



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

Keith Rutter The Myth of the 'Damareteion'

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **23 • 1993**

Seite / Page **171–188**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1085/5452> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1993-23-p171-188-v5452.0

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

KEITH RUTTER

The Myth of the «Damareteion»*

This article examines the evidence of Diodorus Siculus and others for a coin said to have been named a «Damareteion» after Damarete, consort of Gelon who was tyrant of Syracuse between 485 and 478 B.C. In it I hope to advance the discussion not only of a complex and controversial problem of Sicilian numismatics and art-history, but also of the historical methods and attitudes of Diodorus himself, who gives us the most detailed and, as it seems, the most circumstantial account of the «Damareteion».

The ancient texts on the Damareteion are as follows:

1. Diodorus Siculus, 11,26,3: οἱ δὲ Καρχηδόνιοι τῆς σωτηρίας παραδόξως τετυγμένους ταῦτά τε δώσειν προσεδέξαντο, καὶ στέφανον χρυσοῦν τῇ γυναικὶ τοῦ Γέλωνος Δαμαρέτῃ προσωμολόγησαν. αὕτη γὰρ ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀξιωθείσα συνήργησε πλεῖστον εἰς τὴν σύνθεσιν τῆς εἰρήνης, καὶ στεφανωθείσα ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἑκατὸν ταλάντοις χρυσοῦ νόμισμα ἐξέκοψε τὸ κληθὲν ἀπ' ἐκείνης Δαμαρέτειον· τοῦτο δ' εἶχεν Ἀττικὰς δραχμὰς δέκα, ἐκλήθη δὲ παρὰ τοῖς Σικελιώταις ἀπὸ τοῦ σταθμοῦ πεντηκοντάλιτρον. Because they had unexpectedly gained their deliverance the Carthaginians agreed to give this and offered in addition a gold crown to Gelon's wife Damarete. The reason was that at their request she contributed a great deal to the making of the peace; she was crowned by them with 100 talents of gold, and struck the coin that was called after her a Damareteion. This coin was worth 10 Attic drachmae, and because of its weight was called among the Sicilian Greeks a fifty-litra piece.
2. Pollux, Onomasticon 9,84–5: ἴσως δὲ τῶν ὀνομάτων καταλόγῳ προσήκουσιν οἱ Κροίσειοι στατῆρες καὶ Φιλίππειοι καὶ Δαρεικοί, καὶ τὸ Βερενίκειον νόμισμα καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρειον καὶ Πτολεμαϊκὸν καὶ Δημαρέτειον, ὧν τοὺς ἐπωνύμους γνωρίζοντων ἀπάντων, ἡ Δημαρέτῃ Γέλωνος οὕσα γυνὴ κατὰ τὸν πρὸς τοὺς

* I began work on this paper during a sojourn at the Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik in Munich, and thank the Kommission for the opportunity and Dr. H. MÜLLER for epigraphic references. A version of the paper was given to seminars in Dunedin and Auckland, and I am grateful for the stimulus of the discussions on both occasions, in particular to ELIZABETH DUKE, CHRIS EHRHARDT, DOUGLAS LITTLE, VIVIENNE GRAY and TOM STEVENSON. I thank, too, KATHERINE ADSHEAD (Canterbury), CHRISTOF BOEHRINGER (Göttingen), MARTIN PRICE (London) and CHRIS HOWGEGO (Oxford) for comment and discussion.

λίβυας πόλεμον ἀποροῦντος αὐτοῦ τὸν κόσμον αἰτησαμένη παρὰ τῶν γυναικῶν συγχωνεύσασα νόμισμα ἐκόψατο. Perhaps the Croeseid staters belong to the list of names, and the Philippeioi and the Darics, and the coin of Berenice, and that of Alexander, and of Ptolemy, and of Damarete. Everyone knows the eponyms of these, but Damarete, who was Gelon's wife, when he was in financial difficulties in the war against the Libyans, had a coin struck from the jewelry she had requested from the women (of Syracuse) and melted down.

3. Hesychius, s. v. Δημαρέτιον: Δημαρέτιον, νόμισμα ἐν Σικελίᾳ ὑπὸ Γέλωνος κοπὲν ἐπιδούσης αὐτῷ Δημαρέτης τῆς γυναικὸς εἰς αὐτὸ τὸν κόσμον. Demareteion, a coin struck in Sicily by Gelon, for which his wife Demarete had given him her jewelry.
4. Schol. Pindar, Ol. 2,29d = FGH 566. Τίμαιος F 93: ὁ δὲ Δίδυμος τὸ ἀκριβέστερον τῆς ἱστορίας ἐκτίθεται, μάρτυρα Τίμαιον τὸν ζυντάξαντα τὰ περὶ τῆς Σικελίας προφερόμενος, ἡ δὲ ἱστορία οὕτως ἔχει· Θήρων ὁ τῶν Ἀκραγαντίνων βασιλεὺς Γέλωνι τῷ Ἰέρωνος ἀδελφῷ ἐπικηδεύσας γάμῳ συνάπτει τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα Δημαρέτην· ἃφ' ἧς καὶ τὸ Δημαρέτειον νόμισμα ἐν Σικελίᾳ. Didymus sets forth the more accurate part of the story, citing as witness Timaeus the historian of Sicily, and the story goes like this: Theron king of Akragas was related by marriage to Gelon the brother of Hieron by giving him his daughter's hand in marriage, Demarete; after whom also the Demareteion, a Sicilian coin, (is named).
5. Eustathius, ad Od., p. 1567, 63: (Δημαρέτη), ἃφ' ἧς τὸ Δημαρέτειον νόμισμα. (Demarete), from whom the coin Demareteion (is named).

Before I embark on a detailed analysis of these texts, I want to comment first of all on what they appear to be telling us, and then, briefly, on the numismatic aspects of the problem.

In Diodorus, who wrote his *Bibliothēke* in the mid- to later-first century B.C., we are in the year 480/479, when Calliades was archon in Athens. In Sicily Gelon, tyrant of Syracuse, has beaten the Carthaginians at the battle of Himera, and the Carthaginians have sued for peace. They have agreed to provide 2,000 talents of silver and two temples as reparations. These are obviously the most important financial terms of the agreement, but then in a separate gesture, where our passage begins, the Carthaginians, surprised by their lenient treatment, offered in addition a gold crown to Damarete in gratitude for her good offices in the securing of peace. When she had received the crown of 100 talents of gold from them she struck a coin which was named after her a Damareteion. The inference is that the coin was of gold, like the crown, but the careful description of it that follows, in particular the reference to its weight being 10 Attic drachmae or 50 Sicilian litrae, is clearly of a silver coin.

There are four other references to a coin called a Damareteion, all later than Diodorus. Nos. 4 and 5 (Schol. Pindar and Eustathius respectively) summarise the basic information. In the case of no. 4, where the Didymus referred to was compiling his material at approximately the same time as Diodorus was writing his, it is tacked on

to a notice about Damarete's family background and marriage (not, notice, about her involvement in coining); the family information goes back to Timaeus, but the additional information about the *Damareteion* need not do so.¹ Nos. 2 and 3 (Pollux and Hesychius) do refer to coining, and the general context of it is Gelon's war against the Carthaginians (Libyans), but the circumstances are different from those described by Diodorus. Gelon is in financial difficulties (ἀποροῦντος αὐτοῦ), and so we must assume a chronological context before, or maybe during, the Himera campaign, rather than after it. In both Pollux and Hesychius the metal for coining derives from jewelry (κόσμος) provided either by the women of Syracuse at Damarete's request (P), or by Damarete alone (H).² The metal of the coin is not expressly stated, a point to which I shall return later.

