 AE IV 13 mm. 1.14 g. ‡

PERIOD OF THEODOSIUS II, A.D. 425–450

Bust r. Cross in wreath 41
18. 71-1278 AE IV 0.90 g. ‡

39 This type is also used on AE IV coins of Constans and Constantius, A.D. 341–346. Without at least a portion of the reverse legend preserved, either attribution is possible. I have chosen the later series because there are more late 4th-century coins in the hoard than those from the first half of the century.

40 Although these all are probably the camp-gate type minted only at Thessalonica (RIC IX, pp. 186–187, no. 62a) and they all appear to have been of AE IV size, the lack of legible inscriptions and the worn types make it impossible to rule out entirely some being large flan, crude camp-gate reverses of the DOMINVS NOSTRO obverse (BMCV, p. 28, no. 83, pl. 3, no. 40).

41 These are all probably Theodosius II, but the type is also found on a rare issue of Valentinian III, minted at Rome (LRBC, no. 867); see "Zacha", p. 182, note 40 and "Volo", p. 56, note 20. The size of all the coins appears to have been originally AE IV, but the worn types, lack of legible inscriptions, and the number in the hoard allow the possibility that these might also be large flan nummi (BMCV, pp. 40–41, nos. 186–200, pl. 4, nos. 38–43).
FIG. 1. Monograms and christograms from Hoard II

(Obverse illegible)

VALENTINIAN III, A.D. 425–455

ROME
Bust, pearl diademed, r.
58. 71-953  AE IV  12.5 mm.  0.94 g.  †

MARCIAN, A.D. 450–457
Bust l.
59. 71-955  10 mm.  0.61 g.  †
DN[illegible letters]
Bust r.
(Fig. 1:1)42 in wreath
60. 71-1034  12 mm.  0.67 g.  †

42I have not found a parallel for the bust left or this exact variety of Marcian monogram. It appears, however, to be a variety of "Volo", monograms 14 and 15, p. 66, nos. 400, 401.
(obverse illegible)
61. 71-1136

(Fig. 1:2) in wreath

LEO, A.D. 457–474

(Fig. 1:3) in wreath

(Leo illegible)
62. 71-777 10 mm. 0.61 g. ↓

ZENO, A.D. 474–491

(Fig. 1:4) in wreath

(Trace of bust illegible)
63. 71-1103 7.5 mm. 0.57 g. ↓

(Fig. 1:5) in wreath

(Obverse illegible)
64. 71-763 10 mm. 0.84 g.

(Fig. 1:6) in wreath

65. 71-792

AELIA ZENONIS, A.D. 475–476

(Fig. 1:7) in wreath

LRBC 2287,
“Volo” 1043–1058

(Obverse illegible)
66. 71-1215

ANASTASIUS I, A.D. 491–518, OR JUSTINIAN I, A.D. 527–565

Bust r., trace of letters

(Fig. 1:8) in wreath

LRBC 2288, DO
15.1, Hahn 40,
BiblNat 1–10

67. 71-1179 8.5 mm. 0.40 g. ↑
68. 71-1123 8.5 mm. 0.57 g. \ 

43 This monogram is incompletely preserved, but it can only be one of Marcian; compare the monogram tables in LRBC, p. 110, “Volo”, p. 89, “Zacha”, p. 205, and “Korinth”, p. 143.

44 This monogram is incompletely preserved, but it can only be that of Leo; compare the monogram tables in footnote 43 above.


46 Although this monogram is incompletely preserved, it is surely LRBC, p. 110, Zeno monogram no. 1 and “Volo”, p. 89, Zeno monogram no. 1.

47 Adelson and Kustas (under “Zacha”, p. 188, note 54) suggest that this and the following variations of Anastasius’ monogram were minted both by him and Justinian I, although no obverse legends with Justinian’s name have been noted. This suggestion has been accepted by Bellinger in DO, p. 11, no. 15. But Hahn (I, pp. 33–35 and 58–60) does not even note the possibility. Other hoard evidence supports the attribution of these monograms to Justinian I as well as to Anastasius I; the following legible examples were found in hoards associated with the Slavic invasion of the early 580’s: “Kenchreai”, p. 93, no. 12; Kroll, p. 308, nos. 103–113; Walker, p. 45, nos. 14–17 and 30, 31. Two hoards buried during the reign of Justinian I also contain them: “Roman Wall Hoard” (Gregory, p. 273, note 24) and “Korinth”, pp. 151–154, nos. 87–179 and no. 246 with an obverse inscription reading... CSRIC.
Bust r., trace of letters (Fig. 1:9) in wreath

69. 71-954 9 mm. 0.50 g. ↑
70. 71-1042 10 mm. 0.40 g. →
71. 71-1039 8 mm. 0.37 g. ✓
72. 71-771 7 mm. 0.47 g. ↓

Bust r. (Fig. 1:10) in wreath

73. 71-1223 8.5 mm. 0.56 g. ↓

Bust r. (Fig. 1:11) in wreath

74. 71-952 9.5 mm. 0.43 g. ↓ A variation of “Korinth” 144

Bust r. (Fig. 1:12) in wreath

75. 71-1044 8.5 mm. 0.39 g. ↓ Possibly a variation of DO 15.5 (obverse illegible) (Fig. 1:13) in wreath “Zacha” 224–227, “Korinth” 177, 178

76, 77. 71-1227, 71-1228 (obverse illegible) (Fig. 1:14) in wreath

78. 71-1290

JUSTIN I, A.D. 518–527

Bust r., diademed (Fig. 1:15) in wreath

79. 71-892 8 mm. 0.46 g. ↑

Bust r. in border of dots (Fig. 1:15) in wreath

80. 71-775 9 mm. 0.38 g. ✓

Bust r. (Fig. 1:15) in wreath

81. 71-776 9 mm. 0.41 g. ↑
82. 71-949 8 mm. 0.52 g. ↑

(obverse illegible)
33–85. 71-1185, 71-1289, and 71-791 (3 coins)

48 I do not know of a parallel for this variation of Anastasius’ monogram.

49 Not enough is preserved of this monogram to determine if this is Anastasius’ or one attributed only to Justinian I (compare Hahn, I, no. 94; DO, no. 372; “Zacha”, nos. 381, 382).

