

COINS AND AES RUDE AS VOTIVE GIFTS

THE COINS AND AES RUDE FROM THE HELLENISTIC VOTIVE DEPOSIT AT SATRICUM AND THE FIRST COINAGE IN LATIUM

JELLE PRINS · MARLEEN K. TERMEER

ABSTRACT · This article discusses the coins and aes rude found in the “Hellenistic Votive Deposit” at the sanctuary of Mater Matuta at Satricum. The votive deposit was first excavated in 1896. After excavations at Satricum had been resumed by the Dutch Institute in Rome, it was decided in 1985 to excavate the same area again, recovering many votive objects in the fill of the 19th century excavation. The two excavations together yielded a total of 108 coins, mostly dating to the 3rd century BC. In addition, 556 aes rude were among the votive gifts.

The article first presents the coin finds and the information they hold about the date of the votive deposit. It then proceeds with a comparison between the composition of the coin assemblage from the Satricum deposit and coin assemblages from other votive deposits around Rome: Vicarello, Carsoli, Nemi, Via Tiberina, Casalvieri and Ardea. This comparison leads to the identification of various geographical areas in which specific groups of coins were deposited. In addition, more detailed observations are made comparing the RRC 16 and 17, the Neapolitan and Punic issues of these assemblages.

Finally, attention shifts to the aes rude found in the deposit, and their relation to early coinage. The weights of the aes rude show no clear connection to the theoretical weights of the earliest Roman bronze coins, but in some cases a possible link can be recognized. At any rate, the long tradition of deposition of aes rude in religious contexts in Latium was continued in the period when coins were first introduced. Thus, we argue that the use of coins and aes rude had considerable overlap in the 3rd century BC.

KEYWORDS · Early coinage, aes rude, Latium, Satricum, Votive Deposit.

For Monica Prins-Heineman, 1960-2018

1. INTRODUCTION¹

THIS article presents the coins and aes rude found in the “Hellenistic Votive Deposit” or “Votive Deposit III” at the sanctuary of Mater Matuta at Satricum.² In addition, it uses these finds as a point of departure for a broader discussion of coins and aes rude in votive deposits in the wider region around Rome in the 3rd century BC. After briefly introducing Satricum and the Hellenistic Votive Deposit, we first discuss the coin finds and the information they hold about the date of the votive deposit. We then widen our view and compare the coin assemblage from the Satricum deposit with the coin assemblages from several other votive deposits in and just outside Latium, in order to analyse patterns in coin distribution. This analysis leads to the identification of various geographical areas in which specific groups of coins were deposited, and allows us to hypothesize about the movement of the coins in 3rd-century BC Latium.¹ We then move our attention to the aes rude in the Satricum deposit. We argue that the long tradition of deposition of aes rude in religious contexts in Latium was continued in the period when coins were first introduced, and the coins seem to have been embedded in this tradition. Thus, the use of coins and aes rude had considerable overlap in this period.²

2. SATRICUM AND THE HELLENISTIC VOTIVE DEPOSIT

The ancient city of Satricum is located in the Pontine coastal plain, circa 60 km south of Rome. It is mainly known as an important archaic settlement that housed the famous sanctuary of Mater Matuta.³ During the Early and Middle Republic, Satricum features regularly in historical accounts in the context of Rome’s early expansion into Latium. The wars with Rome ended definitively with the destruction of Satricum by consul Marcus Valerius Corvus in 346 BC.⁴ This date seems to be confirmed by archaeological evidence.⁵ As historical tradition has it, only the great temple of Mater Matuta was saved from the fire. Although it may be doubted that after its destruction Satricum was still a “regular” city from the end of the 4th and during the 3rd century, recent archaeological research demonstrates that certain parts of the city area, in particular the acropolis, were still in use.⁶ However, the most eloquent testimony to human activities from the end of the 4th and during the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC is the so-called Hellenistic Votive Deposit in front of the temple of Mater Matuta on the acropolis. This votive deposit may be considered one of the richer ones of Latium Vetus, as is demonstrated by the enormous number of gifts to the Mater, including clay figurines (“local” and “Hellenistic”), coins, aes rude, black gloss wares, local wares and anatomical terracottas.

The Hellenistic Votive Deposit was first excavated by the Italian archaeologist Raniero Mengarelli in 1896; the finds are stored in the National Museum of the Villa Giulia. Mengarelli excavated large areas of the former city during campaigns in 1896-98 and 1907-10.⁷ More than half a century later, in 1977, excavations at Satricum were started again by the Dutch Institute in Rome (NIR, now KNIR). After cleaning the temple remains and the surrounding buildings, the focus was directed at the votive deposit. In 1985 a trench was laid out in order to determine the exact location of the excavated votive deposit. It immediately became clear that the area was still packed full with votive objects. It was then decided to re-excavate this “secondary” votive dump.¹ Unfortunately, this means that any potential information on stratigraphy is lacking, and we therefore know little about the original nature of the votive deposit. It is not clear whether the deposit was entirely excavated in 1896; perhaps some minor parts were left untouched.² It is hoped that the further study of the votive deposit will answer this question.³

In total, three different votive deposits are now known from the sanctuary of Mater Matuta at Satricum. Votive Deposit 1, which is associated with the archaic sacellum (“Temple o”), does not contain any coins, but it does include a large number of

aes rude.⁴ In Votive Deposit II, which is dated to the 5th-3rd century BC, we see the continuation of depositing aes rude alongside other votive material, and the deposit also includes five coins, all found in a stratum dated by the excavators from 300 BC onwards.⁵ The Hellenistic Votive Deposit is number III. The overall study of the deposit and its contents is still in progress and full publication of the material is in preparation (see p. 43, note 2). Unfortunately, this means that we will not be able to relate the coin finds to the other find material. We offer our considerations about the date of the deposit below, based on the coin finds. We hope to come back to this question once the study of the deposit as a whole is completed.

3. THE COINS FROM THE HELLENISTIC VOTIVE DEPOSIT AT SATRICUM

During the excavations of the Hellenistic Votive Deposit at Satricum, approximately⁶ 108 coins were found, here presented in a catalogue in APPENDIX 1 and summarized in TABLE 1. Of this total, 26 coins were recovered in 1896, when the deposit was excavated by Mengarelli (see appendices 2 and 3 for a brief discussion of additional coin finds during the 19th-century excavations). The remaining coins, 82 specimens, were unearthed during the campaigns executed by the Dutch Institute between 1985 and 1989. This larger number is due to intensive use of a metal detector in the 1980s.⁷

There are some differences between the early and the recent finds. A striking difference is the occurrence of only one so-called Minerva bronze (RRC 17, cat. no. 68) in the 1896 collection, whereas 28 specimens of this issue (cat. nos. 39-67) were found during the recent excavations,¹ a difference which is difficult to explain.² Another difference is that a relatively large number of the coins found in 1896 (nos. 79-85, 88 and 94) have a rather late date, that is, between circa 200 and 100 BC. A possible explanation for this is that these later coins are larger than the 3rd-century BC bronzes and therefore easier to discover.³

Looking at the total collection of coins from the Hellenistic Votive Deposit (see TABLE 1 and APPENDIX 1), we may note that almost all coins are bronzes issued in the 4th, 3rd and 2nd centuries BC; among these are 28 Campanian (nos. 1-28), one from Velia (no. 29), four Punic (three Siculo-Punic, nos. 30-32, and one Punic, probably from Carthage, no. 33),⁴ 39 so-called Romano-Campanian (nos. 34-72), six aes grave (nos. 73-78), two rim fragments of currency bars (nos. 107-108) and 15 later Roman Republican struck coins (nos. 79-93). The only exceptions are two silver denarii from 132 and 90 BC (nos. 94, RRC 249/1 (plated!) and 95, RRC 340/1).

Most of the coins belong to very common issues, but there are a few exceptions: one Lion bronze (no. 38) with reverse lion to the left is a variety of RRC 16/1a and 1b, only known from Vicarello and Carsoli;⁵ a cast triens (no. 77) is an “uncertain aes grave”, issued in “Central Italy” (HNIIt 362);⁶ and no. 76, a fragmented cast “1/6 as”, is presumably an issue from nearby Praeneste (HNIIt 249).⁷ Furthermore, the Minerva bronzes nos. 62 and 64 (RRC 17) are particular varieties, which, according to the inventory, do not seem to occur in Vicarello, the findspot with the largest number of these issues.⁸

4. THE COINS AND THE DATE OF THE VOTIVE DEPOSIT

Despite uncertainties about the exact production dates of the coins in the votive deposit⁹ and about the period of circulation of these coins until they were offered to the goddess, it remains possible to give a general picture of the start and the period of the maximum influx of coins into the votive deposit, and, possibly, also of its end. In FIG. 1, the different issues of coins are set against a timetable that gives their probable production dates and the supposed periods of circulation. The period of circulation of 3rd-century BC coins is probably not limited to that century, and may have continued into the 2nd and even the 1st century BC.¹

Based on their date of issue, the coins found in the Hellenistic Votive Deposit can be roughly divided into three periods, which can be recognized in FIG. 1. The first runs from circa 340-275 BC, the second from circa 270-240/225 BC and the third, after a hiatus of circa 20-30 years, covers the 2nd century BC. It must be emphasized that it is difficult to determine when a coin or a series of coins actually entered the votive deposit, especially in the absence of stratigraphic information. For instance, due to a long period of circulation, earlier coins may have entered the region together with later ones.

The earliest coins that could have entered the votive deposit are the earliest Neapolitan bronzes from Taliercio's series I (nos. 1-9), dated 325-300 BC, and the Punic bronzes (nos. 30-33), which are dated in the second half of the 4th century BC.² For the Punic material, the question is whether these coins entered the region independently, or were accompanied by goods or commodities from the Punic cultural sphere. In our view, the most plausible scenario is that these coins did not immediately arrive at Satricum in the late 4th century, but formed part of a larger influx of Campanian and southern Italian – “Hellenistic” – commodities into Latium from the beginning of the 3rd century BC onwards. All of these items also found their way as votive objects offered to the gods of the Latial sanctuaries: “Tanagrine” terracotta figurines, black gloss wares, and coins. While locally made figurines and pottery had already been known in Latium as votive offerings, coins – and their use as money – were a *nouveauté à la grecque* in the 3rd century BC. The question is whether these bronze coins were seen as something completely new or were associated with and used as another form of aes rude, the practice local people had known for centuries.

In this regard, there is a further interesting aspect concerning the Neapolitan Taliercio I specimens from Satricum. Four of these seven Neapolitan coins (nos. 2, 5, 6 and 7) have chop marks. Exactly the same phenomenon is described by Clive Stannard for the Neapolitan coins found in Minturnae.³ In contrast to the material from Minturnae, however, the chop marks occur on only four early Taliercio I issues from Satricum, and not on the later Taliercio II and III (only no. 63, a RRC 17/1d, is literally halved). In addition, while all coins from Minturnae are chopped on the obverse, two specimens from Satricum, nos. 6 and 7, have this mark on the reverse. If it is accepted that the chopped Neapolitan coins have their origin in Minturnae, as Stannard proposes,¹ this may be an indication that they found their way to Satricum via this Roman colony and that therefore the foundation date of the colony – 295 BC – may be cautiously considered a *terminus post quem* for the influx of Greek/Neapolitan coins into Satricum.

As far as the function of the chopping practice is concerned, we do not think that the coins were demonetised in the

modern sense of the word. We rather suggest that the chopping was intended to mutilate the image – the city badge – as the former coins themselves were kept in use. As a result, these *nouveautés à la grecque* may have been symbolically transformed into “harmless” bronze lumps. After all, the practice of offering bronze in the form of aes rude was a practice dating back to Archaic times and is also attested from Satricum itself (see section 6).²

In the second period, the Campanian bronzes of Taliercio’s series I and II are succeeded by the early so-called Romano Campanian struck Lion (RRC 16; nos. 34–38) and Minerva (RRC 17; nos. 39–68) bronzes, Campanian bronze issues from different mints with mostly on the reverse a man-faced bull crowned by a flying Nike (“Taliercio III”; nos. 14–26 and 28),³ and the rare – only six specimens – cast aes grave (nos. 73–78), which may be a little earlier. Coins from this period, namely circa 270–240/225 BC, are the most common in the deposit (FIG. 1).

Then, as far as the influx of coins issued after 230 is concerned, some decline or break may be noticed, one that cannot be explained satisfactorily. For instance, Taliercio IV issues are missing. This break would be shorter or even non-existent if we suppose that the Taliercio III series with “ΙΣ under the bull” (date in HNI t ca. 275–250 BC) and other earlier coins circulated for a longer time, or that their production continued after 250 BC. At any rate, it is noteworthy that the later Neapolitan coins did not reach Satricum. In addition, there are very few Roman coins from the period of the Second Punic War. This is difficult to explain, as in this warlike period the issuing of coins by Rome reached much higher levels and was more widespread than ever before. Only no. 79, a semuncia of the post-semilibral standard, dated 217–215 BC; no. 86, a triens of the sextantal standard (14.87 g), dated 211–200 BC; and no. 89, a sextans of the reduced sextantal standard (5.86 g), dated 210–150 BC, can be attributed to the period of the Second Punic War. The rest of the coins from this last period, a considerable number of 15 specimens, were issued in the 2nd century BC. We suppose that these coins entered the votive deposit during the 2nd century BC (see below).⁴

After the Second Punic War the monetary landscape of Italy underwent a change: Rome was now the main (but not the only) coin producer.¹ This phenomenon is clearly attested in Satricum by the 2nd-century BC coins, 18 specimens in total. A worn triens of the reduced uncial weight standard (no. 87) dated 200–100 BC was found in a layer that, during the excavation, was supposed to belong to a zone untouched by the 1896 excavators. Together with the rest of the 2nd-century BC coins and a global knowledge of the other find materials, it provides a *terminus post quem* for the closing of the votive deposit.² We therefore suggest a date at least somewhere around 150 BC. A later date is also possible, and may be connected to the construction of an adjacent altar and a surrounding wall.³ Through this unpretentious restoration programme, probably the initiative of a certain Cornelius, duovir at Antium, the cult of the great Mater Matuta at Satricum was revived for the last time.