These are the literary references to a coin called a *Damareteion*.³ Now a word or two about the numismatic side of things. Is there a surviving Syracusan coin that we can identify as a *Damareteion*? From early in the nineteenth century until the late 1960s it was universally thought that there was. We saw above that one precisely described element in Diodorus' account was a reference to a silver decadrachm, and among the various fifth and fourth century issues of such coins known at Syracuse, there is only one possible candidate in the period we are dealing with (first quarter of the fifth century).⁴ It was therefore duly dated in 480/479

¹ FGH Timaios F 93 includes it in the Timaeian material, but the relative clause might contain (and I think does contain – see further below), material brought in from another source (as the explanatory phrase ἐν Σικελίᾳ also suggests). There is a parallel later in F 93, where a reference, in a relative clause, to the river Gelas, is attributed to Callimachus: παρὰ Γέλα τῷ Σικελιωτικῷ ποταμῷ, οὗ Καλλιμαχος μέμνηται. On Didymus, see L. COHN, RE 5,1, 1903, 445 ff., s. v. Didymos (8).

² The variant stories might be brought closer together if ἐπιδούσης in Hesychius could signify 'give in addition' (to other women), but ἐπιδίδωμι often signifies simply a voluntary contribution, as opposed to εἰσφέρειν, an enforced one: cf. LSJ, ἐπιδίδωμι, 2b; Pollux' Onomasticon dates from the later second century A.D., Hesychius' Lexicon probably from the fifth century A.D.

³ An inscription in elegiac couplets, preserved in Schol. Pindar, Pyth. 1, 152, and attributed to Simonides (frag. 106 DIEHL, 170 EDMONDS), marking the dedication of a gold tripod at Delphi by Gelon and his brothers, is not relevant to the discussion. A supposed reference in line 4 to Δαμαρετίου χρυσοῦ is an emendation by BENTLEY: cf. G. MANGANARO, La caduta dei Dinomenidi e il 'politikon nomisma' in Sicilia nella prima metà del V sec. a. C., AIN 21–22, 1974–5 (1977), 9–40, at 28, n. 4.

⁴ Obv. Quadriga right, one horse crowned by Nike flying above; in exergue, lion. Rev. Head of Arethusa right, in linear circle; around, four dolphins and ethnic. For illustrations, see C. M. KRAAY – M. HIRMER, Greek Coins, London 1966, Pls. 26–7; C. M. KRAAY, Archaic and Classical Greek Coins, London 1976, Pl. 47.801; G. K. JENKINS, Ancient Greek Coins, 2nd ed., London 1990, 85, Pl. 232. The first scholars to associate Diodorus' account with an issue of silver decadrachms were K. O. MÜLLER, Die Etrusker, 1828, 327, and H. DUC DE LUYNES, Annali dell' Inst. di corr. arch. 2, 1830, 81–7. The latter took the further step of proposing that the earlier decadrachm – our *Damareteion* – was the relevant issue.

and was used as a fixed point for the dating of vase-painting and sculpture, and also for the chronology of fifth century Syracusan coinage that was published in the standard work on the subject in 1929.⁵ Some of the consequences of such a dating were criticised quite soon after BOEHRINGER's book was published,⁶ but it was not until the later 1960s that a concerted attack was mounted from the numismatic standpoint.⁷ The fact is that there are problems both with numismatic and with historical aspects of a reconstruction in which the decadrachm is fixed in 480/479. It comes at the end of a period of intense and massive coining. The *relative* arrangement of the coins seems secure, and so the traditional reconstruction puts the massive issues in the years before 480, with the decadrachm in 480 followed by a gap in coining for five or six years before coining started again in 474.⁸ This requires us to imagine that Gelon's *preparations* for a campaign against the Carthaginians gave rise to the minting of large amounts of coined money, but where did he acquire the bullion before 480? Would it not make more sense historically for the massive issues to come *after* 480, when we know that thousands of talents of silver were available from the Carthaginian indemnity? That in turn would rule out the idea that there was a gap in coinage between 480 and 474. There are in addition numismatic arguments based for example on hoard evidence and on comparisons with the coins of other mints for a down-dating of the massive issues and of the Damareteion with them.⁹ I do not want to go into those here, except to say that in addition to 480 the variety of dates proposed for the Damareteion now goes down into the 470s, and even well into the 460s.¹⁰

What repercussions would such a down-dating on numismatic and historical grounds have on the interpretation of the literary evidence introduced above? For some, the idea that Diodorus provides a fixed point for Syracusan numismatic chro-

⁵ Vase-painting etc.: E. LANGLOTZ, *Zur Zeitbestimmung der streng rotfigurigen Vasenmalerei und der gleichzeitigen Plastik*, 1920, 100ff., Taf. 2, 10; coinage: E. BOEHRINGER, *Die Münzen von Syrakus*, Berlin/Leipzig 1929.

⁶ Cf. K. REGLING, *Gnomon* 6, 1930, 632; E. S. G. ROBINSON, *NC* 1931, 242–3.

⁷ CH. BOEHRINGER, *Hieron's Aitna und das Hieroneion*, *JNG* 18, 1968, 67–98, and C. M. KRAAY, *Greek Coins and History*, London 1969, Ch. 2, 19–42. In C. M. KRAAY – M. HIRMER, *Greek Coins*, New York 1966, 288, KRAAY had drawn attention to difficulties caused by the traditional dating, and had suggested that a date near 466 B.C. would remove them, but the illustrations on Pls. I, 26 and 27 were dated 480–479.

⁸ That is with Group IV, issues bearing in the obv. exergue a *ketos*, thought to symbolise the naval victory off Cumae in that year.

⁹ For a recent appraisal of the evidence, especially that of hoards, see C. ARNOLD-BIUCCHI, *The Randazzo Hoard 1980 and Sicilian Chronology in the Early Fifth Century*, *ANS Numismatic Studies* 18, New York 1989.

¹⁰ Reference to some of these views will be made in the next paragraph and in notes 11–14. Here it should be pointed out that it is not true to say, with CAH IV², 775, n. 55, that 'The extant decadrachms are now connected by most numismatists with the liberation of Syracuse from tyranny in 461 B.C.'

nology, and in particular for the silver decadrachm, naturally dies hard.¹¹ Another view takes his account of a gold crown literally: a gold crown was given and a gold coin would have been made from it; we cannot point to a specimen because none has survived.¹² Another interpretation, while ready to abandon Diodorus' precise chronological indication, is reluctant to abandon also the association of the special coining with Damarete herself. That might not take us too far down from 480, since after Gelon's death in 478 Damarete was married to his brother Polyzalos and moved away from Syracuse to Gela.¹³ Stretching the association of coin with dynasty still further, it could be argued that the evidence of Diodorus provides an association at least with the Deinomenid tyrants, but not with the democracy that followed their expulsion in 466.¹⁴ The view I want to propose here is that further progress towards solving the problem of the <Damareteion> and its historical context will have to depend on greater accuracy in the numismatic dating. Reconstructions that either follow Diodorus' evidence literally, or attempt to overcome the supposed discrepancy between what he (apparently) says about Damarete and the evidence that is accumulating from the coins themselves in ways such as those outlined above, are beside the point, since Diodorus' account has led us astray in ways which have not hitherto been fully analysed. Furthermore the other ancient evidence connecting Damarete with coining is highly suspect. I now therefore begin the enquiry into these sources by examining Diodorus' treatment of Damarete in more detail, starting from its context in his presentation of the Gelonian tyranny as a whole.