50 Under “Zacha”, pp. 169–170, and “Kenchreai”, p. 93, note 8, it is suggested that this monogram could have been used also on nummi minted in the reign of Justin II because of the attribution of a silver stamp with this monogram on it to him (E. C. Dodd, Dumbarton Oaks Studies, VII, Byzantine Silver Stamps, Washington 1961, pp. 13–14). Hahn (I, pp. 33 and 40–41), on evidence from metrology, limits the nummi with this monogram to Justin I; the “Roman Wall Hoard”, buried early in the reign of Justinian I, contained ten legible monograms like this of Justin I (Gregory, p. 273, notes 22–24).
COIN HOARDS FROM THE GYMNASIUM AREA AT CORINTH

JUSTIN I OR JUSTINIAN I, A.D. 518–565

### DECANUMMIUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalog</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86. 71-893</td>
<td>1.47 g</td>
<td>13 mm</td>
<td>I, to l. and r. stars, letters below in circle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PENTANUMMIA

#### CONSTANTINOPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalog</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87. 71-765</td>
<td>1.39 g</td>
<td>15 mm</td>
<td>(Fig. 1:16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(mint mark illegible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalog</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88. 71-885</td>
<td>2.07 g</td>
<td>13 mm</td>
<td>(Fig. 1:16) but the letters to l. and r. are illegible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. 71-1226</td>
<td>1.47 g</td>
<td>13 mm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FOLLES

#### CONSTANTINOPLE, A.D. 527–532

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalog</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*90. 71-753</td>
<td>17.37 g</td>
<td>32 mm</td>
<td>M, cross above, star to l. and r., Γ below, CON in exergue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ANTIOCH, A.D. 527–528

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalog</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91. 71-881</td>
<td>12.42 g</td>
<td>31 mm</td>
<td>M, cross above, star to l. and r., Γ below, ANTIX in exergue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### JUSTINIAN I, A.D. 527–565

#### EDITED COINS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalog</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

51 Decanummia of this type were minted at Constantinople in the reign of Justin I from A.D. 522 to 527 (Hahn, I, no. 24, DO, no. 17), in the joint reign of Justin I and Justinian I in 527 (Hahn, I, no. 6), and in the reign of Justinian I from 527 to 537 (Hahn, I, no. 92, DO, no. 34). At the mint of Cyzicus, these were only issued in the reign of Justinian I from 538 to 552 (Hahn, I, no. 122 and G. E. Bates, *Archaeological Exploration of Sardis*, I, Byzantine Coins, Cambridge, Mass. 1971, p. 39, no. 250). At Carthage they were minted under Justinian I from 533 to 538 (Hahn, I, no. 188 and BiblNat, no. 14).

52 Pentanummia of this type were minted in the reign of Justin I from A.D. 522 to 527 (Hahn, I, no. 32, DO, no. 21a, and BiblNat, nos. 24, 25) and in the reign of Justinian I from A.D. 527 to 537 (Hahn, I, no. 93 and DO, no. 35a).

53 For pentanummia of this type from the mint of Constantinople see footnote 52 above, to which add for Justin I: Hahn, I, no. 33, DO, no. 22, and BiblNat, nos. 26–34. For the mint of Nicomedia see, in the reign of Justin I from A.D. 522 to 527, Hahn, I, nos. 46, 47, BiblNat, nos. 8, 9, DO, nos. 36, 37, and under Justinian I, no. 114 (this was attributed by Hahn to Justin I); in the reign of Justinian I from A.D. 527 to 537, Hahn, I, no. 111.
A.D. 564–565

**DNVSOL-AUCVP**

Bust facing, in helmet with plume and diadem with trefoil ornament in front, and cuirass. In r. hand, globus cruciger. On l. shoulder, shield with horseman device. In field, cross.

*M, cross above A to l. X to r.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>71-1212</td>
<td>34 mm.</td>
<td>18.27 g.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DECANUMMIA**

**CONSTANTINOPLE, A.D. 549–550**

Bust r.

*I, A to l. [X] to r.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>71-1224</td>
<td>14.5 mm.</td>
<td>0.88 g.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only about one third of the coin is preserved.

**NICOMEDIA, A.D. 561–562**

(obverse illegible)

*I, X to r.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>71-1281</td>
<td>3.41 g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PENTANUMMIA**

**CONSTANTINOPLE, small size, A.D. 542–552**

**DNIV[STINIANVSSP]AVC**

Bust r., diademed

*E, cross to r. in circle*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>71-1176</td>
<td>14 mm.</td>
<td>1.73 g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71-1308</td>
<td>13 mm.</td>
<td>1.74 g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71-1177</td>
<td>12.5 mm.</td>
<td>1.72 g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71-1288</td>
<td>11 mm.</td>
<td>1.39 g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71-1276</td>
<td>14 mm.</td>
<td>2.07 g.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

54 The obverse legend is different from that read in *DO* and *BiblNat*.

55 The year is certain because the size and spacing of the legible X require a second X to be restored above it. The spacing of the two legible I’s requires a third to be restored to the right.

56 Hahn (I, p. 60 and note 60) points out that the circle as well as the style of these pentanummia with a cross makes it possible to attribute them to Constantinople and to distinguish them from the pentanummia with a wreath minted at Carthage (Hahn 203) and in the reign of Justin II at Rome (Hahn 86).
(traces of letters)
Bust r.
100. 71-755  12 mm.  1.88 g.  \checkmark

**NUMMI**

**CARThAGE, A.D. 539–540**

JIVŠT[  VOT  XIII  in circle
Bust r.

*101. 71-883  11 mm.  0.57 g.  \checkmark

**A.D. 542–547**

Bust r.

Christogram (as in Fig. 1:16 but without  \(\varepsilon\) or \(\varepsilon\) ) in circle or double circle

102. 71-749  9 mm.  0.65 g.  \checkmark
103. 71-770  10 mm.  0.65 g.  \(\uparrow\)
104. 71-762  8 mm.  0.38 g.  \checkmark

(obverse illegible)

---

105. 71-1182

**A.D. 547–549**

Bust facing  (Fig. 1:17) in wreath

106. 71-766  12 mm.  1.19 g.  \(\uparrow\)

(obverse illegible)

107. 71-1239

**A.D. 549–552**

Bust facing in helmet  (Fig. 1:18) in wreath

108. 71-768  10 mm.  0.68 g.  \(\uparrow\)

---

**57** Hahn (I, p. 69) attributes this issue on stylistic grounds to Carthage. Bellinger (DO, p. 104) includes it with the pentanummia of Constantinople but notes that P. Grierson suggests Thessalonica as the mint. An eastern mint is supported by the eastern provenance of the six other examples catalogued by Hahn (I, p. 126): Athens, National Museum; Curium, D. H. Cox, *ANSNBM, CXLV, Coins from the Excavations at Curium*, New York 1959, no. 679; Sardis, Bates, *op. cit.* (footnote 51 above), p. 36, nos. 219–221, who attributes them to the mint of Thessalonica, giving Grierson’s reasons for doing so, p. 9.

**58** Bellinger (DO, pp. 169–170) and Hahn (I, p. 71) attribute nummi of this type to Justinian I, mint of Carthage, but Adelson and Kustas (under “Zacha”, p. 195, note 73) followed by Hohlfelder (under “Kenchreai”, p. 94, nos. 24–26), Kroll (p. 308, no. 116), and Walker (p. 47, no. 45), suggest that Justin I may also have minted this type.

**59** Hahn (I, p. 71) assigns this reverse type to Carthage but Bellinger (DO) classifies it as from an uncertain mint.
UNCERTAIN MINT OR MINTS

Bust r.

*109. 71-773  8 mm.  0.30 g.  
110. 71-764  10 mm.  0.54 g.  ↓
111. 71-769  8 mm.  0.36 g.  ↑
112. 71-1041 11 mm.  0.45 g.  ↓
113. 71-772  8 mm.  0.39 g.  ↑
114. 71-774  7 mm.  0.24 g.  ↑
115, 116. 71-757, 71-1274

(obverse illegible)


JUSTIN II, A.D. 565–578

FOLLIES

CONSTANTINOPLE, A.D. 573–574

DNIVSTI–NVSPAVC

Justin with Sophia on r. nimbate, facing enthroned. He holds in r. hand a globebus cruciger; she holds a cruciform scepter

*144. 71-946  30 mm.  13.17 g.  ↑

NICOMEDIA, A.D. 565–578

DNIVSTI[NVSP]PAV[C

Ibid.