5. COINS FROM THE SATRICAN DEPOSIT AND OTHER VOTIVE DEPOSITS

In ancient Latium, there were innumerable sanctuaries dedicated to the many gods and heroes.⁴ Equally innumerable were the forms of the cult places where people venerated their gods; they ranged from richly embellished temple complexes to the simplest rural cult places *sine tecto*. The greater majority of these places of worship received votive offerings, again varying from the most opulent prestige goods to the most simple and basic commodities, for instance the handmade impasto *piatti miniaturistici* probably filled with some barley grains.⁵ Some, not all, of these cult places received aes rude and bronze coins as votive offerings. In one known sanctuary – Vicarello – bronze in the form of aes rude, currency bars and coins were even the preferred votive gift. We do not know why only some cult places received bronze objects as votive offerings, and this question regrettably falls outside the scope of this article.⁶ It is clear, however, that bronze was the preferred metal for offering in Latium; precious metals are very rare.⁷

To understand the coin finds from Satricum in a larger regional framework, we will now compare the coin assemblage from the Hellenistic Votive Deposit with assemblages of other votive deposits in Latium and surroundings. Our comparison will focus on the coins found in the votive deposits at Vicarello,¹ Carsoli,² Nemi,³ Via Tiberina⁴ and Casalvieri,⁵ and the Ardea hoard, which was probably part of a votive deposit or even a thesaurus.⁶ This selection is mainly based on the size of these assemblages and their state of publication. We will focus on votive deposits with considerable quantities of coins in order to be able to make meaningful comparisons of the relative numbers of various categories of coins.⁷ For this reason, the deposits with smaller quantities of coins will not be taken into account for the general comparison, although in the more detailed discussion below we will discuss some remarkable finds from smaller assemblages.⁸ As a result, we will only be able to suggest some general patterns in the distribution of the coins.⁹ It is important to realize that we can only compare the contents of votive deposits – that is, “hoards” with a religious character – as there are no clearly “profane” hoards or coin finds from the area in this period, namely the first three quarters of the 3rd century BC.¹⁰

The coins, currency bars and aes rude from the votive deposits that we have selected for comparison are all published, although the quality of excavation and publication varies. For Nemi and Vicarello, both excavated or – better – “dug up” in the 19th century, Crawford (Nemi) and Panvini Rosati and Balbi De Caro (Vicarello) had to reconstruct the numismatic find material before publication was possible in the 20th century.¹¹ The coin finds of Carsoli were partly published in 1951 by Cederna just after the excavation of 1950. To him, only a total of 780 specimens were known. Panvini Rosati, when making a comparison between Vicarello and Carsoli in his 1968 publication, mentions a total of circa 3,000 coins for Carsoli, as he was able to examine and study all the coins in the national museum of Chieti from this site.¹ Fortunately, the *stipe monetale* at the Via Tiberina, found in 1941, is entirely preserved and was published by Cesano in 1942. The coin finds from the deposit at Casalvieri were published by Catalli in 2005.

Despite the many handicaps, these sites offer abundant material for a useful comparison, although the variable nature of the data has to be taken into account. Although the differences in absolute numbers between the votive deposits considered here and their different degrees of research, recording and subsequent publications make a comparison an almost hazardous enterprise, we believe that such a comparison can provide useful insights. In making the comparison, we are mainly interested

in coin distribution patterns in *Latium Vetus* in the 3rd century, based on the differences between these large votive deposits. For this reason, the Second Punic War and later issues will be omitted, so that we are able to focus on a “pure” 3rd-century BC environment of monetary circulation. While we will pay special attention to the Lion (RRC 16) and Minerva (RRC 17) bronzes, it is important to stress that we will only be able to address some aspects of the more general debates on the 3rd-century BC Italian and Roman coinages.

General comparison

When we compare the coin finds from the deposits under consideration here, a first striking observation is the modest number of Satrican coins (108 specimens, including two rim fragments of currency bars) compared to the numbers found in the deposits at Vicarello, Carsoli, Nemi and Casalvieri.² Nonetheless, a rough comparison of relative numbers of coins can be made. We focus on the pre-Second Punic War coins of each deposit; for Satricum, these include the first three categories in TABLE 1.³ We have applied the same categorization to the assemblages from the other deposits: 1) the aes grave (including bars and bar fragments); 2) the RRC 16 and 17 and later Romano-Campanian issues;⁴ 3) all Greek coins.⁵ FIG. 2 presents the relative presence of each of these categories in the votive deposits under consideration.

In the case of Vicarello,¹ the very large percentages of aes grave (ca. 39%)² and Romano-Campanian issues (ca. 60%) on the one hand and the negligible percentage of Greek coins (ca. 1%) is remarkable. Nemi shows a very different picture. Here, cast aes grave (all Roman, except for a few Latin issues) are dominant (ca. 49%), followed by a lesser percentage of Romano-Campanian issues (ca. 25%) and Greek (ca. 26%). Strikingly, Carsoli and Satricum, although differing noticeably in absolute numbers, are percentually almost identical: they both contain large percentages of Romano-Campanian issues (Carsoli: ca. 51%, Satricum: ca. 49%) and Greek coins (Carsoli: ca. 42%, Satricum: ca. 43%), and much lower percentages of aes grave (Carsoli: ca. 7%, Satricum: ca. 8%). Casalvieri differs from all these: it has a modest percentage of Romano-Campanian issues (ca. 13%), a low percentage of aes grave (ca. 4%) and the highest percentage of Greek coins (ca. 83%). Finally, the deposit at Via Tiberina, which is in the immediate environs of Rome, contains 3rd-century BC cast coins and currency bars that can be dated in the first half of that century. The stipe contained four pre-Second Punic War aes grave plus 13 currency bars (so-called *quadrilateri*) or fragments thereof, but no Romano-Campanian or Greek coins.³ The Ardea hoard also consists mainly of aes grave (ca. 160) and has no Greek material. It includes 17 Lion bronzes (all RRC 16/1a) but no Minerva bronzes (RRC 17) or later issues.

The differences between the influx of these three categories of 3rd-century BC material must be at least partly due to the geographical locations of these sanctuaries. Vicarello is north of but not far from Rome (ca. 40 km);⁴ the Via Tiberina stipe is in its immediate surroundings; Nemi, which is easy to reach and next to the Via Appia, is south of and also close to Rome (ca. 30 km); Carsoli, to the northeast, is somewhat farther, about 55 km from Rome; Ardea, to the direct south, is also close to Rome (ca. 35 km); Satricum is somewhat more distant (ca. 50 km); and Casalvieri, to the southeast, is the most remote of these (ca. 100 km) (see the map in FIG. 3).

So what can be said about these patterns? Although a few finds from the direct environs of Rome have some Romano-Campanian Lion and Minerva bronzes,² the Via Tiberina stipe – a complete find with 3rd-century BC coins in the close vicinity of the city – shows that in Rome or its immediate surroundings outside the pomerium, cast currency is dominant.³ A bit farther from Rome, for instance in Nemi and Ardea, cast bronze is still predominant. Perhaps in Nemi, which is next to the Via Appia main artery, we would have expected a greater influx of coins from the “Greek” south as well as from the “Roman” north; on the contrary, it did not receive many Greek specimens.⁴ Cast coins also occur in the other deposits but in much lower percentages than Romano-Campanian and Greek coins.

Moving north of Rome, Vicarello is very instructive. In this sanctuary, again, almost no Greek coins were found. It seems as though Rome acted as a sort of barrier to the inflow of Greek coins, which limited the spread of these issues to the inland regions north of the city. The largest majority of coins dated to the first half of the 3rd century that were offered in Vicarello were Romano-Campanian issues, directly followed by cast coins, which make up more than half of the percentage of Romano-Campanian issues.

Farther from Rome, Carsoli and Satricum were indeed able to receive similarly high percentages of Romano-Campanian and Greek coins. The difference between these two and Nemi is striking, but we have no good explanation for it. We draw attention to the strong geographical difference between Satricum and Carsoli: Satricum in the Pontine plain is halfway between the sea and the Via Appia, while Carsoli is located far inland, behind the Alban hills and the Prenestine mountains. The Greek coins that reached Satricum and Carsoli must most likely have done so by following different routes from the south.⁵

Casalvieri has a modest percentage of Romano-Campanian and a low percentage of aes grave, while its highest percentage consists of Greek coins also when compared to the other sites. In this regard, Casalvieri – which is near Arpinum – seems to belong to another world, one supposedly linked by the valleys of the Liri and Melfa rivers with the nearby “Greek” south.

In the present state of knowledge, the following overall pattern for this period (ca. 300–225 BC) can be sketched. Considerable quantities of aes grave are found in Rome and its immediate surroundings, but fade away as distance from the city increases. The Lion and Minerva bronzes are concentrated in Latin and Faliscan territory, most clearly north and northeast of Rome (Vicarello, Carsoli), but are hardly found in the city itself.¹ Greek and Romano-Campanian coins do not seem to circulate within the walls of Rome in the 3rd century BC. However, we do know that Greek and non-Roman coins did occur in Rome, as is evidenced by the coin finds from the Tiber and the coins present in the Musei Capitolini.² Unfortunately, few archaeological contexts are known.³ It is therefore difficult to decide whether we are confronted here with coin finds from 3rd-century BC contexts or with a coin circulation between the 2nd and the 1st century BC.⁴

It seems, therefore, that the aes grave was the main currency that circulated in Rome during the largest part of the 3rd century BC.⁵ Greek coins penetrated the Latin territories south of Rome (Carsoli, Satricum and Casalvieri), but during most of the 3rd century BC they did not move farther north. In this respect, they show a different distribution pattern than other commodities from the south, which did find their way up to the Roman market.

Closer, more refined observations are possible when the three main categories are divided into subcategories. We divide the Romano-Campanian issues into the Lion bronze RRC 16, the Minerva bronze RRC 17 and the later ROMA issues. For the aes grave, we make a distinction between early and later “city” issues from Rome, and other issues from central Italy.⁶ In regard to the Greek coins, we examine the occurrence of Campanian issues, dividing them as far as possible into Taliercio I, II and III types.⁷ Finally, the finds of Siculo-Punic coins are presented separately. We do not aim for a full discussion of each of these groups, but rather make comments where we think the comparison adds to existing knowledge and debates.

For the aes grave, in general, the Roman city issues form the large majority as compared to minor quantities from central Italy and uncertain issues. The non-Roman issues from Vicarello (ca. 85 ex.) are still 6% of the total (ca. 1380 ex.) of aes grave.¹ All other deposits have negligible quantities of non-Roman aes grave. Nemi has only two (compared to 218 Roman issues), Carsoli is unknown, and Via Tiberina, Casalvieri and Ardea have none. Satricum has only three Roman aes grave (two RRC 14/6 and one RRC 14/7) and two very rare non-Roman aes grave, one presumably from Praeneste (HNIIt 249) and one “uncertain” (HNIIt 362).²

The first aes grave – the heavy Janus/Mercurius series RRC 14 – is represented in all deposits except for the Via Tiberina: Vicarello has 1,109, Nemi 50, Carsoli at least 15, Satricum 3 and Casalvieri 2. The Ardea hoard has 68 specimens. With the following Apollo/Apollo RRC 18 and the Roma/Roma RRC 21 series, occurring in Vicarello, Nemi and Carsoli, we can notice a decline in numbers, except for Carsoli and Ardea. The Carsoli votive deposit contains 17 Apollo/Apollo specimens, that is, only two more than the Janus/Mercurius series, while the Ardea hoard has 91 Apollo/Apollo, that is, 23 more. The following series, the Roma/Roma series (RRC 21), occurs in different numbers in Vicarello (47 ex.), Nemi (16 ex.) and, as far as is known, Carsoli (4 ex.). The next Roma/Wheel series (RRC 24) is found only in Nemi and not, for instance, in the large sanctuaries of Vicarello and Carsoli. The prominent position of Nemi is continued with the libral prow series (RRC 35), with 45 specimens versus Vicarello with 13 and Carsoli and Via Tiberina with 3 each.

Although the numbers of these various aes grave issues occurring in the sanctuaries differ significantly, it is difficult to deduce a clear pattern from these data. It seems that the closer to Rome, the more later aes grave are found. For instance, this seems valid for the Via Tiberina deposit, which we are certain is complete. Aes rude and 3rd-century BC fragments of currency bars were found there, but the oldest coins are those three libral prow issues and one “Latin” Roma/bull as, both dated 225–217 BC. In addition, if we accept Maria Cristina Molinari’s proposal that the three hoards RRCH 40, 41 and 42 together with the coin finds from the Colli Vaticani, as published by her,³ indeed form one deposit belonging to a sanctuary once located at the Monte Mario, then we have clear testimony to the dominance of the prow series and the much lesser occurrence of the earlier aes grave issues in the direct surroundings of Rome and *perhaps* in the city itself. This seeming lesser occurrence of early aes grave in Rome itself as compared to the votive deposits at some distance from the city is intriguing.

As mentioned, a rare triens with boar’s head/lyre (HNIIt 362, no. 77) was found at Satricum. A similar specimen is known from Nemi.⁴ Considering that these two were found in the vicinity of each other and the overall rare occurrence of aes grave at Satricum, we suggest that the mint of this issue was nearby.⁵

Moving to the Romano-Campanian struck bronze issues, we can note differences between the presence of the earlier Lion bronzes (RRC 16) and the later Minervas (RRC 17). The Lion bronze appears in all deposits but in varying proportions, as opposed to the Minerva bronze. In Vicarello (ca. 1,030 RRC 16 vs. ca. 893 RRC 17), Nemi (ca. 43 RRC 16 vs. 5 RRC 17) and Carsoli (ca. 175 RRC 16 vs. ca. 153 RRC 17),¹ the Lion bronzes form the majority. At Satricum (5 RRC 16 vs. 29 RRC 17) and Casalvieri (1 RRC 16 vs. 6 RRC 17), the situation is reversed. In the Ardea hoard, only Lion bronzes (17 specimens) are represented. In short, in Vicarello, Carsoli and Nemi, the Lion bronzes are in the majority whereas at Satricum and Casalvieri the Minerva bronzes are the most numerous. In other words: the further away from Rome, the more Minervas and the fewer Lions.² This situation differs somewhat from the sphere of distribution to the north of Rome/southern Etruria as described by Williams. Here, the two issues remain side by side under the line Gravisca-Falerii, although the stringency of this line is questioned by Pulcinelli on the basis of sporadic finds.³

Much has been written about the spheres of distribution and the dating of both issues.⁴ First, as far as the dating is concerned, there is still much debate, although in contrast to the silver didrachms and quadrigati, general agreement seems to have been reached, as is evidenced by the publications by Taliercio Mensitieri and Vitale.⁵ We only wish to add one remark about the general historical context in which these coins emerged, as this is important for the way in which we can understand the coins. During the decade 280–270 BC, we probably see the first coinage production in Rome itself and in several cities around it, in particular Latin colonies.⁶ All these issues, except for those of Rome, are short lived and on a very modest scale.⁷ However, they do show that in this decade something changed in regard to the monetary sphere in this region, as coinage started to be produced in various locations, and Rome produced her first issues – cast and struck bronze – of some size.

In regard to the distribution of Lion and Minerva bronzes, more and more sporadic finds of both issues are being made at different sites in “Greek” and “inland” central and southern Italy.⁸ However, the main area of distribution still seems to be Latium.⁹ In our dataset, this is confirmed by the fact that the largest concentrations are found in Vicarello and Carsoli, and in lesser quantities in Nemi and the Pontine plain. This probably implies that both issues were minted in the region itself – Rome is the most prominent candidate¹⁰ – and that they were meant for people living in those regions; they were the target group of these coins, in particular the Lion bronzes, as we will see below. These issues are probably associated with war expenses.¹¹ If Rome is accepted as the mint and point of distribution, then the Lion bronzes in particular must have been used as payments at the end of or, perhaps more likely, *after* the Pyrrhic War. Were we to accept that the Lion bronzes were struck *before* the end of the Pyrrhic war, they would have been distributed and found in some quantities over the theatres of the Pyrrhic war, that is, the south of Italy and Sicily.¹ This supports the view presented by Taliercio Mensitieri, who describes these coins – “/o

stipendium” – as an “*indennità eccezionale che non serve per essere speso in loco, ma viene corrisposta alla fine della guerra, al momento delle smobilitazione*”. This exceptional allowance should, in our view, be understood not as real payment or stipendium, but as some kind of specific payment made *after* this war.² The Latin allies, not the Romans, seem to have been the target group of these coins. As we find these coins mainly in votive contexts, we may hypothesize that the Latins, who were perhaps holding coins in their hands for the first time ever, offered them at their cult places, just as they had always done with *aes rude* (see below).