A well-trodden approach to the interpretation of Diodorus is to try to identify his source for a particular narrative or piece of information. This is a difficult area, where arguments can be circular and one despairs of firm results,¹⁵ but as far as Diodorus' account of the battle of Himera and its aftermath is concerned, Timaeus seems the

¹¹ Cf. R. T. WILLIAMS, NC 1972, 1–11; M. R. ALFÖLDI, *Dekadrachmon. Ein forschungsgeschichtliches Phänomen*, Wiesbaden 1976, 103–117, esp. at 112; H. A. CAHN, *Antikenmuseum Basel und Sammlung Ludwig: Griechische Münzen aus Großgriechenland und Sizilien*, Basel 1988, 125, no. 433.

¹² So KRAAY, op. cit. (n. 7) 40–41.

¹³ WILLIAMS, op. cit. (n. 11) 11, mentions the possibility of <releasing the Damareteion issue from its close connection with Himera and of allowing it to float a little further into the 470s>. On Damarete and Polyzalos, see Schol. Pindar, Ol. 2, 29d = Timaios, FGH 566, F 93.

¹⁴ CH. BOEHRINGER, op. cit. (n. 7) argued for dating the <Damareteion> in the last years of Hieron's reign, c. 470–468, thus making it a <Hieroneion>; compare now D. KNOEPFLER, *Rev. Suisse de Num.* 71, 1992, 1 ff., dating it a year or two earlier, in 472. The problems of dating the coin were mentioned but not resolved by G. K. JENKINS, *Ancient Greek Coins*, London 1972, 146; in the second edition (London 1990, 85) a date around 465 is suggested, and this date or something like it (466/5) is supported by H. B. MATTINGLY in a recent study (*Chiron* 22, 1992, 1–12). KRAAY, op. cit. (n. 7) Ch. 2, and MANGANARO, op. cit. (n. 3), argued for a post-tyranny date (461).

¹⁵ L. PEARSON, *The Greek Historians and the West*, Atlanta 1987, x.

likely source.¹⁶ I am not concerned to discuss this view in detail here, except to warn, if warning is needed, that even the firm identification of a specific source will not necessarily tell us much about the content of that source. This point will be amply demonstrated later in this article; for the moment some brief biographical indications are necessary. Timaeus was perhaps a small boy in 345, when Timoleon was welcomed to Tauromenium by his father Andromachus. Forced to leave Sicily by Agathocles, he spent fifty years in Athens and wrote most of his History there; it went down to 264, though Timaeus himself may have lived until c. 250.¹⁷

It is one thing to imagine that one has identified Diodorus' source, quite another to assess the extent to which that source was responsible for what Diodorus actually wrote. For example, it has been remarked that Diodorus' presentation of Damarete owes much to Hellenistic ideas of monarchy, rather than to early fifth century Sicilian tyranny.¹⁸ More specifically, Gelon and his dynasty seem to be described by Diodorus in terms appropriate to the Ptolemies of Egypt: the phrasing at 11,26,6, where Diodorus writes that Gelon was acclaimed by the Syracusans as Euergetes, Soter and King is a sign of Ptolemaic colouring, and the presentation of Damarete at 11,26,6 draws on the picture of a Ptolemaic consort involved in politics, the recipient of homage, a queen on whose authority coins could be struck. Does Diodorus' language and in particular his Hellenistic colouring reflect the treatment of the Gelonian tyranny by Timaeus? Referring to the terms of the acclamation of Gelon at 11,26,6, PEARSON wrote:¹⁹ 'This must be Timaeus giving him Ptolemaic titles.' But, assuming for the moment the literal accuracy of the term 'Ptolemaic titles', on grounds of chronology they could not be Timaeus in origin. Ptolemy I was the first 'Soter', and Timaeus would have known that, but the first Euergetes was Ptolemy III, who did not even accede to the throne until 246, some years after Timaeus' death. However there are firmer grounds, based on Diodorus' general linguistic usage, for doubting the Timaeus origin of these titles. Although it is true that the terms *εὐεργέτης* and *σωτήρ* recur together at 16,20,6 in the context of the honours paid by the Syracusans to Dion (*τὸν εὐεργέτην σωτήρα*), that is not necessarily because 11,26,6 and 16,20,6 derive from a common source.²⁰ Diodorus uses both words separately, and once together, to praise individuals in contexts that could not possibly derive from Timaeus.²¹ The usage can be described as formulaic; it is typical of Diodorus' method of writing and seems to

¹⁶ K. MEISTER, *Die sizilische Geschichte bei Diodor von den Anfängen bis zum Tod des Agathokles*, diss. München 1967, 42–3; L. PEARSON, *op. cit.* (n. 15) 134.

¹⁷ PEARSON, *op. cit.* 37–9.

¹⁸ MANGANARO, *op. cit.* (n. 3) 29 ff.

¹⁹ *Op. cit.* (n. 15) 139.

²⁰ MEISTER, *op. cit.* (n. 16) 116, thinks that Timaeus is behind 16,20,6; PEARSON, *op. cit.* (n. 15) 21 n. 13, states that in Book 16 Diodorus is no longer following Timaeus.

²¹ *Εὐεργέτης* alone: 1,29,1; 11,46,2; 37,11,1; with *κοινός*: 4,15,2; 27,18,2; 38/39,8,2; with *σωτήρ*: 11,26,6; 16,20,6; 33,1,5. I acknowledge here and elsewhere in this paper the help of the IBYCUS program to carry out word-searches.

be his own contribution to the presentation of his material.²² The point need not be laboured here, but is amply illustrated below.

I referred above to PEARSON's assumption that Εὐεργέτης, Σωτήρ and Βασιλεὺς at 11,26,6 are 'Ptolemaic titles', with capital letters, as it were. But it is not in fact necessary to believe that the words are used so exclusively by Diodorus. On the contrary I would argue that they can refer more generally to the Hellenistic world as a whole, and that far from undermining the tentative conclusion just reached about Diodorus' responsibility for the presentation of Gelon's tyranny in Hellenistic guise, further evidence of his linguistic usage confirms it and strengthens it. Casting the net more widely over Gelon's appearances in Book 11, it is apparent that Diodorus consistently portrays him in terms of the stereotype of the 'good king', as it was developed in the Hellenistic period. The elements of the stereotype have been discussed by several recent authors and are conveniently summarised by F.J. CAIRNS.²³ I list them as they apply to Gelon in CAIRNS' order and with references to Diodorus' eleventh book: Gelon is pre-eminent in virtue (K.1; 67.2) and specifically in military ability (K.4.iv; 21,3. 22,5. 67,2); he demonstrates his piety (K.5.i) by building temples and by reverence for Apollo (26.7); he acts with fairness (ἐπιείκεια, K.5.ii; 26,1. 26,4. 38,1. 67,2), mildness (πράοτης, K.5.ii; 67,3), generosity (φιλανθρωπία, K.5.iii; 67,2) and kindness (εὐνοία, εὐεργεσία, K.5.iii; 26,4. 26,6. 67,4); he works hard for his people (σπεύδων, K.5.iv; 26,4), and observes the law in the matter of the arrangements for his own burial (K.5.vii; 38,3); he is the saviour of his people (K.6.iii; 26,6) and is beloved by them (K.6.v; 38,4. 67,3), since he provides εὐνομίαν and πάντων τῶν ἐπιτηδείων εὐπορίαν; finally he ensures his people's zeal in all matters (K.11; 38,2).