145. 71-947  30 mm.  13.19 g.  /

DO 36, 309, 36e 4, Hahn 193, Bibl Nat 74–80

110. 71-774  7 mm.  0.24 g.  ↑

Many appear to be without serifs, but the condition of these makes it impossible to be sure if this is intentional or the result of misstriking, wear and corrosion. Examples without serifs or with a bar over the alpha are known from Sardis (Bates, op. cit. [footnote 51 above], pp. 9–10, 44, nos. 290–297), where they are classified as from unknown mints. Bellinger (DO, p. 82, no. 36), however, assigns those of careful workmanship to Constantinople and those that are less carefully made to Carthage (p. 170, no. 309). The quantity of these reverses noted in hoards from Greece suggests that they were minted at one or more eastern mints: five in “Korinth”, nos. 247–251, five in Kroll, nos. 117–121, three in Walker, nos. 46–48, 26 in “Zacha”, nos. 355–380. Some of the more obscure alpha reverses might have had a rho or a cross above the alpha. Hahn (178–179) attributes these to the mint of Thessalonica from A.D. 538 to 542, following D. M. Metcalf, The Coinage of Thessalonica under Justinian I (Denkschriften der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, vol. 127. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Numismatik, V), Vienna 1976, p. 46, no. 312. The possibility cannot be eliminated entirely that some of the more obscure alphas once formed parts of monograms; I have tried to be sure of the single alpha reading.
HALF-FOLLES

THESSALONICA, A.D. 569–570

(inscription illegible) K, Ε to r. ΤΕ[Σ] below

Ibid.

146. 71-750 halved 25 mm. 3.89 g. ↓

A.D. 574–575

[DNIVSTI]–ΝVS K, cross above, X to r. ΤΕΣ in exergue

Ibid.

147. 71-1318 halved 23 mm. 3.98 g. ↓

CYZICUS, A.D. 574–575

(inscription illegible) K, Α to l., X to r.

Ibid.

148. 71-1213 24 mm. 5.23 g. ↑

PENTANUMMIUM

(Fig. 1:19) Ε to r. Α

Ibid.

*149. 71-948 16 mm. 1.50 g. /

OSTROGOTHIC KING: BADUILA, A.D. 541–552

TICINUM?

Traces of bust r.

(Fig. 1:20) Hahn 87, BMCV

24–27, “Zacha”

447–456

150. 71-779

OTHER NUMMI OR EQUIVALENTS

Traces of bust facing Asymmetrical alpha or delta surrounded by three stars⁶¹

Hahn 213, DO

310

*151. 71-1035 10 mm. 0.63 g. \n
⁶¹ Only the star on the left is legible. Hahn (pp. 71–72, no. 213) reads the letter as a delta and attributes this type to Justinian I, mint of Cartaghe from A.D. 562 to 565, presumably because one of the two examples in DO 310 was found at Cartaghe. Kroll (nos. 126–131) reads an asymmetrical alpha and (note 28) suggests that their more sharp and fresh condition as compared to the coins of Justinian I and Baduila in the hoard would make it more likely that they were minted in the reign of Justin II. The attribution of all these types to Cartaghe would also appear uncertain from the number of them found in Greek hoards: one in “Kenchreai”, no. 49, 11 in “Zacha”, nos. 399–409, and three in Walker, nos. 56–58. Six are known from Caesarea, H. Hamburger, “Minute Coins from Caesarea,” Atiqot, Journal of the Israel Department of Antiquities 1, 1954, p. 136, no. 114.
DOM[IN]QNOST[RO]

152. 71-1180  9 mm.  0.61 g.  →  Emperor(?) standing l. holding in outstretched r. hand a globus(?) or a standard(?)

A[ ]

Bust r.

153. 71-1038  10 mm.  0.59 g.  →  Palm tree with six fronds. Three dots to r. and l. below in circular border

(traces of letters)

154. 71-887  12 mm.  0.79 g.  \ The center is triangularly pierced.

(inscription illegible)

Often only a trace of the bust

*155. 71-950  10 mm.  0.64 g.  †
156. 71-891  9 mm.  0.50 g.  †
157. 71-1043  10 mm.  0.62 g.  ←
158–164. 71-780, -962, -1195, -1125, -1236–1238 (7 coins)

Crude bust r. in border of dots  (Fig. 1:21) in wreath

165. 71-715  8 mm.  0.30 g.  \  (obverse illegible)

166–170. 71-904, -1053–1056 (5 coins)

 illegible letters)  (Fig. 1:22) in wreath

Crude bust r.

171. 71-957  9 mm.  0.80 g.  †

(obverse illegible)

172. 71-963

Crude bust r.  Victory advancing l. with wreath and palm

173. 71-748  12 mm.  0.52 g.  †
174. 71-951  8 mm.  0.27 g.  ←

(obverse illegible)


62 Although the obverse is clear, the reverse is not. It is possible that this might be a very crude version of a Victory advancing r., with a wreath, but the coins with the same obverse as No. 152 have the Victory advancing l. (BMCV, p. 19, nos. 15, 16, pl. 3, nos. 4, 5).

63 See pp. 159–160 and footnotes 25–29 above for the attribution and dating of these types. No. 153 shows only three dots on the left while No. 158 has only one dot on the left and right each; the dots on the others are off the flan or obliterated. Many do not have all six palm fronds preserved.

64 See BMCV, pp. 20–22, nos. 21–41, pl. 3:8–16 and “Zacha”, nos. 317–330 and p. 193, note 68 for the evidence for dating these Victory types to the 6th century.
COIN HOARDS FROM THE GYMNASIUM AREA AT CORINTH

Crude bust r.
*196. 71-890  10 mm.  0.70 g.  ✓
(obverse illegible)
197. 71-1243
Crude bust r.
Part of wreath surrounded by circle\textsuperscript{66}
(Fig. 1:23)

Crude bust r.
*198. 71-1040  10 mm.  0.40 g.  ↑
199. 71-889  10 mm.  0.40 g.  ↑
200. 71-752  10 mm.  0.70 g.  ↑
Crude bust r.
Double alpha overstruck by cross\textsuperscript{67}
(uncertauncy monogram, Fig. 1:24)
(uncertauncy monogram, Fig. 1:25)
(traces of monogram)

201–209. 71-543, -793–800 (9 coins)

Crude bust r.
(Illigible, but pierced through center
with square hole)
287. 71-1207

UNCERTAIN AND ILLEGIBLE 4TH–5TH CENTURY

\textit{AE II FRAGMENTS}

\textit{Ca. one quarter}
288. 71-914

\textit{Ca. one eighth}
289–291. 71-985, 71-1115, 71-1349 (3 coins)
No. 289 with traces of hair on head

\textit{AE III CLIPPED TO AE IV}
292. 71-1063

\textit{AE III FRAGMENTS}

\textit{Ca. one half}
293. 71-913

\textsuperscript{65}This reverse might be only a misstruck monogram in wreath with the edge of the die creating the second border; but compare \textit{BMCV}, p. 36, no. 156, pl. 4:26 and \textquotedblleft Zacha\textquotedblright, p. 194, no. 340.