In other words, these two issues, one struck earlier and the other somewhat later, will probably have served a similar purpose.³ However, there are also strong dissimilarities between the two issues. The Lion bronzes – of which there are three varieties, one of them very rare⁴ – make a far more coherent impression than the Minerva bronzes. The Lion bronzes share a very similar style, the same kind of fabric⁵ and have almost similar weights. The Minerva bronzes are quite a different matter. Four or five main types can be discerned, but there are innumerable other varieties in terms of weight (ranging from 2.5 to 7 g), style (from “classic” to “barbaric”), execution of the type (Minerva with or without leather neck cap, with ornamented or non-ornamented helmet, horse bridled or not, horsehead on tablet or not, etc.), fabric (“bullet” and “pancake” flans),⁶ legend (only reverse, reverse and obverse, in straight line, around, dispersed, no legend at all) and, considering the blundered legends, perhaps “unofficial imitations”.⁷ From this it may be suggested that, first, these Minerva bronzes were minted over a much longer period than the Lion bronzes and, second, that after the first official issues and distribution, the authorities’ interest in minting and distributing these coins had waned. The issuing of “imitations” in connection with a more diffused pattern of distribution may indicate a more developed monetary function for the later issue.⁸ This, it is suggested here, may be the greatest difference between the Lion bronze and the following Minerva bronze.

These issues, and other questions concerning the Romano-Campanian coinages, were extensively discussed during the numismatic congress in 1993;¹ however, Crawford’s remark that many questions remain to be elucidated is still valid, 35 years later.² It should be realized that, together with the cast *aes grave* without legend, these two struck coins with legends were the first Roman issues meant for internal use, for a public near home, that is, for people nearby who shared the same cultural values. Why one was struck and with legend and the other was cast and without legend, remains an intriguing question. Together with the *aes grave* these two issues form the initial phase of the monetary initiatives within the Roman cultural sphere itself and are therefore essential for our understanding of the initial phase of the Roman monetary system – and for many subsequent developments. Thus, the importance of further study of all aspects of these two issues and the *aes grave* must be emphasized.

In regard to the distribution of the “Greek” bronze coins in the votive deposits, we will focus on the Neapolitan Taliercio I; the Neapolitan and Campanian variations of Taliercio II and III; and the Punic coins. It is striking that Satricum has most Taliercio I specimens (7),³ while Vicarello and Casalvieri have only one, and Nemi and Carsoli have none.⁴ The low number at Casalvieri, which is nearer to Neapolis than the others, is especially striking. As for the Taliercio II issues, Vicarello has none, Nemi has circa 10, Carsoli has at least 6, Satricum 4 and Casalvieri 3. Then, with the later Taliercio III/Campanian issue, all arrears are made up, as it were: Vicarello has 40, Nemi 77, Carsoli at least 123, Satricum 14 and Casalvieri 154 specimens.⁵ So, there is a clear difference between the influx of the earlier and later series.

The Punic coins, all small bronzes, only appear in very small numbers, but also from this scarce evidence – or, better, non-occurrence – a clear picture emerges that coincides with the influx of the Campanian issues. No Punic specimens are known from Vicarello or Carsoli. Nemi and Casalvieri have only one specimen, while four are known from Satricum.⁶ Based on this, we suggest that the coins must have reached Satricum by sea. The Punic coins from all these sites were issued before 300 BC.

From the picture of the influx of Campanian bronzes, it may be hypothesized that during the 3rd century BC, the coastal Pontine plain received Greek coins earlier than the inland region. The earliest Taliercio I bronzes may have reached southern Latium by way of the Via Appia or from the sea. However, as Nemi did not receive Taliercio I coins, while seven are known from Satricum, the sea is probably a better candidate, as this picture matches that of the Punic coins.⁷ This is corroborated by the fact that the Pratica di Mare hoard in Lavinium included one specimen of Taliercio I (see below). That there was only one Taliercio I from Vicarello present in the massive votive deposits of Vicarello, Nemi and Carsoli may be because their more inland position meant that “Greek” coins only reached the inland sanctuaries in a later period, during which the coins belonging to the later Taliercio III series were minted.

A broader picture can be sketched when these data are compared with those of southern Etruria as described by Williams.¹ First, in regard to the Punic coins, it seems evident that the earlier ones also reached this region via the coast. In this respect, the finds from Satricum – which lies only 12 km from the coast on the Astura river, which is supposed to have been navigable in antique times – match the data from southern Etruria. In addition, the single specimen from the sanctuary of the *Tredici Are* in Lavinium, whose harbour is in Torvaianica, fits this picture.² Then, the lack in this region south of Rome of navigable rivers farther inland may explain the absence of early Punic coins in, for instance, Carsoli. Only Nemi, which is at the end of the coastal Pontine plain, received one of these coins. Furthermore, coins issued after ca. 260–250 are very scarce both south of Rome and in southern Etruria. In short, the distribution of these coins from the coast onwards into the *entroterra* via navigable rivers seems attested for southern Etruria and for the region south of Rome.³ A distribution of these coins via an inland route from Campania may be excluded, as Casalvieri received only one (Sardo-Punic) coin.⁴

The distribution of the Campanian issues is more or less the same in both southern Etruria and Latium, if we consider that the lack of navigable rivers south of Rome would have impeded easy access inland from the coast. In both cases, early Campanian Taliercio I and II coins are found at the coast (even though the number of finds is very low in Etruria),⁵ while the later Taliercio III/Campanian issues are widely distributed, both in Latium and in southern Etruria.⁶ From this we may hypothesize that both Punic and Taliercio I⁷ and II issues reached southern Etruria and the region south of Rome by sea. So far, no definite 4th- or 3rd-century BC contexts from Rome itself or the *entroterra* are known. The Taliercio III or *à la Taliercio III* issues, on the contrary, were widely scattered over both regions.

In addition to the coins, the Hellenistic Votive Deposit at Satricum also yielded a considerable number of aes rude/bronze lumps in both 1896 and during the recent excavation.¹ A total of 556 aes rude are known from this deposit: 88 were found during the 1896 excavation and are now stored in the Villa Giulia Museum, and 468 were found during the NIR excavations, thanks to the use of a metal detector.

This massive occurrence of aes rude in the Satricum votive deposit is not exceptional: aes rude have also been found in many other cult places in Latium, such as Vicarello, Carsoli, Nemi, Via Tiberina and Ardea.² In other words, coins are mainly found in votive deposits where also aes rude were deposited, and both the early coins and the aes rude occur mainly in religious contexts.³ This practice of offering aes rude at sanctuaries was a long-standing practice that was already known in the Archaic period. This raises several questions: how long was the tradition of offering aes rude continued after the introduction of foreign and Roman coins, cast and struck? How do the weights of the aes rude and the cast coins compare with each other? And did coins and aes rude exist side by side for a certain period? This last possibility is suggested by the as from (presumably) Praeneste in the Satricum deposit that was cut into pieces to make several aes rude.

In what follows, we will first present the aes rude from the Satricum deposit and investigate whether any meaningful similarities between the aes rude and the coins can be found in terms of weight. We will then explore how long the practice of offering aes rude remained active and whether, and if so, how the coins and aes rude functioned side by side.

Aes rude from the Satricum votive deposit

The 556 aes rude from the Hellenistic Votive Deposit can be classified into four categories: 1) very irregular lumps, 2) lumps of a more or less regular shape, that is, with two (apparently hammered) flat surfaces,⁴ 3) lumps with rims, obviously fragments cut from larger currency bars, and 4) fragments of coins that we consider to be on the borderline between aes rude and coins.⁵

In order to investigate how the aes rude compare with the cast bronze coins, we will now compare the weights of the aes rude with the theoretical weights of the earliest Roman bronze coins. In general, no clear connection can be seen, but in some cases it is possible that aes rude followed the weight standard of the Roman libra or its subfractions. Investigation into this matter is complicated because, over time, the libral standard was subject to changes and reductions. Dating aes rude from a votive deposit is difficult as these features in general do not have a stratigraphy.

FIG. 4 shows the weights of all aes rude from the Hellenistic Votive Deposit. The great majority of these weigh less than 10 g, with a preponderance of those weighing 9 g (32 pieces). Above this weight a decrease in numbers is seen, with two marked peaks of 12 and 17 g. Coming near to 20 g, numbers again decrease while within the range of 20–30 g, three small peaks of aes rude weighing 20, 23 and 30 g can be noticed. There are few aes rude heavier than 30–32 g. Aes rude weighing more than 49 g only occur as isolated specimens or in very small clusters of two specimens, for instance those of 82/83 g and 143/144 g. The heaviest specimen is an isolated aes rude of 294 g.

Observing this whole range of weights, particularly the “cloud” between 1 and 20 g, it is clear that these aes rude are not generally exact subfractions of the Roman libra of circa 325 g. Within the cloud of 1–20 g, a peak of 12 g might still be understandable as a light semuncia, but those of 4–9 g cannot be identified as subfractions. Also the clearly recognizable “pinnacle” of 25 aes rude weighing 17 g is quite unintelligible in these terms. Furthermore, no peak is visible around 27 g, the weight of an uncia. However, among the heavier specimens, a link can be cautiously suggested. The aes rude weighing 52–55 g can be considered sextantes while those of 82 and 84 g might be quadrantes. In addition, the two aes rude of 102 and 104 g may be light trientes, the weights of 143 and 144 g are perhaps light semisses and, finally, the heaviest aes rude of 294 g can be understood as a light libral as.

Thus, it is impossible to define the aes rude as subfractions of the libra with any certainty. However, the heavier specimens do suggest that the libra and its subfractions may have been used as units. If the aes rude were used within this weight system, we might imagine that several lumps were weighed together to make up a “correct” subfraction of the libra, or that a correct weight was not considered something important.

We also checked whether the more or less regular, hammered lumps (category 2 above), are more consistently in accordance with the libra and its subfractions.¹ There are 98 specimens of regular aes rude, shown in FIG. 5, and they thus form a minority as compared to the irregular aes rude (370 specimens; a proportion of 1:3.7). Compared to FIG. 4, the whole cloud of light aes rude of 1–7 g has disappeared. Peaks show weights of 7–8 g (quartuncia?), 13–14 g (semuncia?), 20 and 23 g (light unciae??) and, finally, a small cluster around 32 g. Surprisingly, the “pinnacle” of 17 g remains, with 16 specimens (total: 25 specimens). This means that the “regular” aes rude in general terms have the same pattern as the entire corpus: there is no convincing evidence that they were produced as subfractions of the Roman libra.

While it may be tempting to suggest the use of another, for instance, local weight standard for the Satrican aes rude, at the moment there is no good evidence for this. A weight of 267 g was found on the acropolis of Satricum in an archaic context. If we were to accept this as an “alternative” libra,² we could explain the prominent presence of aes rude weighing 17 g as semuncia + quartuncia.¹ However, in the present state of knowledge, this kind of speculation is fruitless.

The published aes rude finds at Ghiaccio Forte, however, give us an opportunity to make a comparison.² At this site, 183 bronze lumps were found of which 61 specimens underwent metallographic analysis to determine their metal content.³ All aes rude were also categorized into groups according to their shape. Five different groups were recognized, two of which – the two groups of *pani rotondi* (groups 1c and 1d) – do not occur at Satricum. On the contrary, the hammered, regular aes rude seem scarce at Ghiaccio Forte (the *piano-convessi*, group 1f). Like at Satricum (see below), a number of lumps from Ghiaccio Forte were cast in holes simply dug in the ground.⁴ As far as the weights are concerned, a first, global look reveals a significant similarity between the two find assemblages, although with some minor differences. Both share a whole mass of lumps weighing 3–10/12 g, with a peak of 7–9 g, followed by a lesser concentration around 15–20 g, and a peak of aes rude weighing 17–19 g. Then both show a gradual decline above 30 g. In short, we can state that aes rude from both sites are

clearly not exact subdivisions of the libra of 325 g, while they do share the same overall pattern with more or less the same peaks of 7-9 and 17-19 g. If more aes rude assemblages demonstrate the same pattern, this might indicate the existence of a different weight system.

Furthermore, importantly, in comparing the aes rude with coin weights, we should realize that even all the official denominations of almost all the series of aes grave vary considerably in weight. The asses of the Janiform head/head of Mercury (RRC 14, 280-270 BC) have an average weight of 306 g, but the different specimens weigh circa 285-350/360 g; the unciae of this series 20-30 g.⁵ The same goes for the second Janiform head/head of Mercury series (RRC 25, 241-235 BC). Asses, with an average of circa 250 g, weigh 230-270 g and the sextantes of this series 44-50 g with an average of 48 g. The RRC 35 Janus/prow asses (225-217 BC), with an average of 267 g, weigh 250/255-299/307 g, the sextantes 37/38-49/50 g and the unciae 18/19-25/27 g. The no longer cast but struck lower denominations, sextantes, unciae, semunciae and quartunciae of the RRC 38 series (217-215 BC), seem to show more consistent weights, while the asses of this series weigh 120/130-149/150 g. This flexible attitude towards weights was continued in the 2nd century BC. The weights of the AE coins of, for instance, the RRC 50, RRC 57, RRC 117, RRC 118, RRC 144, RRC 150, RRC 162, etc. differ considerably; the individual asses of these series have different weights, that is, the average weights of a quadrans or a triens.⁶ Also the other denominations differ considerably.⁷ In short, we are left with the impression that accurate weights were not considered something important, not even for “official” coins with clear marks of value.

In conclusion, although it must have been easy from ancient times onwards to make standard moulds to cast bronze lumps with proper weights according to the division of a, for instance, libral weight standard, this was never done. On the contrary, from the very irregular forms of the aes rude it may be deduced that casting was accomplished by simply pouring molten bronze into little holes made in the ground, where it would cool down and form irregular shapes. Sometimes little plant roots can still be discerned in the solidified metal. We may conclude that there must have been a reason for casting in this way, but the reason will remain a mystery to us. As for the official cast coins with value marks, the differing weights of the individual denominations belonging to the same series demonstrate an apparently similar flexible attitude.

Coins and aes rude side by side

There is one interesting passage in book xxvi where Livy mentions aes rude.¹ He tells us that when in 211 BC Hannibal and his soldiers robbed the wealthy sanctuary of Feronia near Capena of its gold and silver, great heaps of bronze (*aeris acervi*) were found after their departure. Livy gives us the reason: the soldiers did so because they were inspired by religious fear and therefore deposited (*iacerent*) crude lumps (*cum rudera*).² Apart from rightly connecting the depositing of aes rude (“inspired by religious fear”) and sanctuaries, Livy states that the aes rude was offered by the Carthaginian soldiers. On the contrary, we surmise that the bronze was already present in the sanctuary and may have been collected by the soldiers to take away as booty, but was then left behind in favour of the gold and silver, which were much richer spoils. On this reading, Livy may not have realized that the offering of aes rude was an honourable Latin tradition. This misunderstanding by Livy is one indication that in his time the offering of aes rude in sanctuaries was no longer practised.

But when was the practice of offering aes rude discontinued? It seems clear that the practice of offering coins in sanctuaries was embedded in practices that developed through the use of aes rude, a tradition that people had maintained for centuries. Did the coins immediately replace the aes rude, or did coins and aes rude exist side by side for a certain period during the 3rd century BC?