There is no reason to ascribe this material to Timaeus, or indeed to any specific source. Various elements of the 'good king' stereotype recur elsewhere in Diodorus, for example in Book 1 relating to Osiris, Sabaco and other ancient kings of Egypt,²⁴ and in Books 17–20 relating to Ptolemy I.²⁵ Such treatment of Egyptian gods and rulers is natural enough, given the particular interest of Diodorus in Egypt, the only foreign country he had personally visited.²⁶ It is not however necessary to suppose a specific source, for example Hecataeus of Abdera, for the kingly qualities high-

²² Cf. J. PALM, *Über Sprache und Stil des Diodoros von Sizilien*, Lund 1955, who shows at length Diodorus' independence, linguistically, from the sources which he uses, and J. HORN-BLOWER, *Hieronymus of Cardia*, Oxford 1981, Appendix II, 263–81. As will be seen, my approach to these problems of Diodoran language and content is similar to that of K. S. SACKS, *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*, Princeton 1990. I agree with many of his conclusions, but I am perhaps less optimistic than he is about the quality of some of Diodorus' own contributions.

²³ F. J. CAIRNS, *Virgil's Augustan Epic*, Cambridge 1989, 17–21.

²⁴ Cf. 1,20,5 (Osiris); 1,65 (Sabaco).

²⁵ 17,103,7; 18,28,5–6. 33,3–4; 19,55,6. 56,1. 86,3–4.

²⁶ 1,44,1. 83,8–9 (personal witness of the lynching of a Roman for killing a cat); cf. 1,22,2. 61,4.

lighted in Book 1.²⁷ In all these different contexts Diodorus is employing, with remarkable fullness in the case of Gelon, the same stereotype, the same terminology. A Sicilian himself, Diodorus thus emphasizes the greatness of a Sicilian Julius Caesar (compare 11,38,6 with 32,27,3).

There is a further element of Hellenistic colouring in Diodorus' account of Gelon in 11,26,5–6. The terms in which the soldiers of Syracuse acclaimed Gelon have already been discussed, but in fact the whole scene in which Gelon appears unarmed before an assembly of his soldiers and is acclaimed king after rendering an account to them of his career and of his actions on behalf of Syracuse, draws on the practice of the acclamation of a king by Hellenistic armies. The Hellenistic parallels have been collected and discussed in modern work,²⁸ and I select the most obvious. Such acclamations would naturally follow a victory where the successful leader's qualities had been demonstrated,²⁹ and would be made by the army assembled for the purpose. A key term used to describe the assembled soldiers is ὄχλοι (cf. 11,26,6: ἐπισημαινομένων τῶν ὄχλων).³⁰ In certain circumstances a speaker might catalogue his achievements as Gelon does.³¹ To describe the act of acclamation Diodorus does not use the usual term ἀναγορεύω, but prefers a variant of his own, ἀποκαλέω.

So much for the Diodoran conception of Gelon. In a similar way, Diodorus' conception of Damarete as a Hellenistic queen honoured by a crown has been thought to derive from Timaeus.³² But whatever may lie behind Diodorus here (a difficult problem to which I can offer no solution), his own treatment of his material contains a high degree of invention. Certainly as far as the crown is concerned,

²⁷ In this I agree with the remarks of J. HORNBLLOWER, *op. cit.* (n.22) 55, and of SACKS, *op. cit.* (n.22) 43–4 n.86 (criticism of O. MURRAY, *JEA* 56, 1970, 161 n.7). On the sources of Diodorus Book 1, see A. BURTON, *Diodorus Siculus Book 1, A Commentary*, Leiden 1972, 1–34.

²⁸ Cf. F. GRANIER, *Die makedonische Heeresversammlung. Ein Beitrag zum antiken Staatsrecht*, Munich 1931; H.-W. RITTER, *Diadem und Königsherrschaft*, Munich 1965. For a selection of acclamations, see Plutarch, *Demetrius* 18,1; 37,2; *Pyrrhus* 7,1; 11,6; Appian, *Syr.* 54.

²⁹ For a classic case of kingly potential demonstrated by victory in battle, see Diodorus 20,22,6.

³⁰ On ὄχλοι referring to 'soldiers', not 'townsfolk', see F. W. WALBANK, *Commentary on Polybius I*, Oxford 1957, 502 (on Polybius 4,48,10).

³¹ Cf. Diodorus 18,36,6, where Ptolemy, in an assembly of soldiers, περὶ τῶν καθ' αὐτὸν ἀπελογήσατο, and Appian, *Syr.* 61, where Seleucus τὴν στρατιάν συναγαγὼν . . . κατελογίζετο μὲν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔργα τὰ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀρχήν. For a picture of Agathocles achieving a restoration of kingly powers, see Diodorus 20,34,3–5, a passage comparable in details with 11,26,5–6: the references to the type of clothing worn, the reminder to the audience (ὄχλοι) of past deeds, the unanimity of feeling (πανταχόθεν ἔγινοντο φωναί / μὲν φωνῇ). Such writing cannot be taken at face value for the purposes of historical reconstruction, for example, regarding the constitutional arrangements at Syracuse under either Gelon or Agathocles (or, for that matter, under the democracy in 451: cf. δὲ δὲ δῆμος ὥσπερ τινὶ μὲν φωνῇ . . . ἐβόα at 11,92,4).

³² MANGANARO, *op. cit.* (n.3) 29.

linguistic arguments again point to *his* responsibility not only for the words used but also for the conception. His account of the Carthaginian dealings with Damarete begins with a generality, παραδόξως τῆς σωτηρίας τετευχότες, common enough in his writing, (σωτηρίας with a part of τυγχάνω: 1,57,84; 4,33,9 [παραδόξου σωτηρίας]; 4,48,7; 11,4,4; 11,9,1; 11,26,3; 11,77,5; 20,5,4; 20,7,3).³³ Moving on to the offer of the golden crown (offer rather than gift: the verb προσομολογέω is used only twice elsewhere by Diodorus, in the sense of 'agree' [1,27,2] or 'admit' [17,79,6]), there are formulaic elements in the writing that repay investigation. This is the first of many references to honorific crowns in the extant portions of Diodorus. The motivation for its bestowal – the relief of the donors after unexpectedly gracious treatment – is paralleled at 14,105,4: Dionysius I, another peacemaker, εἰρήνην συνθέμενος, let the prisoners go and gave cities their autonomy, for which ἐπαίνου τυχών ὑπὸ τῶν εὖ παθόντων χρυσοῖς στεφάνοις ἐτιμήθη; and at 24,10,2: Hanno (243 B.C.), who preferred εὐεργεσία to τιμωρία, ἔτυχε στεφάνων καὶ τιμῶν μεγάλων παρὰ τῶν εὖ παθόντων. The 'formulaic' nature of these accounts is obvious, but it is on a more extended scale than individual words. We have here examples of 'patterns' of writing; this is 'history being written to a programme', Diodorus' programme.³⁴

To explore the issues raised here we need to start with a brief account of the origin and development of the real-life practice of bestowing honorary crowns, then see how Diodorus handles the theme in his work. The results of the investigation will throw light not only on 11,26,3, but on Diodorus' methods of writing in general. Once again, literary criticism and linguistic analysis have a vital role to play in the assessment of the nature and worth of Diodorus' material.