\textsuperscript{66}This is likely to be a misstruck monogram in wreath with the edge of the die creating the outer circle.

\textsuperscript{67}If this is not a misstruck or overstruck monogram, it may be an imitation of a monogram on an issue with an obverse of an emperor facing. Compare \textquotedblleft Zacha\textquotedblright, p. 198, no. 410 attributed to Justinian I, but Hahn (II, p. 49, no. 87) attributes this issue to Justin II, mint of Rome (or perhaps Carthage).
Ca. one third
.illegible.
Emperor standing l. holding standard or spear in l. hand, r. hand outstretched

Ca. one quarter
.illegible.
Two facing figures


AE IV
301–313. 71-801–810, -997, -1111, -1350 (13 coins)
Traces of figures or busts on some

AE IV HALVES

Ca. one half
314–319. 71-790, -816, -817, -915, -1078, -1197 (6 coins)
A few with traces of figures

ANASTASIIUS THROUGH JUSTIN II

HALF-FOLLIS
.obverse illegible.
K
320. 71-545 quartered 0.25 g.

DECANUMMIUM
Traces of bust r.
I
321. 71-888 13 mm. 1.36 g.

PENTANUMMIA
Traces of bust r.
ε cross to r.
322. 71-884 14 mm. 1.36 g.
(obverse illegible)
cross ineligible or absent
323–327. 71-782, -1125, -1240, -1286, -998 (5 coins)
The last coin quartered

ILLEGIBLE FRAGMENTS: MOSTLY NUMMI
(250 coins)
578, 579. Corinth Lot 7113 Nummi concreted to iron nail shaft, 37 below.
BRONZE: Total weight 53.03 g.

1. Cast buckle fragment (Pl. 38:G). Max. dim. 0.02 m.68

2–9. Eight bent wire fragments from chain links or other circular fastenings (Pl. 38:B, the four best preserved). Min. dim. 0.01–0.025 m.70

10. Lip fragment of small vessel or lamp (Pl. 38:C). Max. dim. 0.03 m.

11, 12. Two small nail fragments. 71-1036 (Pl. 38:A). Max. p. L. 0.02 m. with head 0.003 m. in diameter. The second is only a shaft fragment, 71-1061.

13. Pointed wire fragment, perhaps end of pin, needle or very small nail. L. 0.01 m.

14. Small attachment fragment of cut sheet pierced by iron tack head. Max. p. dim. 0.015 m.

15. Rectangular fragment of cut sheet with delta-like punch mark on one side. L. 0.022 m., 71-1273.

16–36. Twenty-one droplets of bronze, many completely corroded and uncleaned (e.g. Pl. 38:D), while others (including 71-761, -1037, -1062, -1271, -1287) survived cleaning (e.g. Pl. 38:F). Max. dim. 0.007–0.013 m.

IRON: Total weight 46.00 g.

37, 38. Pointed end of nail or spike shafts.

37. L. 0.04 m. Two nummi concreted to it above the point, one of which is facing the viewer in Plate 38:H.

38 (Pl. 38:J). L. 0.055 m. Two fragments of lead concreted to it.

Small pebbles concreted to both.

39. Disk head of nail, 0.03 m. in diameter.

40–42. Three oxidized lumps which might originally have been head or head and part of shaft of nails, but the oxidation has completely obscured the shapes (e.g. Pl. 38:I); small pebbles concreted to them. Max. dim. 0.02–0.035 m.

LEAD: Total weight 3.52 g.

43. Cast strip (Pl. 38:E). Max. dim. 0.02, max. Th. 0.003 m.

44. Droplet. Max. dim. 0.008 m.

GLASS

45. Half a green glass tessera from a mosaic. L. 0.01 m.

HOARD III: FROM THE 6TH CENTURY

On November 5, 1971, a small hoard of bronze coins was found sealed in a basin along the wall of the easternmost fountain chamber cut through the south wall of the bath-fountain complex.71 A block with cuttings that suggest that it was originally a

68 Metal objects readily distinguished from the coins in the hoard were collected and recorded as Corinth Lot 7113. Other objects were included with the coins and given Corinth coin inventory numbers which I have reported below. Because of their inclusion in the hoard, I provide a catalogue of these fragmentary items.

69 Compare G. R. Davidson, Corinth, XII, The Minor Objects, Princeton 1952, p. 272, nos. 2202, 2204–2206, pl. 114, dated to the early mediaeval period, not later than the 10th century.

70 Compare ibid., p. 128, nos. 858 and 860, pl. 63 and p. 194, no. 1455, pl. 88, dated to the Roman and Byzantine periods.

71 Located in grid squares O/P–38/39 in fig. 4 of Wiseman, Hesperia 41, 1972, p. 10 and briefly described by Williams, Δεκατη 27, 1972, B’ 1 [1976], pp. 223–224. The excavation of the hoard is recorded in
statue base covered the basin and hoard. Although this hoard was found ten meters south of Gymnasium Hoard II, both were at about the same elevation.\textsuperscript{72} The number of coins in the hoard was counted as 36 when they were excavated but only 31 coins survived cleaning.\textsuperscript{73} All the coins are corroded from the wetness of the fountain area, and, as far as one can determine in spite of the corrosion, all appear worn from circulation.\textsuperscript{74} All but two of the coins are nummi or the equivalent, and only ten are partially legible. The two nummi, Nos. 8, 9, with the alpha reverse of Justinian I, A.D. 527–565, are the latest coins in the hoard and establish a \textit{terminus post quem} for the burial of the hoard. The wear on the half-follis of Justin I, No. 6, is consistent with this or possibly even a later burial date. The similar elevations of this and Gymnasium Hoard II support the possibility of the same burial date for both after the Slavic invasion of the early 580’s.\textsuperscript{75} The absence of identifiable coins dated after 527–565 might be explained by the great amount of corroded examples in the hoard and its small size in general. It is clear, in addition, from the quantity of earlier worn coins in Gymnasium Hoard II that the scarcity of freshly minted small change in the later 6th century kept old, worn coins in circulation. But the presence in Gymnasium Hoard III of a larger-denomination coin of Justin I and the absence of any large denominations from before the time of Justinian I in Gymnasium Hoard II may indicate an earlier date for the burial of this small hoard. The absence of palm-tree nummi may also support an earlier date; it is, then, not impossible that Gymnasium Hoard III was secreted in the basin before the documented earthquake of 551 closed off this part of the fountain house.\textsuperscript{76} The 29 nummi, one half-follis and one pentanummium of this hoard are equivalent to only 1.35 folles; this is such a small sum that it must have been a fortuitous collection of small change.\textsuperscript{77} Omitting No. 6, the weight of all the coins in the hoard totals 13.18 g. With No. 6 included, it weighs a total of 21.05 g. If one calculates with the ideal weight of the follis which was in use in the later part of Justinian’s reign, 18.19 g., the value of the survi-

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{72}The elevation of the findspot of this hoard was +45.556 m. See footnote 13 above for the elevation of Gymnasium Hoard II.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{73}Five coins were collected separately and given Corinth coin inventory numbers; the rest were gathered together in one large find envelope and were not given Corinth coin inventory numbers until after they were cleaned. One of the Corinth coin inventory numbers (71-733) was used for what proved to be, when cleaned, two illegible nummi, Nos. 18, 19. There may have been 37 coins in the hoard if 71-733 was counted as only one of the original 36 coins. Also compare footnote 16 above.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{74}See footnotes 8 and 17 above.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{75}See footnotes 24, 30 and 32 above.}


\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{77}Walker suggests that his hoard with a total equivalent to 5.5 folles may have been dropped from a purse. The hoards of 20 and 56 coins found over the waists of two skeletons, discussed in footnote 31 above, support the theory that this Gymnasium hoard was the small change carried by a person in 6th-century Corinth.}
ing weight of the hoard is just less that 1.2 folles. Using the ideal weight of the follis during the reign of Justin II, 13.64 g., the present weight of the hoard is valued at 1.5 folles.  