The finds at the Latin colony of Cosa, which was founded in 273 BC, may give some indication. In the publications of the extensive excavations at this site, only two specimens of aes rude are listed.³ If this virtual absence of aes rude is not an indication that the use of aes rude was already fading away in this period, then local or regional aspects may have played a role. The foundation deposits at the sanctuary of Sol Indiges at Tor Vaianica dated around the same decade, consisted only of aes grave from the oldest series and no aes rude.⁴ These two observations seem to indicate that from their very introduction coins took over the role of aes rude as used in sanctuaries.

However, the Pratica di Mare hoard seems to indicate that the use of aes rude continued for longer.² This very intriguing and unique hoard consists of five aes rude – two of which are fragments of currency bars – and 39 bronze coins.³ The hoard was found in a building in the forum of ancient Lavinium, which was destroyed by fire and never rebuilt. Molinari assumes that this large building with rooms opening on to a central courtyard must have had a public function;⁴ the hoard was probably stored on the first floor when the fire broke out.⁵ This means that the context is probably “profane” and not “sacred”. She further suggests that the building was burnt down during the first Punic War when the coast was raided by the Carthaginians. This raises the question why this building, on this prominent spot in the city, was never rebuilt. Even the ruined area itself was never cleared up. This implies that the city of Lavinium was, already from the end of the first Punic War onwards, in a severe state of decay before its abandonment in the next century. Another event, closer to the 2nd century BC, can also be suggested to be responsible for the destruction of the building: a plunder of the city by Carthaginians during Hannibal’s short stay before the gates of Rome in 211 BC.⁶

In regard to the find itself, Molinari stresses the presence of both aes rude and Campanian coins and the absence of Roman coins, struck or cast. She also mentions that the weight of the total hoard (285,56 g) is equal to the weight of a light libral as. In addition, it is important to note that also in the five lumps of aes rude subdivisions of the as may be recognized: a sextans of 48.32 g, an uncia of 22.82 g, a lump of 17.32 g between an uncia and a semuncia, a semuncia of 10.29 g and a quartuncia of 5,50 g. Together they form a complete range of weights from quartuncia to sextans. Official aes grave sextantes and unciae of these weights occur in the series RRC 24 (265-241 BC), RRC 25 (241-235 BC), RRC 27 (235-225 BC) and RRC 35 (225-217 BC). The weights of these denominations thus match the weights of the aes rude in the Pratica di Mare hoard. They all belong to roughly the same period, namely the mid-late 3rd century BC.

The apparently careful selection of weights makes this hoard even more fascinating, although this phenomenon is difficult to

interpret. Were the coins used as aes rude, that is, only to form the total weight of a light libral as? Were these lumps meant to indicate the weights in use in the area? Or were the aes rude used as coins? Perhaps this modern distinction does not help us to understand the use of coins and aes rude in this period. Both found their way to votive deposits in Latium in the 3rd century. The Pratica di Mare hoard, where coins and aes rude are found together in what is probably a “profane” context, not only illustrates that Greek coins were entering the region in larger quantities than ever before, but also seems to indicate that both coins and aes rude were still used in a similar way in the second half of the 3rd century BC.

In conclusion, it seems that aes rude were still in use in the 3rd century BC, the period that saw Rome’s transition from a society without coins to a society that during the second Punic War started to issue one of the most sophisticated coinages the ancient world had ever seen, consisting of a whole range of denominations on a large scale and based on three metals. The interaction between aes rude/currency bars, bronze cast coins (“aes grave”) and bronze struck coins (Romano-Campanian) during this transition certainly deserves further investigation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BAHRFELDT 1899-1900: M. v. BAHRFELDT, *Le monete romano-campane*, «RIItNum», 12, 1899, pp. 387-446 & «RIItNum», 13, 1900, pp. 11-84.
- BALBI DE CARO 1988: S. BALBI DE CARO, *Due serie in bronzo a leggenda “romano” dal deposito votivo di Vicarello*, «RIItNum», 90, 1988, pp. 83-124.
- BALDASSARRI *et alii* 2007: M. BALDASSARRI, G. CRISTOFORRETTI, I. FANTOZZI, M. FIRMATI, S. LEGNAIOLI, V. PALLESCHI, A. SALVETTI, E. TOGNONI, *Analisi LIBS di esemplari di Aes Rude proveniente dall’abitato etrusco di Ghiaccio Forte (Scansano-GR)*, in *Atti del IV Congresso di Archeometria, Scienza e Beni Culturali, Pisa 2006*, a cura di C. D’Amico, Bologna, Pàtron, 2007, pp. 561-574.
- BARBATO 2016: M. BARBATO, *Presenza di moneta straniera a Roma in epoca tardo-repubblicana: il caso delle monete di Cirene*, in *Le monete di Cirene e della Cirenaica nel Mediterraneo. Problemi e prospettive*, a cura di M. Asolati, Padova, Esedra, 2016, pp. 141-156.
- BARBATO, VALCI 2018: M. BARBATO, M. VALCI, *Monete dagli scavi dell’area sacra di Largo di Torre Argentina. Documenti d’archivio e nuove riflessioni*, «BCom», 119, 2018, pp. 39-74.
- BERNARD 2018: S. BERNARD, *The Social History of Early Roman Coinage*, «JRS», 108, 2018, pp. 1-26.
- BIELLA 2006: M. C. BIELLA, *Contributo per una rilettura della stipe di Carsoli: i rinvenimenti del 1906*, «ArchCl», 57, 2006, pp. 347-370.
- BOUMA 1996: J. BOUMA, *Religio Votiva: the Archaeology of Latial Votive Religion: the 5th-3rd c. BC Votive Deposit South West of the Main Temple at “Satricum” Borgo Le Ferriere*, Groningen, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, 1996.
- BOUMA 2001: J. BOUMA, *Understanding a Local Economy: a 5th to 3rd century BC Votive Deposit at Satricum, Borgo Le Ferriere (Italy)*, «Caeculus», 4, 2001, pp. 57-68.
- BURNETT 1977: A. M. BURNETT, *The Coinages of Rome and Magna Graecia in the Late Fourth and Third centuries B.C.*, «SchwNumRu», 56, 1977, pp. 92-121.
- BURNETT 1982: A. M. BURNETT, *The Currency of Italy from the Hannibalic War to the Reign of Augustus*, «AnnIstItNum», 29, 1982, pp. 125-137.
- BURNETT 1989: A. M. BURNETT, *The Beginnings of Roman Coinage*, «AnnIstItNum», 36, 1989, pp. 33-64.
- BURNETT, CRAWFORD 2014: A. M. BURNETT, M. H. CRAWFORD, *Coinage, Money, and Mid-Republican Rome. Reflections on a Recent Book by Filippo Coarelli*, «AnnIstItNum», 60, 2014, pp. 231-265.
- BURNETT, MOLINARI 2015: A. M. BURNETT, M. C. MOLINARI, *The Capitoline Hoard and the Circulation of Silver Coins in Central and Northern Italy in the Third Century BC*, in *FIDES: Contributions to Numismatics in Honor of Richard B. Witschonke*, edited by P. Van Alfen, G. Bransbourg, M. Amandry, New York, American Numismatic Society, 2015, pp. 21-125.
- BUTTREY 1980: T. V. BUTTREY, *Cosa. The Coins*, «MemAmAc», 34, 1980, pp. 11-153.
- CASTAGNOLI *et alii* 1975: F. CASTAGNOLI, L. COZZA, M. FENELLI, M. GUAITOLI, *Lavinium II: le tredici are*, Roma, De Luca, 1975.
- CATALI 2005: F. CATALI, *Materiali numismatici dal santuario di Casalvieri (Sora)*, in *Depositi votivi e culti dell’Italia antica dall’età arcaica a quella tardo-repubblicana*, a cura di A. Comella, S. Mele, Bari, Edipuglia, 2005, pp. 145-151.
- CATALI 2014: F. CATALI, *Le Monete*, in *Il santuario di Diana a Nemi. Le terrazze e il ninfeo. Scavi 1989-2009*, a cura di P. Braconi, F. Coarelli, F. Diosono, G. Ghini, Roma, L’Erma di Bretschneider, 2014, pp. 529-535.
- CEDERNA 1951: A. CEDERNA, *Carsoli. Scoperta di un deposito votivo del III secolo av. Cr. (prima campagna di scavo)*, «NSc», 1951, pp. 169-224.
- CESANO 1913: L. CESANO, *La stipe di un antico sacrario riconosciuto sulla Via Prenestina*, «BCom», 41, pp. 48-53.
- CESANO 1942a: S. L. CESANO, *Ardea-Ripostiglio monetale romano del principio del III secolo av. Cr.*, «NSc», 1942, pp. 396-403.
- CESANO 1942b: S. L. CESANO, *Via Tiberina-stipe monetale del IV-II secolo av. Cr.*, «NSc», 1942, pp. 383-395.
- COLONNA 2007: G. COLONNA, *Le iscrizioni di Satricum*, in *Satricum. Trenta anni di scavi olandesi*, a cura di M. Gnade, Amsterdam, Amsterdams Archeologisch Centrum, 2007, pp. 98-99.
- CRAWFORD 1969: M. H. CRAWFORD, *Roman Republican Coin Hoards*, London, Royal Numismatic Society, 1969.
- CRAWFORD 1974: M. H. CRAWFORD, *Roman Republican Coinage*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- CRAWFORD 1983: M. H. CRAWFORD, *Coins*, in *Mysteries of Diana. The Antiquities from Nemi in Nottingham Museums*, edited by A. MacCormick *et alii*, Nottingham, Castle Museum, 1983, pp. 71-84.
- CRAWFORD 1985: M. H. CRAWFORD, *Coinage and Money under the Roman Republic: Italy and the Mediterranean Economy*, London, Methuen & Co Ltd, 1985.
- CRAWFORD 2003: M. H. CRAWFORD, *Thesauri, Hoards and Votive Deposits*, in *Sanctuaires et sources dans l’antiquité. Les sources documentaires et leurs limites dans la description des lieux de culte*, édité par O. De Cazanove, J. Scheid, Napoli, Centre Jean Bérard, 2003, pp. 69-84.
- FREY-KUPPER 1995: S. FREY-KUPPER, *Monete dal Tevere. I rinvenimenti “greci”*, «BNumRoma», 25, 1995, pp. 33-73.
- FREY-KUPPER 2014: S. FREY-KUPPER, *Coins and Their Use in the Punic Mediterranean: Case Studies from Carthage to Italy from the Fourth to the First century BCE*, in *The Punic Mediterranean. Identities and Identification from Phoenician Settlement to Roman Rule*, edited by J. Crawley-Quinn, N. C. Vella, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2014, pp. 76-112.
- GINGE 1996: B. GINGE, *Excavations at Satricum (Borgo le Ferriere) 1907-1910: Northwest Necropolis, Southwest Sanctuary and Acropolis*, Amsterdam, Thesis, 1996.
- GNADE 2007: *Satricum. Trenta anni di scavi olandesi*, a cura di M. Gnade, Amsterdam, Amsterdams Archeologisch Centrum, 2007.
- GNADE 2019: M. GNADÉ, *Satricum as a Mid-Republican town*, in *Oltre “Roma Medio Repubblicana”: Il Lazio fra i Galli e la battaglia di Zama: Atti del convegno internazionale Roma, 7-8-9 giugno*, a cura di F. M. Cifarelli, S. Gatti, D. Palombi, Roma, Quasar, 2019, pp. 185-194.
- HAACK 2016: M.-L. HAACK, *Les offrandes votives en Italie: ne plus faire corps dans l’Etrurie hellénistique*, in *Figurines antiques d’ici et d’ailleurs. Itinéraire coroplastique de la Picardie au bassin méditerranéen*, édité par A. Bossard, D. Piton, Senlis, Société archéologique de Picardie, 2016 («Revue Archéologique de Picardie», 31), pp. 129-136.
- HELDING 2007: B. HELDING, *Il deposito votivo III: una cisterna prima, un deposito votivo dopo*, in *Satricum. Trenta anni di scavi olandesi*, a cura di M. Gnade, Amsterdam, Amsterdams Archeologisch Centrum, 2007, pp. 78-81.

- HELDLING, STIBBE 1991: B. HELDRING, C. M. STIBBE, *Scavi a Satricum: campagne 1988 e 1989*, «Archeologia laziale», 10, 1991, pp. 229-233.
- JAIA, MOLINARI 2011: A. M. JAIA, M. C. MOLINARI, *Two Deposits of Aes Grave from the Sanctuary of Sol Indiges (Torvaianica/Rome): The Dating and Function of the Roman Libral Series*, «NumChron», 171, 2011, pp. 87-97.
- JOHNSTON 1989: A. JOHNSTON, *The Bronze Coinage of Metapontum*, in *Numismatic Studies in Memory of C.M. Kraay and O. Mørkholm*, edited by G. Le Rider, I. Jenkins, N. Waggoner, Louvain-la-Neuve, Institut supérieur d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'art, séminaire de numismatique Marcel Hoc, 1989, pp. 121-136.
- KEMMERS 2016: F. KEMMERS, *Coin Use in the Roman Republic*, in *Neue Forschungen zur Münzprägung der Römischen Republik. Beiträge zum internationalen Kolloquium im Residenzschloss Dresden 19.-21. Juni 2014*, hrsg. von F. Von Haymann, W. Hollstein, W. Jehne, M. Jehne, Bonn, Habelt, 2016, pp. 347-372.
- LOUWAARD 2007: M. LOUWAARD, *L'acropoli: l'edificio di età medio-repubblicana*, in *Satricum. Trenta anni di scavi olandesi*, a cura di M. Gnade, Amsterdam, Amsterdams Archeologisch Centrum, 2007, pp. 75-77.
- MENGARELLI 1898: R. MENGARELLI, *Conca. Nuove scoperte nella tenuta di Conca nel territorio dell'antica Satricum*, «NSc», 1898, pp. 166-171.
- MENGARELLI 1903: R. MENGARELLI, *Gli scavi di Satricum (Ferriere di Conca)*, in *Atti del congresso internazionale di scienze storiche (vol. 5)*, Roma, Tipografia della Reale Accademia dei Lincei, 1903, pp. 267-272.
- MOLINARI 2004: M. C. MOLINARI, *Un ripostiglio di aes grave proveniente dai Colli Vaticani (Roma)*, «BCom», 105, 2004, pp. 115-122.
- MOLINARI 2011: M. C. MOLINARI, *A Hoard of Bronze Coins of the Third Century BC Found at Pratica di Mare (Rome)*, in *Proceedings of the XIVth International Numismatic Congress*, edited by N. Holmes, Glasgow, International Numismatic Council, 2011, pp. 828-838.
- NIJBOER 1994: A. J. NIJBOER, *A Pair of Early Fixed Metallic Monetary Units from Borgo Le Ferriere (Satricum)*, «NumChron», 154, 1994, pp. 1-16.
- PANVINI ROSATI 1967: F. PANVINI ROSATI, *Monete della stipe di Vicarello nel Museo nazionale romano*, «RendPontAc», 40, 1967, pp. 57-74.
- PIATTELLI 1987: S. PIATTELLI, *Circolazione delle monete romano-campane di bronzo*, «RItNum», 99, 1987, pp. 15-28.
- PULCINELLI 2015: L. PULCINELLI, *Monete e circolazione monetaria in Etruria meridionale nel III secolo a.C.*, «ArchCl», 66, 2015, pp. 481-492.
- RUTTER 2001: *Historia numorum. Italy*, edited by N. K. Rutter, London, The British Museum Press, 2001.
- STANNARD 2018a: C. STANNARD, *'Chopped' Neapolitan Bronze Coins at Minturnae, Overstrikes with Roman Types, and the Coins Stock in Southern Latium and Northern Campania about 200 BC*, «NumChron», 178, 2018, pp. 99-106.
- STANNARD 2018b: C. STANNARD, *The Crisis of Small Change in Central Italy of the Second and First Centuries BC, and the Function of Overstriking*, «RBelgNum», 164, 2018, pp. 97-170.
- STEURES, HELDRING forthcoming: D. STEURES, B. HELDRING, *The Hellenistic Votive Deposit of Satricum*, forthcoming.
- STIBBE 1980: C. M. STIBBE, *Il tempio di Satricum ed il luogo di culto sottostante*, «Archeologia laziale», 3, 1980, pp. 172-176.
- SYDENHAM 1926: E. A. SYDENHAM, *Aes Grave: A Study of the Cast Coinages of Rome and Central Italy*, London, Spink and Son, 1926.
- TALIERCIO MENSITIERI 1998: M. TALIERCIO MENSITIERI, *Le emissioni romano-campane di bronzo*, in *La monetazione romano-campana. Atti del x convegno del centro internazionale di studi numismatici - Napoli 18-19 giugno 1993*, Roma, Istituto italiano di numismatica, 1998, pp. 49-140.
- THURLOW, VECCHI 1979: B. K. THURLOW, I. VECCHI, *Italian Cast Coinage: A Descriptive Catalogue of the Primitive Cast Bronze Money of Ancient Rome and her Dependencies*, London, Vecchi & Sons, 1979.
- VITALE 1998: R. VITALE, *Catalogo dei rinvenimenti sporadici, in stipe, in ripostigli*, in *La monetazione romano-campana. Atti del x convegno del centro internazionale di studi numismatici (Napoli 18-19 giugno 1993)*, Roma, Istituto italiano di numismatica, 1998, pp. 217-351.
- WAARSENBURG, MAAS 2001: D. WAARSENBURG, H. MAAS, *Gods, Men and Money. Reflections on a Protohistoric Bronze Hoard from the Temple of Mater Matuta at Satricum (Latium)*, «Caeculus», 4, 2001, pp. 45-56.
- WAARSENBURG 1995: D. J. WAARSENBURG, *The Northwest Necropolis of Satricum: an Iron Age Cemetery in Latium Vetus*, Amsterdam, Thesis, 1996.
- WAARSENBURG 1997: D. J. WAARSENBURG, *Un secolo di studi su Satricum: saggio di ricerca bibliografica*, «MededRom», 56, 1997, pp. 1-36.
- WILLIAMS 2011: D. WILLIAMS, *Note sulla circolazione monetaria in Etruria meridionale nel III secolo a.C.*, in *Proceedings of the XIVth international numismatic congress*, edited by N. Holmes, Glasgow, International Numismatic Council, 2011, pp. 1103-1113.