Originally, crowns composed of the shoots of some sacred plant were given as a reward for prowess, for example, in athletic contests,³⁵ the value of the crown lying in the honour it conferred. By the fifth century such a reward might be supplemented by a gift of money, and in a further development the wreath itself was given an intrinsic value, being made of gold to a stated amount. The eastern origin of such a practice has been conjectured on the basis of Herodotus 8,118, where Xerxes presents the pilot whose conduct saved him with a gold crown.³⁶ At Athens the

³³ Cf. also the remark of SACKS, op. cit. (n.22) 19: 'The theme of παράδοξον . . . pervades the Bibliothek and may be Diodorus' own sentiment.'

³⁴ For the phrase, see V.J. GRAY, The value of Diodorus Siculus for the years 411–386 B.C., *Hermes* 115, 1987, 72–89, at 79, part of an article showing how Diodorus embroiders simple accounts of battles to give greater vividness to his narrative. On the role of individual benefactions in Diodorus, cf. SACKS, op. cit. (n.22) 106: 'The notion of an individual performing benefactions for the common good is central to Diodoran philosophy.'

³⁵ Cf. Diodorus 16,79,4 for crowns of celery awarded at the Isthmian games.

³⁶ M. BLECH, Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen, Berlin/New York 1982, 153. Xerxes' reward, the gift of a superior to an inferior, is not comparable with the Hellenistic practice of awarding crowns to be discussed shortly.

honorific decrees express the value of the crown in drachmae, usually by ἀπό with the genitive, or occasionally, possibly, by the genitive alone.³⁷ The honorands' virtues are simply expressed by such abstractions as ἀρετή, εὐνοια, ἀνδραγαθία and φιλοτιμία; from the mid-third century on these might be qualified by a short relative clause, e.g., ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας ἣν ἔχων διατελεῖ περὶ.³⁸ In Athens there is not much evidence for the public bestowal of gold crowns until almost the middle of the fourth century; virtually the only example in the fifth century is dated to 410/409.³⁹ Wider Hellenistic usage developed the Athenian formulae a little.⁴⁰ The basic formula remained στεφανῶσαι χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ. The value of the crown can be expressed not only in silver drachmae but also in gold coins such as darics, with ἐκ supplementing the Athenian ἀπό or plain genitive. The citation of the honorands' virtues is comparable with the style adopted at Athens, but with a tendency to cite not simply virtues, but acts, e.g. χάριν τῶν πεπραγμένων; ἐπὶ τοῖς πεπραγματευμένοις.

The custom so amply recorded in inscriptions is reflected in historical writers recording or reflecting the contemporary scene. Of twenty-nine mentions of 'crowns' and 'crowning' in Xenophon, the vast majority refer to the various occasions in Greek life when crowns or garlands could be worn or won: after victory in the games or in war, or in religious contexts such as sacrifice. There are two references to the personal gift of a gold crown (Anab. 1,7,7; Cyrop. 8,5,18-19), and two more to the public bestowal of crowns in which we are particularly interested: Hellen. 2,3,8, where Lysander took home booty that included 'crowns', and Hiero 7,9,6, a general reference to honorific crowning κοινῆς ἀρετῆς καὶ εὐεργεσίας ἔνεκα. The practice referred to fairly tentatively by Xenophon writing in the early fourth century is much more prominent in Polybius writing in the second century, especially in the later books, from 13 onwards. From Book 21 inclusive there are in addition eight references to honorific crowns of the kind recorded in decrees, in each case specifying the value of the crown with ἀπό or (once) the genitive alone, either in talents (150: 21,30,10; 15: 21,34,4; 50: 21,36,4 [genitive]), or gold pieces (15,000: 23,1,7; 10,000: 30,5,4; 31,32,2; 32,1,1; 32,2,1). Earlier, in one instance only (13,9,5), the verb is followed by the accusative case of the honorand and the dative of the value of the crown - 'they crowned king Antiochus (III, in 205 B.C.) with 500 talents of silver'. That idiom can be compared with Diodorus 11,26,3, 'having

³⁷ The evidence is collected by A.S. HENRY, *Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees*, Hildesheim 1983, 22 ff.; the formula specifying the cost of the crown was abandoned in 304 B.C. in favour of the general statement that the crown was to be awarded κατὰ τὸν νόμον: HENRY, op. cit. 25-8.

³⁸ HENRY, op. cit. 42-4.

³⁹ HENRY, op. cit. 22.

⁴⁰ C. BRADFORD WELLES, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period*, Yale 1934; W. LARFELD, *Griechische Epigraphik*, Munich 1914, 382-90, paragraphs 228-30.

been crowned with 100 talents of gold», and to his usage we now turn in more detail.⁴¹

In fact Diodorus' work combines in exactly the same way as Polybius' references both to the variety of occasions in Greek and Roman life when crowns or garlands were part of the ceremonial, and to the bestowal of honorific crowns. In the case of the latter, though, Diodorus introduces more variety of expression into the basic formula. He can refer to honorific crowns without qualification, as for example when Alexander was met by ambassadors from Cyrene, στέφανον κομίζοντες καὶ μεγαλοπρεπὴ δῶρα (17,49,2; cf. 17,113,1; 18,18,8; 19,48,8). On other occasions the crowns are specified as of gold (14,105,4; 16,92,1; 17,24,3. 48,6; 22,8,3). The value of a crown might be given with ἀπὸ (20,46,2: ἀπὸ ταλάντων διακοσίων; 31,28,1. 29,1: ἀπὸ χρυσῶν μυρίων), or by a plain dative (11,26,3; 31,32,1, a passage referring to Orophernes, who in 158 B.C. πεντήκοντα μὲν τάλαντοις ἐστεφάνωσε Τιμόθεον, ἑβδομήκοντα δὲ τάλαντοις Δημήτριον τὸν βασιλέα). (In all cases the crowns are clearly valued in terms of silver weight.) In some expressions the verb στεφανῶω has lost its literal meaning, for example at 20,84,3: τοὺς δ' υἱοὺς . . . ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ στεφανῶσαι . . . πανοπλίᾳ. Finally, Diodorus can elaborate the basic formula on his own account: 11,76,2, the Syracusans ἐστεφάνωσαν τοὺς ἐπιλέκτους ἀριστεῖα δόντες ἀργυρίου μνᾶν ἑκάστω; 20,94,4: τὸν δ' Ἀθηναγόραν ἐστεφάνωσαν χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ καὶ δωρεὰν ἔδωκαν ἀργυρίου τάλαντα πέντε.⁴²

Diodorus therefore repeatedly uses the motif of the public bestowal of a valuable crown as a mark of honour or of gratitude. There are literary reasons for this – it is part of his desire to praise good characters and thus supports the moral purpose of his work – but historically he is reflecting Hellenistic, not fifth-century, practice. At 11,26,3 he applies the motif anachronistically to Damarete.

I finish this survey of Diodorus 11,26,3 with a point about the final part of the material presented there, the naming of a coin after the person regarded as responsible for striking it. For this there is one parallel in Diodorus' work, and the wording recalls what is said about the *Damareteion*: at 16,8,7, under the year 358/7, after referring to the increase in output and revenue from the gold mines of Crenides, Diodorus remarks that Philip struck a gold coin that was called after him a *Philippeion*, to pay mercenaries and bribe supporters.⁴³ I mentioned earlier that in Pollux

⁴¹ In the Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus bestowals of crowns, like the political ideas, arise from Roman circumstances (for example bravery in battle, the triumphal procession), and so do not reflect the diplomatic crown-giving of the Hellenistic period in which we are interested.