CATALOGUE: HOARD III  
(Plate 38)  
An asterisk beside the number indicates that the coin is illustrated. The Corinth Museum coin inventory number follows the catalogue number. Where the denomination is not named, it is a nummus or the equivalent. Where the weight and die position are omitted, either the obverse or the reverse is illegible.

PERIOD OF THEODOSIUS II, A.D. 425–450?  
Slight traces of bust r.  
1–5. 71-1325–1329 (5 coins)  
Cross in wreath79

HALF-FOLLIS  
CONSTANTINOPLE, A.D. 518–522  
[DNIVSTI]–NVSPPAVC  
Bust r. with diadem, cuirass and paludamentum  
K, long cross to l., € to r.  
*6. 71-730  28 mm.  7.87 g.  

NUMMUS  
Traces of bust r.  
(Fig. 1:15) in wreath80

7. 71-731  6 mm.  

JUSTIN I, A.D. 518–527  

7. 71-731  6 mm.  

JUSTINIAN I, A.D. 527–565  

8. 71-694  8 mm.  
9. 71-1330  7 mm.  

ILLEGIBLE 4TH–5TH CENTURY

AE IV  
10. 71-732  halved

PENTANUMMIUM  
Bust r. with diadem  
€ in circle

11. 71-1324  11 mm.

78 Hahn, I, p. 27 and II, pp. 15–16.  
79 See footnote 41 above. But on these examples, I am even less sure of the attribution.  
80 See footnote 50 above.  
81 See footnote 60 above. I am fairly sure, however, that these two alphas do not have serifs.
NUMMI
Bust r. (illegible)
12–17. 71-1331–1336 (6 coins)
(illegible)
18–31. 71-733 which is given to two coins, 71-1337–1348 (14 coins)

HOARD IV: FROM SHORTLY AFTER THE FIRST CRUSADE

On September 13, 1971, while clearing the deep deposit over the Roman Bath and Fountain of the Lamps, a billion hoard of 100 dinari was found underneath a large piece of rock collapsed from the cliff edge, between 2.5 and 3.25 m. below the modern surface.\(^2\) Two other dinari, Nos. 101 and 102, were found slightly above the main body of the hoard and are probably part of it. The earth matrix at the findspot of the hoard was no different from the rest of the earth around it except for a concentration of snail shells about the coins.\(^3\) The coins were found together in a small area (0.044×0.037×0.08 m. deep) which may indicate the size of the original container or pocket of earth into which they were placed. The other material found around and above the hoard and with the two other dinari contained nothing that could be dated later than the 6th or 7th century after Christ.\(^4\)

All 102 coins were struck with the mint mark of the Tuscan mint of Lucca. The majority of the coins, 82 dinari, are of the types introduced by Henry II of Saxony, Emperor and King of Italy, A.D. 1004–1024, which were continued by Henry III, IV, and V of Franconia, Emperors and Kings of Italy, A.D. 1039–1125, and 18 dinari are of Conrad II of Franconia, Emperor and King of Italy, A.D. 1026–1039.\(^5\) The two dinari found near the hoard are one each of Henry and Conrad II. No other coins of Conrad II have yet been identified from the Corinth excavations. Three strays and five dinari in a hoard from the middle of the 12th century, all with the name of Henry and the mint mark of Lucca, were found at Corinth.\(^6\)

\(^2\) For the bath-pool complex see the references cited in footnote 12 above, and for the findspot of the hoard, see Wiseman, *Hesperia* 41, 1972, p. 10, fig. 4, in grid square O-41. The excavation of the hoard was recorded in Corinth Field Notebook 494, pp. 97–101, 103, and 109 (the two other dinari are recorded on p. 93). The elevations of the surface of the trench, which sloped down from south to north, were from +51.947 to +51.195 m. The hoard was found nearer the higher south end of the trench at an elevation of +48.653 m.

\(^3\) These presumably terrestrial mollusks were not saved nor further identified. If they were a species of scavenger, they would have collected around the hoard to feed off the rotting material of its container.

\(^4\) Pottery from the hoard area is in Lot 6944, while that from around the two other coins is in Lot 6945.


\(^6\) For the hoard see Edwards, *Corinth* VI, pp. 12 and 158, no. 45, found with bits of cloth adhering to some of the coins. The nine coins of the Bishops of Valence date the hoard (*ibid.*, p. 157, no. 41). J. Duplessy and D. M. Metcalf, “Le trésor de Samos et la circulation monétaire en orient latin aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles,” *RBN* 108, 1962, p. 203, suggest that the five dinari belong to Henry IV, A.D. 1056–1106, which is more consistent with the date of the other nine coins in the hoard. Metcalf also discusses this hoard in
No coins of Henry or Conrad II have been published from the excavations of the Athenian Agora. A large number of coins struck in the name of Henry have been recorded as stray finds and in hoards from northern Syria throughout the period from after A.D. 1098 to ca. 1175. Metcalf concludes that the Henry coins from Syria were all minted during the reigns of Henry III, IV and V or later and that the latest of them is an imitative series that may have been produced at Pisa or even in the Latin East to fill the needs for currency of the new Latin kingdoms there. According to Metcalf, in the period after the First Crusade until the princes of Antioch and kings of Jerusalem began to strike their own billon coinage, the Lucca type with the Henry name became one of the “few ‘approved’ or preferred types of western dinari. Merchants would have got to know which types were acceptable and would have arranged to carry those coinages with them on their outward journeys. Thus a stock of billon currency may have been built up in Syria, commensurate with the region’s needs.”

Metcalf uses stylistic and metrological analyses, as well as the study of the other dated coins in the hoards, to support his explanation for the presence of these coins in the East. I have repeated Metcalf’s arguments in some detail because the dinari of Gymnasium Hoard IV, although earlier in date, appear to be consistent with the Syrian and Corinthian hoards. The 19 dinari of Conrad II are all among the most worn coins in the hoard. A few of the Henry dinari are as worn as those of Conrad II. While these might be of Conrad’s predecessor, Henry II (A.D. 1004–1024), it is more likely that they are coins minted early in the reign of Henry III (A.D. 1039–1056). The better preserved dinari are likely to be from Henry IV (A.D. 1056–1106), or possible early in the reign of Henry V (A.D. 1106–1125). I do not think any of the billon in this hoard is at all likely to have been from recent Corinth excavations.

