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Suzanne Frey-Kupper

CYRENAICAN COINS IN SITE FINDS FROM THE WESTERN MEDITERRANEAN. THE EVIDENCE FROM SICILY AND ADJACENT ISLANDS, AND FROM CARTHAGE

ABSTRACT - This paper addresses the presence of Cyrenaican coins in the context of the monetary circulation within the areas of former Punic control or influence in the Western Mediterranean that is, Sicily and the adjacent islands (Lipari, Sardinia, Malta and Gozo, and Pantelleria) and Carthage. Only a few Cyrenaican coins, all single finds, and all bronzes, have so far come to light in the islands among Punic, local Greek and Roman coins, while in Carthage, apart from two hoards including gold issues of Cyrene and one large hoard of bronze coins, the small pieces with head of Libya (221-96 BC) make up the largest part of foreign (non-Punic) coins. The evidence is still thin, but one specimen originates from a second century filling in a house at Monte Iato, Sicily and one from an abandonment layer of the second half of the second to the first half of the first century BC in a building on the Acropolis of Pantelleria, while a specimen from Lipari is without stratigraphic context. At least one bronze was found in a pre-146 BC stratum in Carthage, and one may be from the 146 BC destruction layer. Other Cyrenaican bronzes may have reached Carthage after 96 BC when Cyrenaica was bequeathed to Rome or, maybe more likely, after 75 BC when it was made a Roman province. For the period between the Second Punic War and the end of the Roman Republic Cyrenaican coins form a substantial part of small change in Carthage (9.5%). At least part of them may be explained by commercial contacts and the increasing influence of Rome on the political situation in North Africa. The few specimens documented from the islands may have arrived there either from Carthage or from Rome although provenance from Cyrene cannot be excluded.

1. Introduction

The following contribution seeks to address the circulation of coins in the areas of former Punic control or influence in the Western Mediterranean, that is, Sicily and the adjacent islands (Lipari, Sardinia, Malta and Gozo, and Pantelleria) and Carthage (fig. 1). This derives from my collaboration with many excavation teams over many years, mainly in Sicily, and most recently on Malta and Gozo, on Pantelleria, and in various sectors in Carthage1.

1 For information and valuable discussions I would like to express my thanks to Christoph Reusser, Martin Mohr, Christian Russenberger and Erich Kistler regarding Monte Iato; to Nicholas Vella and Maxine Anastasi regarding Malta and Gozo; to Thomas Schäfer, Karin Schmidt and Frerich Schön regarding Pantelleria but especially to Martin Ziegert who is preparing the publication of the coin finds; to Roald Docter, Fethi Chelbi and Boutheina Maraoui Telmini (Belgo-Tunisian excavations) and Christof Flügel, Karin Schmidt and Philipp von Rummel (German excavations) who have entrusted me with the publication of coin finds from Rome, Pompeii and from the River Liri (see their contributions in this volume). For further help and discussions I thank John Morcom, Jean-Albert Chevillon, Catharine Lorber, Michael Nick, Michel Py, Pere Pau Ripollès and N. Keith Rutter, and for assistance with editing the images Badri Redha and Max Stoeckli, Artmax. Special thanks go finally to Michele Asolati who has organised the colloquium.
Little numismatic material has so far come to light and although some of it originates from stratigraphic contexts, the evidence is too thin to allow a proper understanding of the reasons for the presence or absence of Cyrenaican coins in the discussed area. Moreover, Cyrenaican pottery, which would allow us to assess the movement of other archaeological materials including coins, and to understand the trade and exchange of goods, has not been identified so far, either in our islands or in Carthage although pottery from these areas is well researched and Cyrenaican pottery is well known. Likewise, evidence of Sicilian pottery in Cyrenaica is scarce and often uncertain, and evidence of pottery of the other islands in Cyrenaica is unknown. Punic amphorae are known from Euesperides but their origin (Sicilian or Carthaginian) is also uncertain. Overall it is not possible to evaluate exchange between our areas and Cyrenaica, or vice versa, based on pottery evidence.