APPENDICES

In all appendices, the coins are listed per type. For the Greek and Romano-Campanian coins, we list the following details for each individual specimen: weight; die axis (da); readable legend; specific details; specific type; any other comments; inventory number. For the coins from the Villa Giulia, the die axis is only noted for RRC 16 and RRC 17, since we were not able to check the other coins. For the cast coins and the Republican issues after 225, the following details are listed: weight; type; denomination; date; inventory number. Diameters are given only for the undefined coins. Coins marked with an asterisk are illustrated.

APPENDIX 1

Catalogue of the coins in the Hellenistic Votive Deposit

This catalogue presents all the known coin finds from the Hellenistic Votive Deposit at Satricum. The coins found during the 1896 excavation are stored in the Villa Giulia Museum; their inventory number (inv. no.) starts with "VG". The coins found during the NIR excavations are stored at the Satricum site, and are presented here with their project inventory number.

1. Greek coins

NEAPOLIS

Head of Apollo, laur., r. / protome of man-faced bull r., usually with star, above, legend

ca. 325-300 BC, bullet flan (exc. no. 4: round flan), Taliercio gruppo 1a-c, cf. SNG Mün. 257-264, HNIIt 568-570, 574-575.

1. 4.49 g, da: 4, inv. no. 53.
2. 5.54 g, da: 10, rev.: .EO., Tal. 1b?, chop mark on obverse; inv. no. 54.
3. 3.89 g, da: 11, rev.: ..OΛ.. and star, Tal. 1b, inv. no. 55.
4. 3.37 g, da: 2, Tal. 1a, very corroded, inv. no. 56.
5. *2.65 g, da: 6, rev.: ..AI.. and star, Tal. 1c?, chop mark on obverse, inv. no. 57.
6. *4.84 g, da: 3, rev.: .EΘΠOAI.. and star?, Tal. 1a, chop mark on reverse, inv. no. 58.
7. 3.59 g, da: 7, Tal. 1b, very worn, chop mark on reverse, inv. no. 72.
8. 3.77 g, da: 12, inv. no. VG11630/3-2.

9. 2.61 g, da: 3, inv. no. VG11630/3-14.

Head of Apollo, laur., r., before, legend / man-faced bull r., above, symbol, legend in ex.

ca. 300-275 BC, bullet flan (except no. 11: oval flan), Taliercio gruppo 11A.

10. 4.38 g, da: 6, rev., above: star, cf. Tal. 11A/1-3, ANS 444, HNIIt 573, inv. no. 49.
11. 5.11 g, da: 10, obv.: ..TΩN; rev., above: star, cf. Tal. 11A/1-3, ANS 444, HNIIt 573, inv. no. 71.
12. 2.86 g, da: 8, rev., above: uncertain symbol, overstruck?, HNIIt 582?, inv. no. 8.
13. 2.49 g, da: 9, rev., above: helmet, Tal. 11A/26, HNIIt 582, inv. no. VG11628-2.

Head of Apollo, laur., l., before, legend / man-faced bull r., crowned by flying Nike

ca. 270-250 BC, usually round flan, Taliercio gruppo 111A, cf. SNG ANS 465-506, HNIIt 489-590.

14. 4.25 g, da: 2, obv.: ..O.., inv. no. 61.
15. *3.43 g, da: 5, obv.: NEOΠOΛITΩN; rev.: OΣ (between legs), ΙΣ (in ex.), inv. no. 10.
16. 2.71 g, da: 6, obv.: .EΠI.., inv. no. 19.
17. 2.73 g, da: 6, rev., between legs: ΙΣ? inv. no. VG11630/3-16.

CAMPANIAN ISSUES

Head of Apollo / man-faced bull crowned by flying Nike

ca. 270-250 BC, cf. Taliercio 111A-c.

18. 4.88 g, da: 4, inv. no. 60.
19. 4.46 g, da: 2, inv. no. 59.
20. 3.14 g, da: 7, inv. no. 25.
21. 5.10 g, inv. no. VG11630/3-19.
22. 4.07 g, inv. no. VG11628-1.
23. 3.74 g, inv. no. VG11630/3-15.
24. 2.52 g, inv. no. VG11630/3-17.
25. 4.48 g, inv. no. VG11630/3-18.

TEANUM SIDICINUM

Head of Apollo / man-faced bull crowned by flying Nike

ca. 260-240 BC, HNIIt 455.

26. *3.81 g, da: 6, obv. Oscan legend Y.N.., rev., in ex.: M?, inv. no. 51.

SUESSA AURUNCA

Head of Hermes l. / Herakles fighting lion, club between legs

ca. 270-240 BC, cf. SNG ANS 602, HNIIt 448.

27. 4.66 g, da: 11, legend not visible, irregular flan, inv. no. 50.

Head of Apollo, laur., r. / man-faced bull r., crowned by flying Nike

ca. 270-250 BC, cf. SNG ANS 604-8, HNIIt 450.

28. 3.09 g, da: 8, rev., in ex.: .VES ..., inv. no. 15.

VELIA

Head of Athena r. / owl to l.

later 3rd c. BC, cf. SNG Cop. 1607, HNIIt 1338.

29. 1.66 g, da: 2, rev.: legend at l.?, inv. no. 79.

II. Punic coins

Head l. / charging horse to r.

ca. 350/340-330 BC, cf. SNG Cop. 94-97 (date based on FREY-KUPPER 2014).

30. 3.43 g, inv. no. VG11630/3-20.
31. 2.00 g, da: 1, small thick and round flan (diam. 12 mm), inv. no. 52.
32. 1.85 g, da: 9, inv. no. 69.

Palm-tree / horse's head r.

ca. 330-310 BC, cf. SNG Cop. 102-105 (date based on FREY-KUPPER 2014).

33. *5.04 g, da: 11, inv. no. 7.

III. Roman coins

ROMANO-CAMPANIAN

Female head r. / lion r.; in ex. ROMANO (double litra)

ca. 270 BC, RRC 16/1A, HNIIt 276. NB: all specimens have a "pointed" bullet flan.

34. *10.42 g, da: 10, obv.: earring?/ rev.: spear in mouth, inv. no. 30.
35. 9.80 g, da: 6, .OMANO, rev.: left forepaw with spear; not in mouth, inv. no. VG11629.
36. 8.28 g, da: 8, rev.: above, at l.: legend? inv. no. 31.

37. *6.77 g, da: 2, .OMANO, obv.: necklace / rev.: spear in mouth, inv. no. 29.

Female head r. / lion l.; in ex. ROMANO (double litra)

ca. 270 BC, cf. Hunter part 1, 8, HNIIt 277. NB: "pointed" bullet flan.

38. *9.34 g, da: 10, ..M.N., rev.: above lion, 4 dots in line, inv. no. 14.

Head of Minerva l. / horse's head r., bridled, on tablet; behind, ROMANO upwards (litra)

ca. 270-250 BC, RRC 17/1a, HNIIt 278. NB: all specimens have a "pointed" bullet flan, unless otherwise stated.

- 39. *2.54 g, da: 6, ROMANO, re-struck on 1/4 part of coin, inv. no. 24.
- 40. 4.76 g, da: 9, ..MANO, inv. no. 22.
- 41. 3.64 g, da: 1, rev: no base, inv. no. 4.
- 42. 5.41 g, da: 3, ROMA., round flan, inv. no. 3.
- 43. 5.02 g, da: 2, inv. no. 2.
- 44. 4.60 g, da: 1, rev.: rectangular die, inv. no. 1.
- 45. *3.84 g, da: 6, ..MAN., rev: base off flan, inv. no. 36.
- 46. 3.90 g, da: 11, ROMA., inv. no. 39.
- 47. *7.14 g, da: 8, ROMA., very thick, oval flan with projecting part of casting channel, inv. no. 40.
- 48. 4.29 g, da: 1, RO..., inv. no. 41.
- 49. 3.23 g, da: 11, .OMAN., round flan, inv. no. 42.
- 50. *4.78 g, da: 12, ..MAN., inv. no. 70.
- 51. 3.81 g, da: 9, rev.: no base, inv. no. 23.
- 52. 3.54 g, da: 11, inv. no. 5.
- 53. 3.48 g, da: 2, large round flan, inv. no. 32.
- 54. 5.48 g, da: 12, ..MA., round, thick flan, inv. no. 34.
- 55. 6.01 g, da: 12, inv. no. 35.
- 56. 2.49 g, da: 6, rev.: blundered; re-struck? inv. no. 38.
- 57. 4.01 g, da: ?, obv.: nothing visible, inv. no. 26.
- 58. 5.27 g, da: 3, inv. no. 8ob.
- 59. 5.29 g, da: 3, thick flan, rev.: horse not bridled, inv. no. 100.

Head of Minerva r. / horse's head r., bridled, on base; usually behind, ROMANO (litra)

ca. 270-250 BC, RRC 17/1d, HNIIt 278. NB: all specimens have a "pointed" bullet flan.

- 60. 2.94 g, da: 9, obv.: legend? rev., behind: ..MAN., crude style, inv. no. 6.
- 61. 3.74 g, da: 1, broken flan, inv. no. 73.
- 62. *3.93 g, da: 9, obv.: RO (below neck), MAN (at r.); rev.: A N O retrograde, inv. no. 37.
- 63. *3.70 g, da: 10, rev.: C(?)O., halved coin, inv. no. 17.
- 64. 3.53 g, da: 6, obv., before: .MANO; rev.: ROM AN O (around upwards), no base, inv. no. 21.

Head of Minerva l. / horse's head l., behind, ROMANO (litra)

ca. 270-250 BC, RRC 17/1b, HNIIt 278. NB: all specimens have a "pointed" bullet flan.

- 65. *3.71 g, da: 7, obv.: ornamented helmet (cf. RRC 17/1c), rev.: .ON.. (downwards?), without base, inv. no. 43.
- 66. *3.47 g, da: 9, rev.: ROMAO. (downwards), inv. no. 77.

Head of Minerva r.; ROMANO / horse's head l.; ROMANO (litra)

ca. 270-250 BC, cf. RRC 17/1h, HNIIt 278. NB: all specimens have a "pointed" bullet flan, unless otherwise stated.

- 67. *5.03 g, da: 3, obv.: with long curls, from below: RO MA; rev.: bridled, no base, from l.: MA .O, inv. no. 33.
- 68. 3.85 g, da: 7, round flan, inv. no. VG11630/2.

Head of Roma r. / dog r., in ex. ROMA (half-litra)

ca. 235 BC, RRC 26/4, HNIIt 309.

- 69. 1.56 g, da: 5, inv. no. 76.
- 70. 1.44 g, da: 7, inv. no. 46.
- 71. 1.39 g, da: 6, inv. no. 9.

Head of Hercules r., below, club, border of dots / Pegasus r., above, club, below, ROMA (double litra)

ca. 230 BC, RRC 27/3, HNIIt 316.

- 72. *4.72 g, da: 7, pointed flan at one side, inv. no. 48.

CAST COINS / AES GRAVE

ca. 280-225 BC.

- 73. *23.14 g, uncia, knucklebone and pellet/pellet, cf. RRC 14/6, HNIIt 273, 280-270 BC, inv. no. 16.
- 74. 22.16 g, uncia, knucklebone and pellet/ pellet, cf. RRC 14/6, HNIIt 273, 280-270 BC, inv. no. VG11629.
- 75. *16.31 g, semuncia, acorn/ Σ, cf. RRC 14/7, HNIIt 274, 280-270 BC, inv. no. 44.
- 76. *42.55 g, 1/6 part of as, lion's head / horse's head, mint: Praeneste?, Thurlow 45, HNIIt 249, ca. 275-225 BC, inv. no. 11.
- 77. *81.17 g, triens, boar's head r. / lyre, mint: Central Italy?, Thurlow 201, HNIIt 362, ca. 250 BC, inv. no. 12.
- 78. *5.87 g, part of AE cast coin, 3rd c. BC, inv. no. 65.

REPUBLICAN ISSUES AFTER 225 BC

NB: most asses are very corroded.

- 79. 3.88 g, semuncia, RIC 41/11, 215-211 BC, inv. no. VG11630/3-1.