---

Coinage in the Balkans 820–1355 (Institute for Balkan Studies No. 80), Thessalonica 1965, p. 251, and in Metcalf, pp. 448 and 468, where he proposes a date of the middle of the 12th century for the deposit or loss of this hoard, and where two of the Henry coins are illustrated on plate 18: nos. 21, 22. One of the stray coins is reported from the years 1930–1935 (Edwards, 1937, p. 256) and two from the years 1936–1939 (Harris, p. 154); their findspots are recorded by Metcalf, p. 468. I was able to locate only one of these coins to confirm that it was Henry (and not Conrad II) with the mint mark of Lucca (Agora SC 16/2/38). It appears to be more like those in the hoard from Corinth than those in Gymnasium Hoard IV; compare Metcalf, pl. 18:21, 22. The Corinth coin-index cards for the other two give the mint mark of Lucca. I was able to check the Corinth index cards of the unpublished coins in August 1972 and found no others attributed to Henry II–V or Conrad II, nor any others minted at Lucca. Joan E. Fisher has not published any of these from recent Corinth excavations.

87 Thompson, op. cit. (footnote 17 above).
88 Metcalf, pp. 443–452, 458–462 and 467–469.
89 Ibid., pp. 444 and 452, from the extensive commercial interests of the Pisans in Syria and Palestine after the First Crusade and the evidence assembled by D. Massagli, “Dissertation sur les monnaies frappées à Lucques sous les empereurs de Germanie et les rois d’Italie dans les Xe, XIe, et XIIe siècles,” Revue numismatique française, n.s. 8, 1863, pp. 22–42. On this same issue, see also the discussion by D. Herlihy, “Pisan Coinage and the Monetary Development of Tuscany, 1150–1250,” ANSMN 6, 1964, pp. 143–168; see footnote 107 below.
90 Metcalf, p. 446. He points out a similar pattern in Frankish Greece where the diniers tournois of Philippe Auguste and Louis VIII and IX and abbatial issues of Saint-Martin de Tours were the earliest billon currency: “The Pylia Hoard: Diners Tournois of Frankish Greece,” ANSMN 17, 1971, pp. 173–227.
91 Metcalf, pp. 448–452.
minted after 1125 because, although most of the Henry coins are in better condition than those of Conrad II, they all show some signs of wear. It also appears unlikely that dinari of Conrad II could remain in regular circulation up to a hundred years after they were minted.

The study of the weights of the coins in the hoard is aided by Metcalf’s analysis of the Henry types with the Lucca mint mark. The 19 Conrad II coins have an average weight of 1.036 g. while the 83 coins of Henry have an average weight of 1.062 g., both of which are higher than the highest of Metcalf’s hoards. While the total number of Conrad’s dinari is so small that we cannot be sure whether the sample is representative, the 0.026 g. difference in the two averages suggests that the coins of Conrad II in the hoard have lost more of their weight through wear than have those of Henry types.

Frequency tables of the two types of dinari in the hoard indicate its compactness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conrad II:</th>
<th>Henry:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conrad II:</th>
<th>Henry:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentages:</th>
<th>Percentages:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

92 Metcalf, p. 449, the Izmir hoard: 36 coins, 0.973 g.
93 The coins in the body of the hoard were cleaned as if they were made of silver. Copper corrosion products had leached to the surfaces of the two coins found above the hoard so that, like all billon at Corinth, they could not be distinguished from bronze coins in the field. Those two coins, consequently, were cleaned like bronze coins by electrochemical reduction which plated them with a copper coating. The coins were all weighed after cleaning.
94 I have followed the practice of Metcalf, p. 459: “The weights are given below correct to two places; 0.95 g., for example, includes actual readings from 0.946 to 0.955 g. The histograms ... are based on steps of 0.05 g., e.g. 0.96 g.—1.00 g., or actual readings between 0.056 and 1.005 g. inclusive.” The coins in all the Gymnasium hoards were weighed on a simple chemist’s balance surrounded by glass. Perhaps because of the intense heat, high winds or frequent earthquakes at Corinth, or just the fatigue of the operator, the balance is occasionally inaccurate. I have included two frequency charts each for the Conrad and Henry coins in the hoards: The first is the actual count, which stresses the relative numbers of the two groups in the hoard. The second has had the totals converted to percentages to permit comparison with the histo-
The Henry coins form a clear peak between 1.05 and 1.10 g., and the Conrad II coins cluster at the same interval, but most of them are 0.05 to 0.10 g. below the standard of the Henry coins. Comparing the frequency tables of our hoard with those of the Eastern hoards, it is clear that the Henry coins in Gymnasium Hoard IV are closer in weight standard to those of the two earlier hoards, Izmir and First Subak, than to those in the later Second Subak hoard. It is also obvious that the coins in the Gymnasium hoard have much less of a tail on the lower end of the frequency tables than those of any of the hoards from the East. The smaller number of underweight coins and the compactness of the frequency tables of the Gymnasium hoard are sure indications that it is earlier than the Eastern hoards tallied by Metcalf.95

To test the possibility that the coins were hoarded shortly after minting, I tried to do a die study of them. The monogram and Lucca mint mark are not aligned within each die with the inscriptions around the outer edge. The letters of the inscriptions and the size of the monograms and mint marks also vary considerably. Thus any coins in the hoard made from the same dies, even if poorly struck or worn, should be readily apparent. There are no coins from the same dies in the hoard, nor are any dies even very close in any of the variables so noted. It would seem that this hoard was collected after the coins had been in circulation so that it would be unlikely for die-linked examples to be included.

Gymnasium Hoard IV is in agreement with the stylistic observations that Metcalf made about the Eastern and Corinthian hoards: “The extremes of style are, on the one hand, coins with small, neat lettering, quite well struck on round flans, and, on the other hand, coins with thick, crowded lettering, of rude workmanship on flans tending towards a square shape, and often with a damaged impression . . . .”96 He suggests that these stylistic extremes reflect an earlier and a later variety. He cautions that the coins are not easily grouped and that there are gradations between the stylistic extremes. This, too, the Gymnasium Henry and Conrad II coins reflect, but they belong to Metcalf’s earlier, neater group. Part of the problem with these billon dinari is that they are often so hurriedly struck that the die impression can range from very shallow to very deep, sometimes on opposite edges of the same coins. In addition the dies were used until they became so worn that the types are almost illegible, particularly the legend around the edges.