Figure 1. Map with the sites mentioned in this paper; sites providing finds of Cyrenaican coins listed in the catalogue are represented with black dots (by the Author on a map Nasa/BlueMarble; Grafische Gestaltung).

2 Riley 1979 (on local coarse ware and amphorae of the Hellenistic period from Sidi Krebish, Bengazi (Berenice); Göransson 2007 (on amphorae up to c. 250 BC from Euesperides, see p. 217 for the difficulties in identifying Cyrenaican ceramics in the Western Mediterranean); on local coarse ware also Crawley Quinn 2011, p. 14 with fn. 11 (based on Swift 2005, p. 152) and p. 15, pl. 15 where no Cyrenaican amphorae (450-200 BC) are plotted for the site of Sabratha.

4 This applies especially for the so-called Graeco-Italic amphorae whose origin is unknown (Riley 1979, pp. 131-133 «Hellenistic amphora 7», listed as «possibly from the Sicily region», p. 406); see Göransson 2007, pp. 225-226.


6 The information is better regarding exchange between Italy and Cyrenaica thanks to literary
In order to discuss the possible significance of Cyrenaican coinage found in our area, the knowledge of all other coins circulating there is all the more important. In this respect Sicily is probably one of the best studied areas since coins from many excavations are now fully published; progress has also been made on the minor islands, although the quantity of material is inevitably more modest.

The coins which I have been able to record from our area date mostly from the period between 221/104-96 BC and thus overlap with the period when Rome was establishing its rule beyond the Italian peninsula. It might therefore be useful quickly to recall the main historical events of the areas of the sites considered here and of Cyrene. The conquest of Sicily in two steps is well known. The cities of the western part of the island came under Rome during the First Punic War from 264 BC, either by choice or by force, and by 241 BC the West was well in the hands of the Romans with, at latest, from 227/225 BC, a *praetor* in Sicily residing in Lilybaeum, probably helped by a *quaestor*. From 218 BC at the latest, magistrates occupying these offices were sent to Sicily yearly, and from 211/210 BC a second *quaestor* joined, with his seat in Syracuse. Sicily was the only Roman province having two administrative centres; Lilybaeum was in the area of the former Punic Epicracy and Syracuse in the area formerly controlled by Hieron II. Sardinia also was assigned a *praetor* in 227/225 BC. Scholarship has generally paid little attention to the Roman conquest and the following Roman administration in the minor islands, but Livy (21, 51), reports on the Roman conquest of the Maltese Islands in 218 BC by the *consul* Ti. Sempronius Longus.

Malta and Gozo became part of Sicily, the first Roman *provincia*, at the time under the responsibility of the *praetor* residing in Lilybaeum, supported by a *quaestor*. What this means *de facto* from the administrative point of view can only be inferred as there is no concrete evidence. Whether the Maltese Islands answered to the governor based in Lilybaeum or to the magistrate with command of the fleet in the region is difficult to ascertain. All we know is that administration became settled and consolidated only in the years following the sack of Syracuse, under the *consul M. Valerius Laevinus* from 210 BC. From that time, for practical reasons, control from Syracuse, where the second administrative centre had been installed, would seem likely. Cossyra was taken
by the Romans in 255 BC\textsuperscript{13} and shortly thereafter reconquered by the Carthaginians\textsuperscript{14}. In 217 BC the island came permanently under Roman rule\textsuperscript{15} and was then absorbed into the province of Sicily\textsuperscript{16}.

As for Carthage, the date 146 BC of her destruction by Rome is of course key, but it is certainly worth recalling that Roman trade with Carthage existed before that date\textsuperscript{17}; and there was undoubtedly a revival of commercial exchange between Central Italy and Carthage after the foundation of the Roman colony \textit{Colonia Iulia Concordia} in Carthage in 44 BC and especially between 22 and 15 BC after its Augustan \textit{deductio} in 29 BC\textsuperscript{18}.