⁴² For 20,94,4 as an example of Diodorus' improving on his source, see J. HORNBLLOWER, *op. cit.* (n.22) 276.

⁴³ Νόμισμα γὰρ χρυσοῦν κόψας τὸ προσαγορευθὲν ἀπ' ἐκείνου Φιλίππειον . . . There is a further reference to the coining of money at 16,56,5–6, where the depredations of Phayllus at Delphi are described. Golden bricks, statues etc. are said to have been coined into money. Not

the account of the Damareteion rounds off a list of seven coins named after individuals. Diodorus gives us two of these. Is he deriving this information about coin names from the same source, a source, that is different from his 'main' source for Sicily and for Philip respectively? For an indication of a parallel procedure I refer to chapter 103 of Book 17, where Diodorus tells how Ptolemy son of Lagus was wounded by a poisoned arrow, and how divine providence saved him, through the mediation of Alexander. The main source for this incident as presented by Diodorus appears to be Cleitarchus, but GOUKOWSKY has picked out two elements in Diodorus' account – his description of the symptoms of poisoning, and of how the poison was obtained from dead snakes – and argued that they may have derived not from Cleitarchus but from technical treatises, perhaps a *περὶ θηρίων* or a *περὶ δακέτων*.⁴⁴ The question of Diodorus' willingness or ability to depend on more than one source is sometimes disputed, but seems to me to be a distinct possibility here, in connection with the specialism of coinage.⁴⁵

Let us now summarise our conclusions about Diodorus' treatment of Damarete in 11,26,3. Down to *τάλαντοις χρυσοῦ* we found generalised phrasing, writing to a 'pattern', mechanical cliché, anachronistic content. Some years ago ROSS HOLLOWAY speculated that 'these tales (the collection of jewelry as related by Pollux and Hesychius) and Diodorus' story of the gold crown all smack of the uninformed conjectures of the man in the street'.⁴⁶ For the story of the crown at least, HOLLOWAY's 'man in the street' turns out to be Diodorus himself. What we have down to this point in 11,26,3 are Diodorus' own contributions to 'history', samples of 'diodorisches im Diodoros', and it is useless to press such writing for nuance and significance. We can take it as certain that the offer of a gold crown to Damarete by the Carthaginians in 480 B.C. is wholly unhistorical. And since we are dealing here with a literary form of presentation, by Diodorus and not by his source, speculation about the nature of the talents referred to is beside the point. They are no more 'Sicilian' than are any of those cited above.⁴⁷

The above analysis of Diodorus' presentation of Damarete and of her husband Gelon has produced useful insights into his methods of composing 'history', and has carried forward the discussion of his evidence for the 'Damareteion'. But of course Diodorus is only a part of the literary side of the Damareteion problem. It may be agreed that he 'wrote up' and rehashed his source(s) in accordance with fantasies and formulae of his own, but we have not yet disposed of the two fundamen-

one gold piece has survived, though there is an abundance of silver belonging to this period. Has Diodorus tinkered with the facts?

⁴⁴ P. GOUKOWSKY, *Clitarque seul?*, REA 71, 1969, 320–37, esp. 332–7.

⁴⁵ For Diodorus' ability to use 'second-line' sources to improve the didactic value of his writing, see R. DREWS, *Diodorus and his Sources*, AJP 83, 1962, 383–92.

⁴⁶ ANSMN 2, 1964, 2.

⁴⁷ For discussion of the talents of 11,26,3, see (CH. BOEHRINGER, *op. cit.* (n.7) 89ff.

tal elements of his account, Damarete herself, and a decadrachm of silver accurately designated in Sicilian terms. Damarete the wife of Gelon is a historical, though not in the record a prominent, figure, and silver decadrachms survive from approximately the period of her lifetime. Furthermore there is the evidence set out in texts 2 and 3 above that a coin called a Damareteion was so named either because Damarete gave her jewelry to Gelon for him to strike into coin (Hesychius), or because she herself arranged for the striking, from jewelry contributed by the women of Syracuse (Pollux); this took place at a time when Gelon lacked funds, and so presumably either preceding or during the war with Carthage. These two variants of the Damareteion story thus differ strikingly from Diodorus with regard to the historical circumstances of the coining and the source of the bullion used; they also differ from each other in that Hesychius makes Gelon responsible for the actual coining, while Pollux gives the responsibility to Damarete herself. Let us look at these accounts more closely, beginning with Pollux.

The reference to the Damareteion in Pollux 9,84–85 comes at the end of a list of seven coins named after individual rulers. This list was analysed by M. CALTABIANO and P. COLACE, who distinguished the first three items, Kroiseioi, Philippeioi and Dareikoi, which are staters and of gold, from the other four, each designated as a νόμισμα.⁴⁸ They went on to point out that although Pollux elsewhere (9,59) includes the Alexandreioi among gold coins, in the context of 9,84–5 he includes coinage named after Alexander not with the staters of gold, but as a *nomisma* which could be struck from metal other than gold. This marks a change in the fashion of the naming of eponymous coins, from gold coins to coins in other metals, and the remaining three coins in the list, the Ptolemaikon, the Berenikeion and the Damareteion, are in fact of silver. In that case the missing <gold Damareteia> are no longer a problem.⁴⁹ The Damareteion in Pollux is a silver coin and without more ado CALTABIANO and COLACE identify it with silver decadrachms struck after the battle of Himera and in the period of preparations before the battle of Cumae (474). This identification of the Damareteion as a silver coin certainly fits the interpretation of Diodorus I presented above (no gold crown; silver decadrachm), but on the origin of the Damareteion story as presented by Pollux, CALTABIANO and COLACE do not convince. They themselves draw attention to the anomalies of its inclusion in Pollux' list: it was evidently less well known than the other six, and is the only one to be provided with a note of historical explanation; it comes at the end of a group of Hellenistic coins, all of course originating in the eastern Mediterranean; and its sub-

⁴⁸ M. CALTABIANO – P. COLACE, L'eponimia monetale: dall'esperienza orientale a quella di età ellenistica, NAC 16, 1987, 29–46.

⁴⁹ On <gold Damareteia>, see KRAAY, op. cit. (n. 7) 40–41. The argument of ALFÖLDI, op. cit. (n. 11) 110, that Pollux' use of νόμισμα reflects the usage of the word in his own time to refer to a gold coin is invalid: cf. Pollux 3,86, τὸ δ' ἀργύριον καλεῖται καὶ χρήματα καὶ νόμισμα, ὥσπερ καὶ τὸ χρυσίον, and 7,105, νόμισμα σιδηροῦν.

ject is a <queen>, which ought to be another sign of a Hellenistic ambience. They raise, but reject, the suggestion that Pollux on the Damareteion derives from an *a posteriori* Hellenistic reconstruction: both the idea of an eponymous coin and also of one relating to a queen, they say, would have reached Deinomenid Syracuse from the east. But no detailed evidence is presented to support this view. Again, CALTABIANO and COLACE draw attention (p. 42) to the intensification in the Hellenistic period of the habit of naming coins, including coins of base metal, after an individual, but regard this as inimical to the creation *a posteriori* of a coin named after Damarete. I think, though, that the Hellenistic period in general, and Hellenistic Syracuse in particular, provide an eminently suitable ambience for the creation of a (pseudo-)Damareteion. I will develop arguments in support of that view shortly, but before I do so, I want to discuss one or two points in the language and content of the accounts of Pollux and Hesychius.