This hoard of billon dinari is certainly a traveler’s hoard because it consists of coins not in general circulation in the area in which it was found.97 Byzantine coinage supplied

---

95Metcalf, p. 451, fig. 2. The percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number in the same fashion as with the weights of the coins. On the use of such statistics in numismatic studies, see J. Guey, “Propos de numismatic statistique, II. Un domaine sous-développé de la numismatic descriptive: l’étude des dispersions: écart-type, coefficient de variation,” Bulletin de la Société Française de Numismatique 23, 1968, pp. 270–273.
96Metcalf, p. 451, fig. 2.
97Ibid., p. 448. Six more of degenerate style are reported from a Near Eastern hoard by M. S. Phillips, Coin Hoards 4, 1978, p. 154, no. 450.
98Metcalf, Coinage in the Balkans (see footnote 86 above), pp. 249–258; he lists only two travelers’ hoards, both from Yugoslavia, dating before the First Crusade.
the currency for Corinth in the 11th and 12th centuries. From the Corinth excavations between 1896 and 1939, 23,738 Byzantine coins, minted after the end of the reign of Nicephorus II in 969 through the reign of Alexius II (A.D. 1195–1203), were published. In contrast, there are a total of 223 coins from European mints and only 19 from other Eastern mints of the same two centuries. Several of the European issues continue into the 13th century. A great many of them probably arrived as a consequence of the Norman sack of Corinth led by Roger of Sicily in 1147. Thus it is clear that the bulk of coins lost in Corinth in the 11th and 12th centuries were Byzantine, but occasionally European and other Eastern coinages were lost. The traveler who hid Gymnasium Hoard IV was probably a merchant from Pisa, perhaps on his way to the East where Pisa had large trading interests, bringing with him the local coinage of Lucca, which would also circulate in the Latin kingdoms of the East. He stopped at the Byzantine commercial center in Greece on his way, perhaps to establish trade with Corinth. He obviously was concerned about his welcome and hid his money before entering the town. Whether his reception was cooler than he anticipated or he sickened and died before he could reclaim his hoard, we cannot know. But sometime in the first quarter of the 12th century he concealed his hoard, and it remained where it was hidden until 1971.

In the following catalogue I have separated the Conrad II and Henry coins. Within each group, I have tried to organize them from most worn to least worn but, given the varying depths at which the coins were struck and the crudeness of the letter and monogram forms, the order is often rather arbitrary. The two coins found above the hoard are included at the very end of the catalogue.

99149 European and two from other Eastern mints in Edwards, *Corinth* VI, pp. 150, 155–160; 57 European and seven from other Eastern mints in Edwards, 1937, pp. 255–256; 17 European and ten from other Eastern mints in Harris, pp. 154–155. These totals apparently do not include the hoard of 73 coins discovered in the theater, T. L. Shear, “Excavations in the Theatre District and Tombs of Corinth in 1928,” *AJA* 32, 1928, pp. 481–482: this hoard included a coin referred to as “a so-called anonymous Crusader’s coin,” but the parallel cited is class IX of A. R. Bellinger, *ANSNM*, XXXV, *The Anonymous Byzantine Bronze Coinage*, New York 1928, p. 7, which indicates that this coin would now be attributed to Nicephorus II, A.D. 1078–1081: see Thompson, *op. cit.* (footnote 17 above), pp. 109–115. The other coins in the hoard included one each of Michael IV, A.D. 1034–1041, Theodora, A.D. 1055–1056, and Constantine X, A.D. 1059–1067, and 69 Islamic coins of which five are illustrated in Shear, *op. cit.*, fig. 5. The last bring the total of the coins from other Eastern mints at Corinth up to 88. The Byzantine coins in this hoard have not been added into the totals.
101See references in footnote 100 above. At Corinth, Venice’s trading privileges began in 1126, Genoa’s in 1169 and Pisa’s in 1170. The Gymnasium hoard may be the first evidence that the Pisans preceded the Venetians in their interest in trade with Corinth.
102I regret that funds did not permit all the coins in the hoard to be photographed. I have selected slightly more than one third of the total, attempting to cover all aspects of the hoard in the coins which are illustrated.
COIN HOARDS FROM THE GYMNASIUM AREA AT CORINTH

CATALOGUE: HOARD IV
(Plates 39, 40)

An asterisk beside the number indicates that the coin is illustrated. The Corinth Museum coin inventory number follows the catalogue number.

CONRAD II OF FRANCONIA
EMPEROR AND KING OF ITALY, A.D. 1026–1039

Obverse: Debased monogram of Otto (Fig. 2) in a border of dots which becomes a wide circle as the die is worn; around, +IHPERATOR in crude, block letters.103

Reverse: LVCA in a cruciform arrangement about a central pellet; around, +CHVINRADV in crude, block letters.104

Fig. 2. Debased monogram of Otto

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Catalogue</th>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>71-654</td>
<td>15 mm.</td>
<td>1.06 g.</td>
<td>+IHPERATOR</td>
<td>[+CHVIN[RA]DV ∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>71-661</td>
<td>16 mm.</td>
<td>0.97 g.</td>
<td>+IHPERATOR</td>
<td>+CHVIN[RA]DV ∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>71-635</td>
<td>15 mm.</td>
<td>1.07 g.</td>
<td>+IHPERATOR</td>
<td>+CHVINRADV ∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>71-598</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>1.03 g.</td>
<td>+IHPERATOR</td>
<td>+CHVINRADV ∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>71-631</td>
<td>14 mm.</td>
<td>1.05 g.</td>
<td>+IHPERAT[O]R</td>
<td>+CHVIN[R]ADV ∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>71-651</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>1.05 g.</td>
<td>+IHPERATOR</td>
<td>[+CHV]INRADV ∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>71-600</td>
<td>16 mm.</td>
<td>0.95 g.</td>
<td>+IHPERAT[O]R</td>
<td>+CHVINRADV ∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>71-665</td>
<td>15 mm.</td>
<td>1.18 g.</td>
<td>+IHPERATOR</td>
<td>+CHVINRADV ∞</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

103 While occasionally the letters are fairly clear and well formed, more often they are so poorly made and misshapen as to suggest that the die cutters were illiterate. The horizontal bar of the H is very short and thin compared with the two verticals. Where it can be clearly read, it is often at a slight incline, or with a bend at the center as if an N or M were implied. Thus, I have not separated clear N’s from H’s because there are so many variations in between.

104 The N has a clearly slanted bar in a great majority of the legible examples, but sometimes it is more horizontal, like an H, if it is not, in fact, an H. The I is often almost square and is clearly a mistake as in the debased monogram of Otto, since Conrad was spelled Chuonrat in Franconia and Latinized to Chuonradus. I am grateful to Professor James Marchand for this information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>71-593</th>
<th>71-626</th>
<th>71-672</th>
<th>71-612</th>
<th>71-625</th>
<th>71-641</th>
<th>71-649</th>
<th>71-605</th>
<th>71-607</th>
<th>71-653</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 mm.</td>
<td>16 mm.</td>
<td>14 mm.</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>18 mm.</td>
<td>15 mm.</td>
<td>16 mm.</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>16 mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.07 g.</td>
<td>1.03 g.</td>
<td>0.99 g.</td>
<td>1.03 g.</td>
<td>1.02 g.</td>
<td>1.05 g.</td>
<td>0.98 g.</td>
<td>0.99 g.</td>
<td>1.09 g.</td>
<td>1.10 g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HENRY III, IV AND V OF FRANCONIA**

**EMPERORS AND KINGS OF ITALY, A.D. 1039–1125**

*Obverse*: as above.

*Reverse*: as above except +ENRICV in crude, block letters.

---

105 It is not impossible that a few of the most worn of these dinari belong to Henry II of Saxony, Emperor and King of Italy, A.D. 1004–1024.