The Ptolemaic kingdom of Cyrene, whose coins are the focus of this contribution were issued, was bequeathed to Rome by his last king, Ptolemy Apion at his death in 96 BC, and Cyrenaica’s cities were declared free by the Roman Senate (\textit{Livy, Per.}, 50). Thereafter, it seems that Rome made no attempt to concern itself with administration until 75 BC, when Cyrene was made a province to which the \textit{quaestor (pro praetore)} \textit{P. Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus}, is reported to have been sent (\textit{Sallust., Hist.}, II, fr. 43)\textsuperscript{19}. This is the time frame which is relevant when discussing the Cyrenaican coins later in this piece. It is certainly worth noting also that a group of Roman \textit{negotiatores} in Cyrene is epigraphically attested in 67 BC\textsuperscript{20}. The first provincial coins issued by Roman magistrates date no earlier, but possibly later\textsuperscript{21}.

I will first (section 2) give an overview of Cyrenaican coin finds by islands and sites, in the framework of other coins found there, and try to understand when they were in circulation. Since there are so few coins, and given the aforementioned difficulties in identifying non numismatic material from Cyrene, it is difficult to answer the question whether they follow wider circuits of goods or the movement of persons. I will however at least try to address the question and also to understand the Cyrenaican coins’ role in the monetary stock (section 3, conclusions). The following overview of Cyrenaican coins will focus on evidence from recent excavations and discuss them in geographical order as in the catalogue below. I include some notes on coin finds from Sardinia, and from Malta and Gozo although no specimens from Cyrene have to my knowledge been discovered there. The sections are: Sicily (Monte Iato/Iaitas) and Lipari/Lipara (section 2.1), Sardinia (section 2.2), Malta/Melita and Gozo/Gaulos (section 2.3), Pantelleria/Cossyra (section 2.4), and Carthage (section 2.5). The catalogue at the end of the paper lists the specimens from excavations individually. These comprise entirely bronze coins from site finds.

\textsuperscript{13} Zon., VIII, 14, 2, who reports on the destruction of the island and on the installment of a garrison.

\textsuperscript{14} Zon., VIII, 14, 4; see Bleckmann 2002, p. 171, fn. 1.

\textsuperscript{15} Polyb., III, 96, 11-13; Liv., XXII, 31, 1-5; Zon., VIII, 26.

\textsuperscript{16} Alföldy 2005, pp. 193-213; see esp. pp. 212-213; for the history of the island now Schäfer 2015, esp. pp. 92-96 for the period discussed here.

\textsuperscript{17} See below, section 2.5.

\textsuperscript{18} See below fn. 113.


\textsuperscript{20} Reynolds 1962, pp. 97-98, 101-103; Braund 1985.

\textsuperscript{21} Buttrey 1987, p. 168; NaCg, p. 49.
As far as stratigraphic data are available, I will present the coins in their archaeological context in order to assess their possible period of circulation. I will also briefly discuss the overall picture of the coin finds from these sites between the Second Punic War and the first century BC which corresponds, as was shown, roughly to the period when the Cyrenaican coins found in the islands and in Carthage were issued. Needless to say, coins can have been lost long after their period of issue. The presence of coins of similar date of production as the Cyrenaican coins may nonetheless be informative regarding patterns of monetary supply and thus help to assess the circulation of Cyrenaican specimens in the islands and in Carthage.

2. Overview

2.1. Sicily and Lipari

Monte Iato, Sicily

Two single finds of Cyrenaican coins are so far known, one from Sicily and one from the small island of Lipari north of it. The former coin came to light at Monte Iato, the ancient site of Iaitas 34 km South West of Panormus. This city went over to Rome in 254 BC. Its site has been extensively excavated since 1971 with yearly campaigns conducted by the University of Zurich.