These two accounts share with Diodorus the person of Damarete and, now, a silver coin, but they are at variance with him on the background to the striking (pre- or post-Himera?) and on the bullion from which the coin was struck (jewelry or gold crown?). But even these differences are more apparent than real, if indeed, as I have shown, Diodorus is in debt to his own inventions. Given that circumstance it is not methodologically helpful to try to construct a hypothesis as to how two different versions of the story came to be transmitted.⁵⁰ The crucial question is, how did Damarete come into the picture, and linked with a silver decadrachm? It is impossible, given the lacunose state of the surviving record, to demonstrate step-by-step how this came about. Furthermore ancient authorities on coinage are rarely rational, and there are awful warnings about the confusions they can introduce into accounts of the nature and development of their own monetary history. Consider ps.-Aristotle on a Solonian coinage, or Pliny on the early coinage of Rome. Nevertheless there are points to be made both on the details of the tradition preserved by Pollux and Hesychius, and on how this tradition might have originated and been shaped.

The contribution, either forced or voluntary, of women's jewelry for a war effort, or simply to satisfy a tyrant's caprice, is a commonplace in ancient literature. Diones Laertius for example quotes Ephorus on Periander, who vowed to dedicate a gold statue if he won the four-horse chariot-race at Olympia, and lacking the means to do so (ἀπορῶν χρυσίου) took away the women's jewelry (κόσμον).⁵¹ Diodorus reports a story about the women of Rome which introduces the same motif: <because they contributed their gold jewelry (τὸν χρυσοῦν κόσμον) for the common safety they received . . . the right to ride in chariots through the city>.⁵² The motif is common

⁵⁰ Cf. MANGANARO, *op. cit.* (n.3) 28–31, on a common core of material going back to Philistus, differently elaborated by Ephorus, whose version is reflected in Pollux/Hesychius, and by Timaeus, who was carefully summarised by Diodorus.

⁵¹ Diog. Laert. 1,96 = FGH 70 Ephoros F 178.

⁵² 14,116,9.

in accounts of Sicilian tyrants. We have seen it already in connection with Gelon: note the κόσμον in Pollux and Hesychius. Agathocles according to Diodorus included among his depredations the removal of women's jewelry (again, κόσμον).⁵³ A more elaborate anecdote survives about Dionysius I, which it is worth quoting in full: Διονύσιος Συρακούσιος βουλόμενος χρήματα συναγαγεῖν, ἐκκλησίαν ποιήσας ἔφησεν ἑωρακέναι τὴν Δήμητραν, καὶ κελεύειν τὸν τῶν γυναικῶν κόσμον εἰς τὸ ἱερόν ἀποκομίζειν· αὐτὸς μὲν οὖν τῶν παρ' αὐτῷ γυναικῶν τὸν κόσμον τοῦτο πεποιηκέναι, ἡξίου δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους, μή τι μὴνιμα παρὰ τῆς θεοῦ γένηται· τὸν δὲ μὴ τοῦτο ποιήσαντα ἔνοχον ἔφησεν ἱεροσυλίας ἔσεσθαι. Ἀνεγκάντων δὲ πάντων ἃ εἶχον διὰ τε τὴν θεὸν καὶ δι' ἐκείνον, θύσας τῇ θεῷ τὸν κόσμον ἀπηνέγκατο ὥς παρὰ τῆς θεοῦ δεδανεισμένος. Προελθόντος δὲ χρόνου καὶ τῶν γυναικῶν πάλιν φορουσῶν, ἐκέλευσε τὴν βουλομένην χρυσοφορεῖν τάχα τι ἀνατιθέναι ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ.⁵⁴

In general, then, the practice of turning jewelry into money is frequently attested in the ancient world, and we have unfortunately experienced the same phenomenon in more recent times. We must suppose that the frequency of the occurrence was real, and not always just a matter of literary convention. The Sicilian tyrants were not exceptional. However, it can also be said that the financial needs and arrangements of *one* of these tyrants, Dionysius I, were of a particular sophistication. We can assess this from the multiplicity of coins that were issued in his reign (in gold, silver and bronze, the silver including a large number of decadrachms),⁵⁵ and the literary record reflects it. Little detailed information survives about the financial arrangements of any of the Sicilian tyrants, but what there is centres on Dionysius I. We have notes on his introduction of tin money, an anecdote about the expulsion from Syracuse of a man whose financial manipulations interfered with his own, and a report that his tax-impositions drained the resources of Syracusans over a period of five years.⁵⁶ And there is the account quoted above of his method of acquiring

⁵³ 20,4,5.

⁵⁴ Ps.-Aristotle, *Oeconomica* 1349a: 'Dionysius of Syracuse wanted to collect money, so he summoned an assembly and declared that he had seen Demeter telling him to bring the women's jewelry into her temple; he himself had done this with the jewelry of the women of his household, and he asked everyone else to do the same, to avoid the goddess' anger; anyone who did not, he said, would be guilty of sacrilege. When everyone had brought what they had, to satisfy both the goddess and Dionysius, he sacrificed to her and carried off the jewelry, making out that he had borrowed it from her. After some time had passed and the women were again wearing jewelry, he told any who wanted to wear gold ornaments to make a fixed offering in the temple.'

⁵⁵ A. CUTRONI TUSA, *La monetazione di Siracusa sotto Dionisio I*, in: Φιλίας Χάριν: Miscellanea in onore di Eugenio Manni, Rome 1979, 631–47; CH. BOEHRINGER, *Zu Finanzpolitik und Münzprägung des Dionysios von Syrakus*, in: *Greek Numismatics and Archaeology, Essays in Honor of Margaret Thompson*, Wetteren 1979, 9–32.

⁵⁶ Tin money: ps.-Aristotle, *Oeconomica* 1349a, 32–6; Pollux, *Onomasticon* 9,79; financial manipulations: Aristotle, *Pol.* 1259a; taxes: id., 1313b.

bullion, the same method as that ascribed to Gelon/Damarete by Hesychius/Pollux. We might begin to look here for the origin of the Damarete story.

The reference to jewelry, κόσμος, with reference both to Gelon and Dionysius, is a relatively superficial matter. What is perhaps more significant is the division into two groups of the women who are to provide the jewelry. In ps.-Aristotle's account a distinction is clearly made between the women of the tyrant's household (τῶν παρ' αὐτῷ γυναικῶν), who had already done their duty, and others, who are urged to follow their example. Pollux and Hesychius are of course each presenting very abbreviated summaries of what they supposed happened in Gelon's time, but they do between them reflect a similar distinction: in Hesychius the tyrant's consort gives her *own* κόσμος to be struck by him; in Pollux she collects it from others (and subsequently has it struck). Another element in ps.-Aristotle's account worth a comment is the prominence in it of Demeter. Dionysius justified his actions by reference to her, and it was in her temple that the collected κόσμος was stored. There is however no reference to an actual coining of the κόσμος, and though we might imagine that as the natural ending of this story, I do not think we should be tempted even further into supposing the events described by ps.-Aristotle as a suitable occasion for the striking of a 'Damatreion' along the lines suggested by R. T. WILLIAMS for a different historical context.⁵⁷ There is no parallel in the Greek world for such a naming of a coin after a divinity, and the Roman *moneta*, derived from Juno Moneta whose temple for some time served as the mint of Rome, is a much more generalised nomenclature. Furthermore I think that we can in fact point to a period and a set of circumstances in Syracuse when the idea of naming a coin 'Damatreion' would have been both possible and appropriate. For such a development the reign of Hieron II provides the perfect setting.