106 See footnote 104 above. The R of both the reverse and obverse is often spread out so that it looks like a lower case n with a small triangle as its tail.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>71-610</td>
<td>16 mm.</td>
<td>1.12 g.</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>71-678</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>0.97 g.</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>71-669</td>
<td>16 mm.</td>
<td>1.04 g.</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>71-633</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>1.17 g.</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>71-636</td>
<td>16 mm.</td>
<td>1.09 g.</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>71-642</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>0.96 g.</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>71-648</td>
<td>15 mm.</td>
<td>0.97 g.</td>
<td>/ (mint mark almost illegible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>71-622</td>
<td>15 mm.</td>
<td>0.97 g.</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>71-658</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>1.01 g.</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>71-613</td>
<td>16 mm.</td>
<td>1.05 g.</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>71-596</td>
<td>16 mm.</td>
<td>1.09 g.</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>71-597</td>
<td>16 mm.</td>
<td>1.08 g.</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>71-599</td>
<td>16 mm.</td>
<td>1.15 g.</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>71-627</td>
<td>14 mm.</td>
<td>0.88 g.</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>71-628</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>1.21 g.</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>71-655</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>1.05 g.</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>71-594</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>1.17 g.</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>71-679</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>1.11 g.</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>71-591</td>
<td>16 mm.</td>
<td>1.12 g.</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>71-606</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>1.15 g.</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>71-650</td>
<td>15 mm.</td>
<td>1.00 g.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[+IHPERATOR] [+]ENRICV ∞

45. 71-617 16 mm. 1.14 g. ✕
   [+IHPERATOR] [+ENRI(CV) ∞
46. 71-674 15 mm. 1.10 g. ✓
   [+IHPERATOR] [+ENRICV ∞
*47. 71-666 15 mm. 1.14 g. ✗
   [+IHPERATOR] [+ENRICV ∞
48. 71-592 15 mm. 1.00 g. ↓
   [+IHPERATOR] [+ENRI(CV) ∞
49. 71-614 16 mm. 1.06 g. ✓
   [+IHPERATOR] [+ENRICV ∞
50. 71-657 15 mm. 0.96 g. ✓
   [+IHPERATOR] [+ENRICV ∞
*51. 71-601 17 mm. 1.13 g. ↓
   [+IHPERATOR] [+ENRICV ∞
52. 71-588 16 mm. 0.85 g. ✗
   [+IHPERATOR] [+ENRICV ∞
53. 71-589 16 mm. 0.85 g. ←
   [+IHPERATOR] [+ENRI(CV) ∞
*54. 71-611 18 mm. 1.11 g. ✓
   [+IHPERATOR] [+ENRI(CV) ∞
55. 71-618 15 mm. 0.98 g. ✗
   [+IHPERATOR] [+ENRI(CV) ∞
56. 71-629 17 mm. 1.01 g. ✓
   [+IHPERATOR] [+ENRI(CV) ∞
*57. 71-676 15 mm. 1.00 g. ✓
   [+IHPERATOR] [+ENRI(CV) ∞
58. 71-608 17 mm. 0.98 g. ←
   [+IHPERATOR] [+ENRI(CV) ∞
59. 71-673 16 mm. 1.04 g. ↑
   [+IHPERATOR] [+ENRI(CV) ∞
60. 71-675 17 mm. 1.07 g. ✗
   [+IHPERATOR] [+ENRICV ∞
*61. 71-634 16 mm. 1.13 g. ✗
   [+IHPERATOR] [+ENRICV ∞
62. 71-590 16 mm. 1.05 g. ↓
   [+IHPERATOR] [+ENRICV ∞
63. 71-609 17 mm. 1.06 g. ↓
   [+IHPERATOR] [+ENRI(CV) ∞
64. 71-638 16 mm. 1.02 g. ↑
   [+IHPERATOR] [+ENRI(CV) ∞
*65. 71-660 17 mm. 1.08 g. ✗
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+IHPE[RATOR] +ENRICV

66. 71-646 17 mm. 1.06 g. →
   +IHP[E]RATOR +EN[R]ICV
67. 71-670 17 mm. 1.05 g. ↓
   +IHP[ER]ATOR +EN[R]ICV
68. 71-602 17 mm. 1.01 g. ↑
   +IHPERATOR +ENRICV
   *69. 71-619 18 mm. 1.03 g. ↓
       +IHP[ER]ATOR [+ENRICV
70. 71-630 17 mm. 1.13 g. ↓
       +IHPERATOR +ENRICV
71. 71-640 16 mm. 1.02 g. ↑
       +IHPERATOR +ENRICV
72. 71-664 17 mm. 1.07 g. ↓
   [+]IHPERATOR +ENRICV
73. 71-677 17 mm. 1.15 g. ↓
   +IHPERATOR +ENRICV
74. 71-668 16 mm. 1.08 g. ↑
   +IHPE[RATOR] +ENRICV
   *75. 71-644 17 mm. 1.09 g. →
      [+IHP]RATOR +ENRICV
76. 71-663 17 mm. 1.12 g. ↓
      +IHPERATOR [+ENRICV
77. 71-632 16 mm. 1.08 g. ↓
      +IHPERATOR +ENRICV
78. 71-583 17 mm. 1.10 g. ↑
      +IHPERATOR +ENRICV[∞]
79. 71-595 16 mm. 1.01 g. →
      +IHPERATOR +EN[R]ICV
   *80. 71-585 16 mm. 1.09 g. ↓
       +IHPERATOR [+EN]RICV
81. 71-659 16 mm. 1.04 g. →
      [+IH]PERATOR +EN[R]ICV
82. 71-667 17 mm. 1.15 g. ↓
      +IHPERATOR [+E]RICV
83. 71-656 17 mm. 1.03 g. ↑
      +IHPE[RATOR] +ENRICV
84. 71-645 16 mm. 1.06 g. ↓
      +IHPERATOR +ENRICV
85. 71-647 16 mm. 0.99 g. ↑
      +IHPERATOR +ENRICV
   *86. 71-623 16 mm. 1.11 g. →
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>71-643</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>1.06 g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*88.</td>
<td>71-639</td>
<td>16 mm.</td>
<td>1.01 g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>71-637</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>1.04 g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*90.</td>
<td>71-584</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>1.05 g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>71-586</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>0.88 g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*92.</td>
<td>71-604</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>1.01 g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>71-581</td>
<td>18 mm.</td>
<td>1.16 g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*94.</td>
<td>71-616</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>0.97 g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*95.</td>
<td>71-662</td>
<td>16 mm.</td>
<td>0.94 g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*96.</td>
<td>71-615</td>
<td>18 mm.</td>
<td>1.09 g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+IHERATOR [+]ENRIC ~
Not paralleled in CN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*97.</td>
<td>71-603</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>1.18 g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*98.</td>
<td>71-621</td>
<td>16 mm.</td>
<td>1.05 g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*99.</td>
<td>71-671</td>
<td>16 mm.</td>
<td>1.03 g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*100.</td>
<td>71-582</td>
<td>17 mm.</td>
<td>0.94 g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+IHERATOR [+]ENRIC ~

---

**Found above the hoard:**

Same variety as Nos. 10–18

+IHERATOR [+]ENRIC ~

101. 71-534 16 mm. 0.95 g. ~

Same variety as Nos. 19–96

+IHERATOR [+]ENRIC ~

102. 71-537 16 mm. 1.07 g. ~

---
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