80. 15.32 g, as C. SCR., RRC 201/2, 154 BC, inv. no. VG11630/3-8.
 81. 24.61 g, as, ca. 200-150 BC, inv. no. VG11630/3-7.
 82. 24.35 g, as, ca. 200-150 BC, inv. no. VG11630/3-4.
 83. 22.09 g, as, ca. 200-150 BC, inv. no. VG11630/3-6.
 84. 21.17 g, as, ca. 200-150 BC, inv. no. VG11630/3-3.
 85. 11.94 g, as, ca. 200-150 BC, inv. no. VG11630/3-5.
 86. 14.87 g, triens, ca. 211-200 BC, inv. no. 27.
 87. 4.90 g, triens, rev.: ROMA, ca. 200-100 BC, inv. no. 75.
 88. 3.40 g, triens, ca. 200-100 BC, inv. no. VG11630/3-9.
 89. 5.86 g, sextans, cf. RRC 56/6?, ca. 210-150 BC, inv. no. 47.
 90. 3.15 g, sextans, ca. 210-150 BC, inv. no. 78.
 91. 1.77 g, sextans?, ca. 200-100 BC, inv. no. 99.
 92. 1.59 g, sextans?, ca. 200-100 BC, inv. no. 97.
 93. 1.40 g, sextans, ca. 200-100 BC, inv. no. 45.
 94. 1.15 g, plated denarius P.MAE ANT M.F, RRC 249/1c, 132 BC, inv. no. VG11630/1.
 95. 3.65 g, denarius L.PISO L.F. L.N.FRVTGI, rev.: CXXVI, RRC 340/1, 90 BC, inv. no. 28.

IV. Undefined AE coins

96. 4.75 g, diam. 18 mm, melted AE coin/AR plated, inv. no. 62.
 97. 1.35 g, diam. 15 mm, folded, inv. no. 64.
 98. 2.22 g, diam. 15 mm, inv. no. 63.
 99. 3.98 g, diam. 15 mm, cf. RRC 17?, inv. no. 20.
 100. 3.09 g, diam. 14 mm, cf. Tal. 1? inv. no. 80.
 101. *8.43 g, diam. 18 mm, cast coin? with protruding “ears”; “obv.”: thin central line in high relief, inv. no. 66.
 102. 6.04 g, diam. 19 mm, Campanian issue? inv. no. 13.
 103. 2.95 g, diam. 18 mm, Roman Republic, 2nd century BC? inv. no. 74.
 104. 1.65 g, Roman Republic, 2nd century BC? inv. no. 96.
 105. 1.05 g, Roman Republic, 2nd century BC? inv. no. VG11630/3-12.
 106. 8.00 g, diam. 37 mm, as, ca. 2nd/1st century BC?, inv. no. 18.

v. Currency bars – rim fragments

ca. 300-225 BC.

107. *33.33 g, l. 2,4 cm., w. 1,0 cm., rounded rim, inv. no. 68.
 108. 20.44 g, l. 2,7 cm., w. 1,5 cm., protruding casting seam, inv. no. 67.

APPENDIX 2

The coins “stray finds acropolis”

In the Villa Giulia Museum, a group of 31 coins and two fragments of currency bars found in 1896 are labelled “Stray Finds Acropolis”. When making the inventory in 1991 of all the Satricum finds in this museum, the provenance of this set of coins was not certain at first. We now believe that they may belong to the finds in the Hellenistic Votive Deposit made during the cleaning of the area in 1896 in order to determine the location of the deposit before excavating it. Unfortunately, we have not been able to find evidence for this in the archives of the Villa Giulia. In order to avoid confusion, we present these “stray find” coins separately below.

Of these 31 coins, eight are Romano-Campanian issues; seven Minerva bronzes and one half-litra Roma/dog (RRC 26/4). The Campanian coins consist of one Neapolitan Taliercio I, two “à la Taliercio II”, one with amphora behind the head of Apollo and one with uncertain symbol above the man-faced bull, five Taliercio III, three of which from Naples, one possibly from Nola (HNIIt 607) and one uncertain. Four of the later Roman Republican coins, three semunciae and one quartuncia, were issued during the Second Punic War¹ and four others, three asses and one semis, during the first half of the 2nd century BC or somewhat later. Two fragments of currency bars belong to this group, one with a smooth surface and a carefully executed rim. The weights of these lumps, 23.90 and 22.50 g, can be considered those of slightly lighter unciae. Finally, there is one Punic coin, one small bronze from Velia and, surprisingly, one bronze from Argos with obverse head of Hera wearing stephanos right and reverse Athena Promachos left, dated 280-260 BC (SNG Cop 57). This coin from the Greek city of Argos, however, does not stand alone. Two similar specimens from Casalvieri as well as two from Rome itself, found in the Tiber, have been published.² Four coins could not be identified.

The reasons we believe these coins to be associated with the Hellenistic Votive Deposit are as follows. First, except for two coins found together in a heavily disturbed building on the acropolis perhaps connected to the nearby sanctuary,³ no further coins appeared during the excavations around the temple complex, even though the whole surface of the acropolis was extensively searched with the metal detector. This did not yield any coins or aes rude outside the temenos and the cella⁴ or the areas of the 5th-century BC Votive Deposit II and the Hellenistic Votive Deposit III.⁵ In addition, the coins presented here match the other coin finds in the votive deposit very well, although it is remarkable that the 19th-c. excavations of the deposit yielded only one Minerva bronze, while this group contains seven.

i. Greek coins

NEAPOLIS

Head of Apollo, laur., r. / protome of man-faced bull, above, legend
 ca. 325-290 BC, Taliercio gruppo 1^o-c (-d?), cf. HNIIt 568-570.

1. 3.25 g, rev. star on shoulder?, above .OIIOA., inv. no. VG 11721-17.

Head of Apollo, laur., r., with symbol and legend/ man-faced bull r. with symbol

ca. 290-270 BC, Taliercio gruppo IIa, HNIIt 582.

2. 5.46 g, obv. behind amphora, inv. no. VG 11721-19.
3. 2.29 g, obv head l./rev. uncertain symbol, inv. no. VG 11721-18.

Head of Apollo, laur., l., before, legend / man-faced bull crowned by flying Nike

ca. 270-250 BC, Taliercio gruppo IIIa, HNIIt 589.

4. 3.88 g, VG11721-20.
5. 5.46 g, rev. ΙΣ between legs, "bullet" flan, VG 11714.
6. 3.90 g, obv. ΑΙΤΩΝ, very worn VG 11713.
7. 4.78 g, Campanian? rev. primitive style, worn, irr. flan, inv. no. VG 11721-22.
8. 4.37 g, obv. .Ο../rev. Ν (?) between legs, inv. no. VG 11721-21.

VELIA

Head of Zeus, laur., l. / owl facing, wings open

ca. 3rd c. BC, HNIIt 1327-1330.

9. 1.88 g, worn, inv. no. VG 11717.

ARGOS

Head of Hera, wearing stephanos / Athena Promachos, stg. l., holding shield and spear

ca. 280-260 BC, SNG Cop. 57.

10. 2.95 g, obv.: ΑΡΤΗ on stephanos? worn, inv. no. VG 11721-12.

II. Punic coins

Head l. / horse charging r.

ca. 350/340-330 BC, SNG Cop. 94-97 (date based on Frey-Kupper 2014).

11. 4.79 g, worn, inv. no. VG 11720.

III. Roman coins

ROMANO-CAMPANIAN

Head of Minerva l. / horse's head, bridled, on tablet; behind, ROMANO upwards (litra)

ca. 270-250 BC, RRC 17/1a, HNIIt 278. NB: all specimens have a "pointed" bullet flan, unless otherwise stated.

12. 4.81 g, da: 12, round flan?, inv. no. VG 11721-2.
13. 6.40 g, da 9, rev.: R., inv. no. VG 11721-3.
14. 4.87 g, da: 5, rev.: no tablet, bridled? ROMAN, inv. no. VG 11719-1.
15. 3.99 g, da: 2, round flan, rev.: ROMA, inv. no. VG NN6.2-3.

Head of Minerva r. / horse's head r., bridled, on tablet; usually behind, ROMANO (litra)

ca. 270-250 BC, RRC 17/1d, HNIIt 278, NB: alle specimens have a "pointed" bullet flan, unless otherwise stated.

16. 6.43 g, da: 3, inv. no. VG 11721-1.
17. 5.87 g, da: 6, obv.: gryphon (?) on helmet, rev.: no tablet, ROMA., inv. no. VG 11719-2.
18. 1.66 g, da: 9, light weight, inv. no. VG 11721-9.

Head of Roma r. / dog r., in ex. ROMA (half-litra)

ca. 235 BC, RRC 26/4, HNIIt 309.

19. 0.75 g, da: 7, rev. .OMA, inv. no. VG 11721-8.

REPUBLICAN ISSUES AFTER 225 BC

NB: all asses are very corroded.

20. 1.20 g, quartuncia, RRC 38/8, 217-215 BC, inv. no. VG 11716.
21. 3.34 g, semuncia, RRC 41/11, 215-211 BC, inv. no. VG 11721-11.
22. 3.03 g, semuncia, RRC 41/11, 215-211 BC, inv. no. VG 11715.
23. 3.98 g, semuncia, RRC 41/11, 215-211 BC, inv. no. VG 11721-10.
24. 16.30 g, as, 200-150 BC, inv. no. VG 11721-5.
25. 12.38 g, as, 200-150 BC or later, inv. no. VG 1721-7.
26. 20.11 g, as, 200-150 BC, inv. no. VG 11721-6.
27. 9.10 g, semis, 200-150 BC, inv. no. VG 11721-4.

IV. Undefined AE coins

28. 1.48 g, 3rd c. BC? inv. no. VG 11721-15.
29. 1.92 g, inv. no. NN 6.2-2.
30. 7.77 g, Roman? inv. no. VG 11721-16.
31. 3.66 g, very worn, mediaeval or recent, inv. no. VG 11721-14.

ca. 300-225 BC.

32. 23.90 g, 25×17 mm, inv. no. VG NN 1307, box 13.4.
 33. 22.50 g, 24×23 mm, inv. no. VG 11712/1-1.

APPENDIX 3

The “Roman Site” coins

There is another group of 20 coins in the Villa Giulia Museum collected during the 1896-98 campaigns, labelled “Roman Site”. The oldest specimens in this group are one Punic coin and one Lion and one Minerva bronze. These are followed by nine 2nd-century BC asses, of which one is of the series with dog (RRC 122/3), and, again, a plated denarius with T.Q. (RRC 267/1), dated 126 BC. From the imperial era date an as of Domitianus and a sestertius of Marcus Aurelius (RIC 1696). Finally, five coins remained unidentified.

Their precise provenance is unclear; the name “Roman Site” is misleading. The journals of the campaigns leave us with the impression that these coins were found “everywhere” in the city. Although a “Roman villa” was built within the pomerium of the former city during the 1st century AD, it seems very improbable that coins from the 3rd century BC were used in a context of the 1st century AD. On the contrary, two other cult places are known from Satricum. One, called “in the macchia Santa Lucia”, is considered a temple and has yielded some coins.¹ The other is the cult place in the macchia Bottacci; this is considered a very modest and simple building with a “*stipe minore*” in the direct vicinity.² It is known that both these sites were investigated during the 1896-98 campaigns. Unfortunately, the finds were not catalogued and stored in a systematic way. As a consequence, it will remain unclear whether all or some of the coins came from these two sites. It is also possible that these coins come from a find spot – a small hill – just outside the city boundaries of Satricum on the other side of the Astura river towards Campoverde.³

I. Punic coins

Head of Tanit l. / horse's head r.

ca. 300/290-260 BC, SNG Cop. 144-178 (Sardo-Punic; date based on Frey-Kupper 2014).

1. 2.96 g, worn, rev.: letter behind head, inv. no. VG 12340

II. Roman coins

ROMANO-CAMPANIAN

Female head r. / lion walking r.; in ex. ROMANO (double litra)

ca. 270 BC, RRC 16/1a, HNIt 276, “pointed” bullet flan.

2. 4.24 g, da: 11, rev.: tail above head, inv. no. VG 12335-1.

Head of Minerva l. / horse's head r. bridled, on tablet, behind, ROMANO (litra)

ca. 270-250 BC, RRC 17/1a, HNIt 278, “pointed” bullet flan.

3. 5.21 g, da: 7, slightly worn, overstrike, inv. no. VG 12341.

REPUBLICAN ISSUES AFTER 225 BC

NB: most asses are very corroded.

4. 36.00 g, as Dog?, cf. RRC 122/3, 206-195 BC, worn, inv. no. VG 12337.
 5. 26.81 g, as, ca. 200-150 BC, very worn, inv. no. VG 12338.
 6. 23.38 g, as, ca. 200-150 BC, inv. no. VG 12334-1.
 7. 21.17 g, as, ca. 200-150 BC, inv. no. VG 12334-2.
 8. 17.40 g, as, ca. 200-150 BC, inv. no. VG 12334-3.
 9. 17.05 g, as, ca. 200-150 BC, inv. no. VG 12335-7.
 10. 16.75 g, as, ca. 200-150 BC, inv. no. VG 12334-4.
 11. 13.92 g, as, ca. 200-150 BC or later, inv. no. VG 12335-5.
 12. 13.55 g, as, ca. 200-150 BC or later, inv. no. VG 12335-6.
 13. 3.00 g, plated denarius T.Q, RRC 267/1, 126 BC, inv. no. VG 12343.

ROMAN EMPIRE

14. 7.21 g, as Domitianus, very worn, hole above head, 81-96 AD, inv. no. VG 12333.
 15. 18.06 g, sestertius Marcus Aurelius / Faustina I, RIC 1696, 176-181 AD, inv. no. VG 12336.

III. Undefined AE coins

16. 11.41 g, as?, ca. 200-150 BC or later, inv. no. VG 12342-2
 17. 7.95 g, inv. no. VG 12335-3
 18. 5.06 g, inv. no. VG 12335-2
 19. 4.10 g, 3rd c. BC? inv. no. VG 12392-1
 20. 3.53 g, plated? 2nd-1st c. BC? inv. no. VG 12335-4

¹ The following abbreviations are used: RRCH = *Roman Republican Coin Hoards* (CRAWFORD 1969); RRC = *Roman Republican Coinage* (CRAWFORD 1974); HNIIt = *Historia Numorum, Italy* (RUTTER 2001).

² Full publication of the deposit is in preparation (STEURS, HELDRING forthcoming); for a preliminary publication, see HELDRING 2007. Marijke Gnade, current project leader of the Satricum project, generously allowed us to publish the coins from the deposit. Jelle Prins would like to thank the Projectmanagementbureau Amsterdam (PMB) for giving him the opportunity to work on this research. Marleen Termeer contributed to this research in the context of her project “Coining Roman Rule”, which is funded by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) VENI scheme (project number 016.Veni.195.134, University of Amsterdam). Both authors thank Andrew Burnett and Michael Crawford for commenting on a previous draft of this paper; we also thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions. All photos were made by René Gerritsen.

³ Cf. BURNETT, CRAWFORD 2014, p. 263 on the need for more detailed research on the circulation of specifically Rome’s 3rd-century BC early cast coinage.

⁴ While we recognize that this has implications for our understanding of the social role of early Roman coinage (see BERNARD 2018), this is not a line of research that we pursue in this article.

⁵ For a complete bibliography up until 1997, see WAARSENBURG 1997. GNADE 2007 gives an overview of the main findings of the Dutch excavations.

⁶ Livy VII, XXVII.

⁷ As suggested by GNADE 2019, p. 186.

⁸ The mid-Republican archaeological evidence is briefly presented by GNADE 2019.

⁹ Part of the work was published; see MENGARELLI 1898 and MENGARELLI 1903. The documentation on and material from these excavations were re-studied and partly published by Demetrius Waarsenburg and Birgitte Ginge: WAARSENBURG 1995; GINGE 1996. However, neither of these two focuses on the excavations on the acropolis.

¹⁰ The deposit was excavated during four campaigns: 1985, 1986, 1988 and 1989. In 1990 some control trenches were made.