The coin (fig. 2, 1) was found in 1993 west of the temple of Aphrodite, in a building identified as a house with banqueting rooms related to the cult of the sanctuary (below, catalogue no. 1). Like the temple, the house was erected in the Archaic period (late sixth century BC), and was restored in the Hellenistic period. The Cyrenaican coin, a bronze of Ptolemy V Epiphanes to Ptolemy VI Philometor (204-163 BC) was actually found on the Hellenistic circulation level of room 9 as part of a massive filling covering the whole house. The pottery included in the layer has not yet been fully studied but most materials seem to belong to the third century BC whereas diagnostic pottery of the later second century BC such as mould-made lamps of the so-called Ephesus type is absent. The Cyrenaican specimen (fig. 2, 1) seems however to be later than the bulk of ceramic materials, and is later than five Punic coins from the circulation level in the room and a bronze of Hieron II dated to 240-215 BC (fig. 2, 2) from a context related to the filling above the circulation horizon. The late date given by the Cyrenaican coin seems to be confirmed by another bronze from the same filling layer, in room 4 of the same house (south of room 9), likewise found on the bottom of the filling, that is, a Romano-Sicilian coin of the magistrate L. (Caecilius) Metellus which I attribute

---

22 The coins listed by Cavagna 2015, pp. 137-159 are from public and private collections and except the specimen from Lipara (p. 141, no. 13.510/1) of unknown provenance; see also Stannard, Ranucci in this volume, p. 185.
24 Isler 1994, p. 37, fn. 34 and information from Erich Kistler (4 March 2016).
26 Frey-Kupper 2013, pp. 520-521.
to Panormus and date to the decades between 150/140-130/120 BC (fig. 2, 4)\textsuperscript{27}. An \textit{uncia} of the Roman Republic from the same context belongs to the series \textit{RRC}, no. 42/4 (fig. 2, 3) and, issued in Sicily 214-212 BC, the coin is chronologically close to the higher end of the Cyrenaican coin’s chronological scale. The massive filling is related to the abandonment of the house in question, and the bronze of Panormus provides a \textit{terminus post quem} for the filling in room 4. If the filling of the house results from a single action, which cannot be ascertained as long as a detailed analysis of the pottery including matching sherds is outstanding, the Cyrenaican coin was lost a few (two to five) decades after it was put into circulation which would be in line with the fact that it is not much worn.

After 35 years of excavation, almost 3,000 ancient coins were found at Monte Iato. The recent study of the coins found between 1971 and 1990 has shown that the circulation is mainly local with 87\% of Punic and 13\% Greek coins, mostly of Syracuse for the period between the mid fourth and the mid third century BC. The only foreign coins are a Corinthian stater and a few coins of Campania and Samnium\textsuperscript{28}, which are common in Sicily and related to war activities, the former to the expeditions of Timoleon and the latter to the First Punic War. In the period after the Second Punic War until the end of the Republic, only the Roman coins form a substantial group. They make up roughly 20\% of the coins circulating at the site. Almost half of them, 55 specimens out of 115, are however coins issued in Sicily following Roman prototypes produced in Rome with the most notable group of 22

\textsuperscript{27} For the stratigraphic context ISLER 1996, p. 59, fn. 60; for the date and the mint of the coin FREY-KUPPER 2013, pp. 224-227, 229-230, 232, 262-264, 388, nos. 320-321.

\textsuperscript{28} Inv. M 2269 (Corinthian stater: g 8,11; 15\°; mm 21,5); FREY-KUPPER 2013, pp. 165-167, 362-363, nos. 2-10.
specimens of the *sextans RRC*, no. 69/6a complemented by a Sardinian *sextans RRC*, no. 63/6 and 27 *asses* of Sextus Pompey\(^{29}\). Thus only 60 coins, including 24 *denarii*, are from Rome rather than local. The only other coins produced outside Sicily are a Celtic *quinarium* of the Aedui issued in the name of their king Dumnorix (c. 60-40 BC, fig. 3, 1)\(^{30}\), a regular bronze of Ebusus (fig. 3, 2)\(^{31}\), five Maltese coins (fig. 3, 3)\(^{32}\), and the discussed Cyrenaican coin (fig. 3, 4). It has been shown that Sicily was autonomous and self-sufficient up to the period after the First Punic War; after the loss of the areas of the Punic Epicracy in Western Sicily the exchange with Carthage opened up, while trade activities with Campania and southern Latium, thanks to Italian *negotiatores*, started from the late fourth century BC. Punic coins are almost completely absent in Sicily for the period after the Second Punic War.