Hieron himself was of a not particularly distinguished family on his father's side, and he was illegitimate, his mother being a slave.⁵⁸ To bolster his position he claimed descent from Gelon I,⁵⁹ and underlined his claim by naming his only son Gelon,⁶⁰ and one of his two daughters Damarete (the other was named Heraclea).⁶¹ There are

⁵⁷ Op. cit. (n. 11) 10–11. WILLIAMS to his credit found it hard to believe both Diodorus' story of Damarete and the crown and Pollux' picture of her 'going round with a hat'. He proposed to explain the name 'Damatreion' as a corruption of 'Damatreion'. In support of his case he pointed out the special relationship of Gelon with Damater, and conjectured that what he supposed to be Gelon's 'Damatreion' was struck in the precinct of the goddess; after the name was corrupted, later writers had to think of reasons why the coin was apparently called after Damarete.

⁵⁸ Hieron's family: Polybius 7,8,1; Zonaras 8,6; his mother: Justin 23,4,1.

⁵⁹ Justin, *ibid.*, reports as a fact what must have been a later claim by Hieron.

⁶⁰ On Gelon, who died before his father, see Livy 23,30,11 ff.; 24,5,3 (note in this reference the harking back to an earlier tyrant – Hieronymus was said to be acting 'more Dionysi'); Polybius 5,88,5; 7,7–8; Pausanias 6,12,3 (where it is said that Hieron met his end at the hands of one Deinomenes, but Hieron is confused with his grandson Hieronymus [Livy 24,4–7; Polybius 6,7,2–6]); Justin 28,3,4.

⁶¹ On Damarete, see Livy 24,22,8–11. 24,2. 25,6–11; again, note how, in order to strengthen

in fact only two women named Damarete known to history, and we have rather more information about the second than about the first – she was clearly a woman of spirit. Furthermore Hieron fostered links with the Hellenistic world of the eastern Mediterranean, those with Rhodes and Egypt being of particular significance for this investigation.

With regard to the former, Polybius provides interesting details of Hieron's beneficence to the Rhodians after the disastrous earthquake of 224: 'He and Gelon gave seventy-five talents . . . to supply oil in the gymnasium, dedicated silver cauldrons with their bases and a certain number of water-pitchers, and in addition granted ten talents for sacrifices and ten more to qualify new men for citizenship, so as to bring the whole gift up to one hundred talents . . . Finally, after bestowing so many gifts, they erected, just as if they were still under an obligation, . . . a group representing the people of Rhodes being crowned by the people of Syracuse.'⁶² Here, a crowning in its proper historical and artistic context. With regard to Hieron's relations with Egypt the record is fuller and more varied. Athenaeus tells us of the large and luxurious vessel, the *Syrakosia*, constructed by Hieron for Ptolemy III,⁶³ but it is the coinage that provides the most fascinating links.⁶⁴ The denominational system of Hieron's coinage was strongly influenced by that of Ptolemaic Egypt. The portrait of Hieron's queen Philistis which appears on many Syracusan issues is the first such portrait in Sicilian coinage, and is strongly influenced by that of Arsinoe II, the wife of Ptolemy II Philadelphus. It is Philistis in fact, along with her son Gelon, who is the most prominent member of the royal family on the coinage of Hieron's reign – her name is known only from the coins – and she was thus very much the representative of the splendour of that family to the outside world. This feature of the coinage is again exemplified in Ptolemaic Egypt, and it is no surprise at all that a coin called a *Philistideion* should parallel a *Berenikeion*.⁶⁵ Among the list of known eponymous coins the *Philistideion* and the *Damareteion* are the only two western examples, and both emanate from Syracuse.⁶⁶ An invented *«Damareteion»* would support Hieronian propaganda and in particular provide an exemplar for Philistis' prominent role. Finally, the link with Demeter again: there is a substantial group of Philistis coins portraying her with a wreath of barley, in other words as Demeter.

the resolve of her husband Adranodorus, she evokes the example of Dionysius: *Damareta . . . filia Hieronis . . . admonet saepe usurpatae Dionysi tyranni vocis* (24,22,8).

⁶² 5,88,5–8.

⁶³ 5,206 d–209 e.

⁶⁴ In what follows on coinage in this paragraph I am indebted to P. R. FRANKE, *Historisch-numismatische Probleme der Zeit Hierons II. von Syrakus*, JNG 9, 1958, 57–85. On Hieron's *«Deinomenid»* propaganda, and the prominence in it of Demeter, see D. WHITE, *Demeter's Sicilian Cult as a Political Instrument*, GRBS 5, 1964, 261–79, at 268–9.

⁶⁵ Hesychius, s. v.

⁶⁶ For a list of eponyms (adjectival), see P. RADICI COLACE – M. CACCAMO CALTABIANO (eds.), *Atti del I Seminario di Studi sui Lessici Tecnici Greci e Latini*, Messina 1991, 161.

The cult of the goddess was of course an important part of Hieron's claim of legitimacy: to be not only descended from the Deinomenids, but also to have inherited that family's well-known tenure of the priesthood of Demeter.

I remarked above how ancient authors often succeed in hopelessly confusing matters to do with monetary history. Among the reasons for this can be literary or more broadly cultural ones, such as the desire to find a *πρῶτος εὐρετής* for an important human institution such as coinage. In the case before us I have discussed three sources of confusion in the record. First, the efforts of an individual, and patriotic, author to embellish his account: Diodorus' presentation of Gelon I and his consort Damarete as Hellenistic monarchs owes little if anything to early fifth-century Sicilian realities, or indeed to his source, but very much to his own invention. I do not think Timaeus would recognize much in Diodorus' account, and in addition it is likely that there is non-Timaeian material here as well (in particular, the description of a decadrachm). A second source of confusion, about the historical activities of the Deinomenids and of the Syracusan tyrants in general, is the marked tendency for contamination of the record to take place. In my discussion of this phenomenon I concentrated on the motif of converting women's jewelry into coin, but other examples could easily be found.⁶⁷ Finally, an extension of the second point, I showed how in one case a deliberate attempt was made by a Syracusan tyrant (or, 'royal') family to emphasize and to publicize its claimed dynastic links with the Deinomenids, in various ways including the naming of a second Damarete. The propaganda can be traced particularly well on coins of the regime, as can the influences that shaped its form, and these influences emanated from the eastern Mediterranean, from Egypt in particular. All this is fertile ground for the creation of a myth – for that is what I believe the 'Damareteion' was for the third century Hellenistic world, and has been for us in the form in which we received it from the DUC DE LUYNES.

Department of Classics
The University of Edinburgh
David Hume Tower
George Square
Edinburgh EH8 9JX

⁶⁷ For some comparisons between Gelon I and Dionysius I, cf. Diod. Sic. 14,66,1; Plutarch, Dion 5,4–5; Plato, Ep. 7,333a. Or compare ps.-Aristotle, *Oeconomica* 1349b,14–17 and Diod. Sic. 20,4,5, regarding Dionysius I and Agathocles respectively: each commandeered for his own use all the money belonging to orphans until they came of age. VAN GRONINGEN suggests that both these traditions are true; Agathocles was inspired by the example of his predecessor: Aristote, *Le second livre de l'économie*, Leyden 1933, 134–5.