¹¹ During the excavations in the 1980s, Tanagrine statuettes were used as a *guida fossile* to establish whether the area had been excavated in 1896. For instance, those parts that yielded more or less intact Tanagrine terracotta figurines or large fragments of these were supposed to have been left untouched by the former excavators. Comparing the numbers and state of preservation of the Tanagrine statuettes found, we can note that a total of 621 were found during the 1896 and the recent excavations. Of these, 444 are in the Villa Giulia; 208 of the latter are in a more or less entirely preserved state. From the recent excavation, a total of 177 figurines are known, but only two are more or less intact. (Information Monica Prins-Heineman, November 2017, who has studied the Tanagrine statuettes from the Hellenistic Votive Deposit).

¹² STEURS, HELDRING forthcoming.

¹³ STIBBE 1980.

¹⁴ For the aes rude: see BOUMA 1996, Part II, pp. 290-295 (“bronze lumps”). The coins were found in “Stratum 10” (BOUMA 1996, Part II, pp. 104-117 and 294-295). There are two RRC 17/1a issues, one denarius RRC 369/1 and two very worn staters from Hyria, HNIIt 339, dated ca. 405-385 BC.

¹⁵ There is no absolute number of coins. Some “coins” are fragments of unidentified “currency bars”; aes grave or aes rude? No. 101 is a cast, round “aes rude” with two protruding “ears”. See also the section on aes rude.

¹⁶ During the 1980s excavations, Jelle Prins searched systematically – layer by layer, “unit by unit” – with a metal detector (from 1988 onwards) and therefore found the majority of the coins. In 1985 and 1986, 20 coins were found and in 1988 and 1989 (with the use of a metal detector) 64 coins were found.

¹⁷ In the catalogue of finds from Satricum in the Villa Giulia, made in 1896-98, a group is listed as “Stray Finds Acropolis”. These stray finds include coins, including seven Minerva bronzes. Although it is highly likely that these finds belong to the Hellenistic Votive Deposit, we do describe them separately in APPENDIX 2.

¹⁸ Michael Crawford proposed that these 28 Minerva bronzes once formed part of a scattered hoard or even a thesaurus (CRAWFORD 2003, p. 82). Considering that these issues were found dispersed over the whole votive dump, which had already been excavated in 1896, our conclusion is that the 1896 excavators must have missed these coins (like a lot of other coins and votive objects) and put them back when they “restored” the votive deposit with the dump of the excavation.

¹⁹ The 2nd-century BC coins found in 1896 are, for the greatest part, asses with a diameter of 25-30 mm weighing ca. 15-25 g, that is, from the uncial and reduced uncial standard.

²⁰ For the mints and dates of the Punic coins, we follow FREY-KUPPER 2014.

²¹ Vicarello: 9 specimens (BALBI DE CARO 1988, p. 106). Carsoli: 4 specimens (CEDERNA 1951, p. 183). This variety of RRC 16/1a or 16/1b is not mentioned in RRC.

²² Triens HNIIt 362 (obverse: head of boar, four pellets; reverse: lyre, four pellets): 81.17 g. SYDENHAM 1926, no. 173; THURLOW, VECCHI 1979, no. 201 (see p. 40); according to Haeblerlin 23 specimens are known.

²³ The average weight of as HNIIt 249 (obverse: head of lion facing, spear between teeth; reverse: head of horse) is 266 g (HNIIt, p. 44). This fragment weighs 42.55 g, and can therefore be considered as 1/6 as, i.e. the weight of a sextans of the libral weight standard.

²⁴ BALBI DE CARO 1988, pp. 106-119. According to the classification of BAHRFELDT 1899-1900, these Satrican specimens belong to the varieties Dd and Db/Ca.

²⁵ The dates of the Lion (RRC 16) and Minerva bronzes (RRC 17) in particular, and the aes grave in general, are still under debate. For RRC 16 a date is given “before the end of the Pyrrhic War” (CRAWFORD 1985, p. 38) or from 260 (HNIIt, p. 47). Crawford mentions “different mints” and HNIIt situates the mint in southern Italy. For RRC 17, with its countless varieties, Crawford gives a date in the First Punic War (CRAWFORD 1985, p. 38), while Burnett posits that the issue starts after 260 BC, more than a decade after the foundation of Cosa (BURNETT 1989, p. 38); both think that this issue was minted in Cosa. HNIIt prefers also here a later date: from 260 BC (HNIIt, p. 47) onwards and places the mint in Rome. Dating these issues is further complicated as both scarcely show up in hoards (BURNETT 1989, p. 38); they are mostly found in votive deposits; cf. TALIERCIO MENSITIERI 1998, p. 80: “la tendenza a concentrarsi nei depositi votivi”; see also below.

²⁶ On the continued use of 3rd-century BC coins in Italy, see STANNARD 2018b, p. 140. See also BURNETT 1982, p. 131, where he mentions the prolonged use of 3rd-century BC south Italian diobols, which have the same weights as sestertii, at Rossano di Vaglio in the 2nd century BC.

²⁷ For the dates of the Punic coins: FREY-KUPPER 2014. It is noteworthy that the Hellenistic Votive Deposit does not contain any later (i.e. 3rd-century) Punic coins. Elsewhere at Satricum, one 3rd-century Punic coin has been found, at the so-called Roman site; see APPENDIX 3, no. 1.

²⁸ STANNARD 2018a, pp. 99-106 and plates 13 and 14.

²⁹ STANNARD 2018a, p. 101.

³⁰ See WAARSENBURG, MAAS 2001 for the description and interpretation of a hoard of bronze objects that was part of the Archaic Votive Deposit buried under the temple of Mater Matuta. The hoard includes aes rude, and is dated roughly to the 7th-6th century BC. BOUMA 2001, pp. 66-67 discusses the disappearance (in the early 5th century BC) and reappearance (in the late 5th/early 4th century BC) of aes rude from Votive Deposit II at Satricum.

³¹ The greater majority of coins found are poorly or very poorly preserved. What we understand as “Uncertain Campanian” and “à la Taliercio IIIa” are coins with obv. head of Apollo l, rev. man-faced bull r. crowned by flying Nike with no discernible letters between legs or in exergue. Only on two specimens (nos. 15 and 17) from Neapolis are the letters IE visible.

³² Although the presence of 2nd-century BC material (black gloss wares) has been noticed (communication D. Yntema, Aug. 1993), the end of Votive Deposit III has thus far been tentatively dated towards the end of the 3rd century BC (HELDING, STIBBE 1991, p. 231; BOUMA 1996, Part I, pp. 83-84 and notes, HELDRING 2007, pp. 78-81). This date does not match with the coin finds. We must also realize that 2nd-century (bronze) coins remained in circulation during the 1st-century BC when the minting of bronze issues was suspended by the Roman state for some time. So a date in the 1st-century BC remains possible.

³³ Italian cities like Brundisium, Paestum, Velia and Rhegium (and many more) continued issuing sub-denominations of the Roman as (CRAWFORD 1985, p. 71), so coins with value marks in the Roman style became dominant. See KEMMERS 2016, pp. 359-360 for the observation that locally produced bronzes remain important especially in Sicily and southern Italy, while Roman production is more prominent in central Italy. STANNARD 2018b offers an overview of recent work that has drawn attention to the rather large-scale presence of non-Roman bronze coins in Italy in the 2nd and 1st centuries BC, including older coins that remained in circulation; imported coins and “coin blocks”; and locally produced “non-state” coins.

³⁴ This coin, like the other 2nd-century BC issues, could have been lost much later (CRAWFORD 2003, p. 82). See also p. 51 note 4.

³⁵ A cippus found near the altar provides a possible date for the small building programme and mentions the duovir from Antium. Colonna dated the cippus to between 150 and 100/90 BC (see COLONNA 2007 and cat. no 640 on p. 196 in GNADE 2007). The cult of the Mater probably did not come to a sudden stop, but will have faded away gradually.

³⁶ Cf. BOUMA 1996, Part III, pp. 6-8 (map and list of 151 cult places in southern Latium).

³⁷ See also HAACK 2016, p. 132, who observes, with the appearance of the “offrandes de petite taille fabriquées en série, toute une nouvelle population d’offrants, des fidèles qui, jusqu’alors, restaient souvent invisibles”.

³⁸ Female (Mater Matuta, Diana) as well as male deities (Apollo) received bronze and/or bronze coins.

³⁹ In some votive deposits a few silver coins from the 5th and 4th centuries BC are present (Satricum Votive Deposit II, Carsoli, Sora), a period when bronze coins were only very rarely issued in Italy. On the limited presence of silver in Rome and Latium in the 3rd century, see BURNETT, MOLINARI 2015. Other silver coins that do occur in votive deposits are denarii from the 2nd and 1st century BC. See also CRAWFORD 2003, pp. 69-84 about this issue. At Satricum, Votive Deposit II

contained two very worn staters from Hyria, HNIt. 539, dated ca. 405-385 BC (see p. 45, note 5). These are the only Hyrian issues found in Latium Vetus; more examples – single, often in pairs or in one case a trinity – have shown up in hoards from central Italy. In general, when contexts are known, these silver staters occur in contexts dated in the 3rd century BC; see the inventory in BURNETT, MOLINARI 2015, pp. 37-72. These issues are associated with those staters of Nola HNIt 603-605, of which one specimen (HNIt 605) was found in Carsoli (CEDERNA 1951, p. 182).

¹ Although Vicarello is in southern Etruria, we include it in the analysis. See PANVINI ROSATI 1967 and, for the Romano-Campanian issues with legend ROMANO (RRC 16 and 17), BALBI DE CARO 1988.

² CEDERNA 1951 (780 specimens) and PANVINI ROSATI 1967, p. 61 (3,000 specimens).

³ CRAWFORD 1983.

⁴ CESANO 1942b calls the find “la stipe monetale”. CRAWFORD 2003, p. 79 suggests it is an uncertain thesaurus.

⁵ CATALLI 2005.

⁶ CESANO 1942a. Although the find context is poorly recorded, we know the coins were found in the vicinity of a structure built of tufa blocks, dispersed over the area with no container found. Also 31 pieces of aes rude were found.

⁷ This also means that for Satricum, we only take into account the coins from the Hellenistic Votive Deposit. These finds make up the major part of the coins found at Satricum. The few other coin finds include the coins from Votive Deposit II (see p. 45, note 5), the coins presented in APPENDICES 2 and 3, the coins from the sanctuary at *macchia Santa Lucia* (GINGE 1996, appendix 3) and two 3rd-century Campanian coins found in a building near the temple (LOUWAARD 2007, p. 75).

⁸ We are aware of coin finds in other Latial votive deposits at Ponte di Nona, Norba, Lavinium (le Tredici Are), Gabii (sanctuary of Juno & sanctuary outside the walls to the east), Tivoli, Celle, Via Nomentana, Via Prenestina, Porta Capena and Lucus Feroniae (at the conjunction of different territories) and the coins from a probable religious context in the Monte Mario area just outside Rome (MOLINARI 2004). As these have much smaller numbers of coins and low numbers of Romano-Campanian coins and/or aes grave, we exclude them here. There are no known substantial votive deposits from inside the walled area of the city of Rome itself that belong to this period.

⁹ A more complete analysis would need to include individual finds.

¹⁰ In Latium, only two hoards that at first sight might be considered “profane” are known: Ardea 1940 (RRCH 20, CESANO 1942a) and Pratica di Mare (MOLINARI 2011). Ardea may be considered a votive deposit or even a thesaurus (see note 6 on this page). The hoard of Pratica di Mare will be discussed below. No contextual information is known for the hoards of Ariccia (RRCH 13) and Santa Marinella (RRCH 21).

¹¹ Vicarello is unique, due to the enormous number of coins (5,200 specimens) and aes rude. In fact, we know that all the objects offered at the (supposed) *Aquae Apollinares* were metal, some very rich, like the 34 gold and silver vases and drinking vessels (including the famous four silver ones with the *itinerarium Gaditanum*). It is also obvious that many finds were robbed and never published.

¹ PANVINI ROSATI 1967, p. 61. Also in regard to the “Greek” coins of Campania and Apulia, he mentions higher numbers, and some other coins from other cities like Syracuse. Taliercio Mensitieri mentions 466 RRC 16 and 368 RRC 17 (TALIERCIO MENSITIERI 1998, p. 80, n. 186)! As the total number of coin finds are not published yet, here the 780 coins published by Cederna are taken for the comparison. We do not know when exactly these were found. A total of 100 was dug up by the owner in 1906 (CEDERNA 1951, p. 169) and sold with other material to the museum of the Villa Giulia. The rest must have been discovered during the (private) excavation under the supervision of the *soprintendenza di Chieti* in 1950 (CEDERNA 1951, pp. 171-172). Only a small part of the site, so it seems, was excavated. From the remark made by Panvini Rosati we may assume that all the numismatic material is still in the museum of Chieti. On the excavations in Carsoli in the earlier 20th century, see also BIELLA 2006.

² Vicarello: 5,200 specimens (without the imperial issues; PANVINI ROSATI 1967), Carsoli: 780 specimens (CEDERNA 1951)/3,000 specimens (PANVINI ROSATI 1967), Nemi: 823 specimens (CRAWFORD 1983), Casalvieri 537 specimens (CATALLI 2005). The Via Tiberina *stipe monetale* comprises 66 coins (CESANO 1942b) and the Ardea hoard 177 (CESANO 1942a).

³ This leaves the following number of coins for each of the deposits (see FIG. 2): Vicarello: 3,659; Carsoli: 736; Nemi: 367; Satricum: 80; Casalvieri: 221; Via Tiberina: 40 (this includes the fragments of currency bars and all semilibral aes grave as presented in CESANO 1942b; note, however that some of these weigh less than 100 g and may date during the Second Punic War. The overall picture, however, does not change).

⁴ All bronzes; no Roman (!) silver coins were found in these deposits. The bronze RRC 23, minted in Messana, does not occur in central Italy.

⁵ Except for Casalvieri, where they are not mentioned, all deposits include considerable quantities of aes rude.

¹ The sanctuary of Vicarello was a hot spring; the water was very hot. The 13 workers who dug out the coins and aes rude in two hours suffered badly from blisters (BALBI DE CARO 1988, p. 84). All this indicates that the coins offered were not to be recovered for other use; see CRAWFORD 2003, p. 81. Here, clearly, bronze dominated and silver coins were not donated.

² “Circa”: the percentages are rounded off.

³ Four aes grave RRC 35, 225-217 BC. The stipe also contained 2nd-century BC and later coins.

⁴ All distances are from Rome as the crow flies.

² The stipe of the Via Nomentana and the finds from the Via Prenestina and the Porta Capena; TALIERCIO MENSITIERI 1998, p. 79. See also the catalogue of VITALE 1998, p. 239. Like the stipe of the Via Tiberina, all these sites are found just outside the pomerium of the ancient city.

³ Other hoards from Rome’s direct surroundings show the same picture: Ponte di Nona (CESANO 1913), Monte Mario (MOLINARI 2004).

⁴ Note, however, the Greek and Punic coins (6 Greek and 1 Punic) that were found at the sanctuary of Diana in the excavations between 1989 and 2009: CATALLI 2014, p. 533. Interestingly, four of the Greek coins and the Punic coin are probably from Sicily.⁵ See below for the distribution of Siculo-Punic coins.

¹ The find of one RRC 16/1a is attested for the Largo Argentina area (BARBATO, VALCI 2016, p. 42). However, as a 3rd-century BC coin it stands isolated, the earliest other coins dating from the Second Punic war onwards. Furthermore, it was found in a definite 2nd-century BC context. VITALE 1998, pp. 238-239 mentions two Roman collections from the Museo Nazionale Romano and the Museo Capitolino/coll. Bignami with RRC 16 and 17 specimens. The provenance of these specimens is uncertain. The image may change with the publication of Republican coins from Rome kept in the Medagliere Capitolino; as yet an unpublished PhD thesis (Barbato, M. 2018. *Coin Finds of the Republican period in Rome and in Central Italy: The Coin Sample from the ‘sottosuolo urbano’ of Rome Kept in the Medagliere Capitolino. Circulation and Use of Greek and Roman Republican Coins*. PhD Thesis, University of Warwick; non vidimus).

² FREY-KUPPER 1995; BARBATO 2016.

³ As noted by BARBATO 2016, p. 142; an exception is the RRC 16/1 found on the Largo Argentina discussed in note 1 above.

⁴ Cf. BARBATO 2016, p. 142.

⁵ The reasons for all this are obscure: pure coincidence? Or the result of a rational well-chosen policy? Why was the heavy weight aes grave introduced, and was it the only official currency? Did this include prohibiting the circulation of other currencies, including gold and silver? We are reminded of “Lycurgan money”: we know from Polybius (VI 48, 49) – who, 50 years later, discusses the Spartan way of using money as compared to the Roman way – that these notions about money were not unknown.

⁶ The issues from central Italy include the “Uncertain Aes Grave” (HNIt 344-405).

⁷ From the frequent very short descriptions in the coin lists, published before the work of Taliercio Mensitieri on the bronzes of Neapolis, it is somewhat difficult to differentiate between I, II and III. Fortunately, the Victory above the bull is mentioned very often.

¹ (Only?) one entire Roman currency bar with anchor/tripod, RRC 10/1, is known from Vicarello. Via Tiberina has 7 bars, including fragments, Satricum 1 possible fragment and Carsoli and Casalvieri none. From Nemi bars are not known. Ardea probably had a few, but they were robbed (see CESANO 1942a, p. 396).

² It remains a curious fact that no aes grave are known from the 1896 excavation.

³ MOLINARI 2004.

⁴ CRAWFORD 1983, p. 77, no. 180, see also plate XVII.

⁵ Nemi itself, housing the important sanctuary of Diana, is a good candidate. The wild boar can be associated with the hunt and Diana, while the lyre is the chosen instrument of her brother, Apollo.

¹ See p. 54, note 1; the actual totals of RRC 16 and RRC 17 were higher.

² We think this geographical distribution is meaningful, because the deposits containing Lion and Minerva bronzes all span a long period of time and only close in the 2nd century BC or later. Therefore, differences in the chronology of the deposits cannot explain the presence or absence of these two types.

³ WILLIAMS 2011, p. 1108. The later bronze Roma issues have a wider distribution; *ibidem*, 1109; PULCINELLI 2015, pp. 484-485.

⁴ See, for example, CRAWFORD 1985, pp. 38-59; PIATTELLI 1987, *passim*; BURNETT 1989, p. 38 (only on Minerva bronze); TALIERCIO MENSITIERI 1998, pp. 52-55 and 70-110; VITALE 1998, *passim*.

⁵ TALIERCIO MENSITIERI 1998, pp. 52-55 and 70-110; VITALE 1998, *passim*.

⁶ Of course, Rome produced coins earlier (RRC 1, RRC 2), but these coins were almost certainly produced outside the city of Rome.

⁷ Rome, Carsoli and perhaps Praeneste issued cast coins; Signia, Alba Fucens, Cora and Norba silver. Moreover, the start of the Lion bronze is generally dated at the end of this decade.

⁸ For a general overview of find spots: VITALE 1998; more detailed information for Etruria in WILLIAMS 2011 and PULCINELLI 2015.

⁹ See the maps in tav. XII and XIII in VITALE 1998.

¹⁰ In fact, no finds of Minerva bronzes RRC 17 are known from Cosa (WILLIAMS 2011, p. 1108). That excludes, in our opinion, this city as the mint of these issues.

¹¹ See CRAWFORD 1985, pp. 38-39. But what kind of war expenses? With these small bronzes nothing really substantial could be bought. Payments or, better, parts of payments to individuals – soldiers? – is then what remains as an explanation. In addition, as a denomination these coins were isolated; they were not supported by other denominations as was the common use in the Hellenized world.

¹ CRAWFORD 1985, p. 38 states that RRC 16 was produced *before* the end of the Pyrrhic War.

² TALIERCIO MENSITIERI 1998, p. 125.

³ Based on VITALE 1998, pp. 217-351 and tavola XII and XIII, these two issues also seem to share mainly the same areas of distribution, but more research is necessary in regard to the find contexts and their dates.

⁴ Besides RRC 17/1a and 17/1b, the third variety with obverse female head (“goddess”) right and reverse lion l., not mentioned in RRC, is unofficially called RRC “17/1c”. This variety has somewhat lower weights.

⁵ The way the coin flans were cast is defined by JOHNSTON 1989, p. 123 as (sling) “bullet flans”. These flans were cast “vertically” in moulds and generally have protruding points from the casting seam whereas round “pancake” flans were cast “horizontally”. All Lion bronzes were struck on bullet flans.

⁶ One specimen from Satricum, no. 39, was even re-struck on a part of an unidentified coin and weighs 2.54 g.

⁷ BURNETT 1977, p. 112 observed this variety and the connection of these coins with those of Cosa for the first time. We think that the Minerva bronzes inspired the issuing of the autonomous COZANO bronzes. For an impression of the different varieties, see BAHRFELDT 1899-1900, pp. 394-403.

⁸ The Minerva bronze, finely executed in a “classic” style of heavy weight and struck on a “bullet flan”, is, in our opinion, to be considered the original type of this issue.

¹ See p. 46, note 9.

² CRAWFORD 1985, p. 38.

³ The coins showed different wear and corrosion, but in all cases the obverse and reverse types were clearly visible.

⁴ That is, from Satricum, 3 specimens, 3-4 g, have a star on the protome of the man-faced bull, 4 others are in bad condition but have weights above 3.5/4-5.5 g. Two other specimens with protome of a man-faced bull weigh circa 2.5 g and are therefore excluded here. See inv. nos. 1-9. The specimen from Lavinium (Tal. 1c) belongs to the exceptional Pratica di Mare hoard, which will be discussed below. Also the Tal. II specimen from Lavinium belongs to this hoard.

⁵ Note that the Pratica di Mare hoard from Lavinium – not found in a religious context – also holds 27 specimens *à la* Taliercio III; see below.

⁶ To these four specimens from the Hellenistic Votive Deposit can be added two more Punic coins from Satricum, one Punic (Carthage or western Sicily) and one probably Sardo-Punic; see APPENDIX 2, n. 11 and APPENDIX 3, n. 1.

⁷ This should also support the existence of a port at Torre Astura/Satricum at the mouth of the Astura river. This supposed existence is also mentioned by JAJA, MOLINARI 2011, p. 92.

¹ WILLIAMS 2011, pp. 1103-1114. Unfortunately, she mentions neither contexts nor numbers of coins. See also PULCINELLI 2015. ² CASTAGNOLI *et alii* 1975, p. 445: M1.

³ The publication of the coin finds of Lavinium/Pratica di Mare is of great interest. Also JAJA, MOLINARI 2011, pp. 86-101 mention no coins other than aes grave from Torvaianica, the harbour of Lavinium.

⁴ Catalli gives SNG München 1695 as reference. This isolated coin may, however, be considered a completely random find. ⁵ On the map, only Cosa is mentioned as a find place, WILLIAMS 2011, p. 1107.

⁶ Note that in Etruria, the early Taliercio I and II coins are found in Cosa – on the coast – where Taliercio IV also occur, and in Vicarello, an inland sanctuary.

⁷ As the early Taliercio I bronzes were issued from ca. 325 to ca. 300 BC, we may suspect with the utmost caution that some of these coins may have reached coastal Etruria and Latium in the first decades of the 3rd century BC. We know that Punic coins entered the area in this period; cf. PULCINELLI 2015, p. 483, who remarks that Punic coins from the Vulci area must antedate 280 BC as the sites show traces of destruction and were never reoccupied around that date. The Taliercio I coins may have been part of the same movements of coins.

⁸ The aes rude from the Satricum deposit were also studied by Andreas Murgan for his PhD research at the Goethe Universität Frankfurt.

¹ Furthermore, a fragment of a “ramo secco” bar is a sporadic find from the acropolis (see GNADE 2007, p. 114, cat. no. 76). Aes rude have also been found both in the cellas of the temples and around them. Aes rude were also found in Votive Deposit II, see BOUMA 1996, pp. 290-294. In general, at Satricum aes rude are only found in “sacred” contexts.

² Again, Vicarello stands out with ca. 400 kilos (at an average of 30 g for an aes rude: ca. 13,000 specimens). Carsoli with a known total of 2.9 kilos has ca. 80 specimens, but is incomplete, like Nemi with only 18 known specimens. The Via Tiberina has 59 specimens, including the 12 fragments of currency bars. Ardea, also incomplete and considered here a votive deposit, has 31 aes rude.

³ At Satricum, aes rude were found in votive deposit I (inside the temple), votive deposit II, and the so-called southwest sanctuary (GINGE 1996). See TALIERCIO MENSITIERI 1998, p. 80; JAJA, MOLINARI 2011, p. 89 for the observation that the Lion and Minerva bronzes mainly occur in religious contexts.

⁴ We have the impression that these hammered specimens with flat surfaces (sometimes also called *aes formatum*) represent a later form of aes rude.

⁵ The fragment of the cast as, presumably from Praeneste (HNIIt 249), has already been mentioned (no. 76; see p. 46, note 7); in short, a coin transformed into aes rude. Second, a small part (5.87 g) of a large, very worn (cast) coin (no. 78), third, a halved Minerva bronze (no. 63) and fourth, a cast small lump of round/oval, “coin-like” shape with two protruding “ears” weighing 8.43 g (no. 101). Furthermore, two coins were melted (nos. 96, 97).

¹ We were able to check this only for the aes rude from the NIR excavations, as this distinction was not made for the 88 aes rude from the 1896 excavation that are now in the Villa Giulia Museum.

² Cf. NIJBOER 1994, pp. 3-4, where he has difficulty connecting a weight of 267 g found in an Archaic context at Satricum to a certain weight standard. He suggests that it is a “Roman-Oscan pound”. However, a weight of 267 g matches that of 10 unciae, i.e. a dextans. Or is this the weight of a light libral as, and perhaps datable in the middle of the 3rd century BC?

¹ An uncia of this “standard” weighs 23 g; a semuncia 11/12 g. Notice the presence of an aes rude of 17.32 g in the Pratica di Mare hoard; see below.

² BALDASSARRI *et alii* 2007, pp. 1-13.

³ The analysis showed that lead was definitely added to the metal with which the lumps were cast. This circumstance implies that they were meant to be used as end product; BALDASSARRI *et alii* 2007, p. 4.

⁴ BALDASSARRI *et alii* 2007, p. 2.

⁵ Based on the specimens shown in the *Coinage of the Roman Republic Online* (“CRRO”; <http://numismatics.org/crro/>, consulted December 2018).

⁶ Again as is shown by the different RRC series and their examples of different denominations on the “CRRO”. Asses of some series, the RRC 61, the RRC 142 and the RRC 160 are more consistent, only differing a sextans or so in terms of weight.

⁷ On the contrary, the *average* weights of the individual denominations remain fairly consistent and stick to their “ideal” weights of the reduced sextantal standard (asses of ca. 32 or 36 g), the uncial (asses of ca. 23 or 27 g), the reduced uncial (asses of ca. 18 g) and semuncial standard (asses of ca. 12.5 g). Surprisingly, the seldom struck unciae remained “loyal” to the original, much heavier sextantal weight standard of an as weighing ca. 48-50 g (unciae: 4-4.5 g [RRC 61/7, RRC 72/9, RRC 85/7: all from 211-28 BC]) during the first half of the 2nd century BC (series RRC 149, RRC 133, RRC 150, RRC 184, RRC 185, RRC 190, RRC 194, RRC 205, RRC 215) when their asses weigh between 18 and 35 g. The somewhat lighter unciae Wolf and Twins, RRC 183/6, weigh 3 and 3.8 g (2 specimens in CRRO), that is, a reduced sextantal standard, while their asses weigh between 20 and 29 g; an uncial standard.

¹ Livy XXVI XI, 9.

² “... *aeris acervi, cum rudera milites religione inducti iacerent, post profectioem Hannibalis magni interventi*”; “Great heaps of bronze were found after the departure of Hannibal, since the soldiers inspired by religious fear deposited crude lumps”; Livy XXVI XI, 9, transl. F. Gardner Moore, Loeb, repr. 1950.

³ BUTTREY 1980, pp. 31-42. On p. 40 two fragments of what was still defined as “aes signatum”, weighing 13 and 15 g, are mentioned.

¹ JAJA, MOLINARI 2011. Note the remark on p. 89: “the two foundation deposits shed further light on the first two series of aes grave recorded so far, confirming the association of these and their deposition in predominantly sacred contexts”. ² MOLINARI 2011.

³ 38 Campanian AE, including 1 Taliercio 1d, 1 Taliercio 11b, 1 Taliercio 111a, 34 like Taliercio 111, 1 Taliercio 1vd and 1 bronze, head of Zeus/eagle from Messana.

⁴ A large public building on the forum? The city hall? A macellum? Also a taverna may be a candidate, given the presence of commercial amphorae and (sparse) kitchenware associated with the hoard (MOLINARI 2011, p. 829).

⁵ MOLINARI 2011, pp. 828-829.

⁶ As late as 211 BC, Lavinium is mentioned by Livy (XXVI, VIII) as one of the cities along the Via Appia, besides Setia and Cora, which had to provide supplies and draw in a garrison (these cities were threatened by Hannibal) on the orders of proconsul Quintus Fulvius as he retreated from Capua to protect Rome. At the time, Lavinium must have been a town of some prominence. Otherwise, the destruction of the building by fire may not have a link with a known historic event, as Molinari acknowledges.

¹ At least seven coins from the votive deposit were issued during the Second Punic War.

² Casalvieri: CATALI 2005, p. 150. Rome: FREY-KUPPER 1995, cat. nos. 88 and 89 (p. 65). Interestingly, BURNETT, MOLINARI 2015, 58 also note that “[t]here is nothing from Campania”.

³ See LOUWAARD 2007, p. 75. This building may have been in use until the late 2nd century BC (GNADE 2019, pp. 188-189).

⁴ An imperial Roman as, presumably of Hadrianus, with inv. no. VG 10561, found in 1896-98, belongs to the find complex of the Archaic Votive Deposit 1.

⁵ BOUMA 1996, pp. 290-294. Among the most recent finds: six World War II unexploded mortar grenades were unearthed by Jelle Prins as the acropolis was used as an allied stronghold just after the landing at Anzio/Nettuno in 22 January 1944.

¹ GINGE 1996, appendix 3 (pp. 189-190) presents most of these coins as illegible, with the exception of PER?12 (traces of male head, see p. 101) and SVD64

(possibly a ship's prow, see p. 108), which remain, however, unidentified.

² BOUMA 1996, Part 1, p. 79.

³ Communication Marijke Gnade, May 2018.