I do not include in the figures of foreign coin finds those of Ptolemaic type which, as has been convincingly demonstrated by Cathy Lorber and Daniel Wolfe\(^{33}\), are of Sicilian production, probably by Hieron II since the control marks beneath the eagle’s tail match those on Hieron’s bronzes with the cavalryman. Not surprisingly, (i) these coins are found frequently in the territories under Hieron’s control and (ii) they are rarer in the territories of the former Punic Epicracy\(^{34}\).

It is also noteworthy that no Cyrenaican coin is present among the 9780 preimperial coin finds from Morgantina in Eastern Sicily, where the coins of Ptolemaic type struck in Sicily are regularly found, a fact which emphasises that the arrival of the few

\(^{29}\) Frey-Kupper 2013, p. 194, tab. 41; 272, tab. 58; 439, nos. 1187-1189 (Sicily); pp. 440-442, nos. 1196 (Sardinia), 1197-1220 (Sicily); pp. 450-452, nos. 1268-1294 (Sextus Pompey).

\(^{30}\) Allen 1990, p. 67, nos. 483-486 and S 383-386, pl. 13 and 27; see Isler 2006, p. 111, fn. 34.


\(^{32}\) Frey-Kupper 2013, pp. 436-437, nos. 1174-1177, and since then inv. M 2864, found in 1999 (type as the aforementioned nos. 1175-1176), here fig. 3, 3.

\(^{33}\) Wolf, Lorber 2011.

\(^{34}\) Frey-Kupper 2013, pp. 599-601, no. 13; p. 626, fig. 111.
Cyrenaican coins in Sicily has nothing to do with king Hieron’s likely Egyptian ties. This is not surprising since penetration of Egyptian coins in Cyrenaica and vice versa seems to be virtually non-existent. For example, among the 1446 pre-imperial coins catalogued by the French team in Alexandria, only one coin from Cyrene has been recorded\(^{35}\) and among 750 pre-imperial specimens from the sanctuary of Demeter and Persephone at Cyrene, only one coin from Egypt has been listed by Buttrey\(^{36}\).

As at Monte Iato foreign coins are relatively rare at Morgantina, although, compared with Monte Iato, more mints are represented. 13 gold coins of Macedonia (Pella and Amphipolis), of Mysia (Lampsacus) and Troas (Abydus) were hoarded together with 29 Syracusan gold coins of Agathocles, Hicetas and Pyrrhus\(^{37}\). The site finds include coins of Celsa in Spain, Ebusus (regular and imitative), a Celtic mint of the Nervii, Massalia (uncertain whether regular), Illyricum in Dyrghacium, Thespiae in Boetia, Carystus in Euboea, Lacedaemon, Messene and Patrae in the Peloponnese, Lampsacus, Rhodes, Numidia (Masinissa and Juba I) and Tingi in Mauretania\(^{38}\). Six coins are of the Carthaginian type SNG, Cop., North Africa nos. 307-323 issued during the Second Punic War (see fig. 7, 2)\(^{39}\), which are very rare in Sicily since the bulk of the issue was produced in the period when Sicily was under Roman rule. These coins are complemented by an otherwise unknown issue of a plated silver coin (with head of Persephone l. / horse standing r. above sun disk), which must also belong to the Second Punic War\(^{40}\). Four coins are from other islands, three from Gaulos\(^{41}\), and one from Cossyra\(^{42}\), but none from Melita has so far come to light. Both Gaulos and Cossyra were part of the province of Sicily as has been shown. The greater variety of mints may be due to the fact that the mass of (published) coin finds for Morgantina is three times that at Monte Iato but the proximity to Syracuse where more coins from Greece and Asia Minor may have arrived than in Panormus from where many coins reached Monte Iato may be another explanation.

**Lipari**

The Cyrenaican coin from the island of Lipari, a find from Contrada Diana (proprietà Zagami), is a bronze attributed to the Ptolemies IV-VIII, 221-140 BC (below, catalogue no. 2). Although we have no information on the stratigraphic context, the presence of the coin on Lipari is interesting since, being in a group of nine bronzes dated to the period between the Second Punic War and Sextus Pompey, it is the only specimen from outside the island and nearby Sicily (tab. 1) from this site\(^{43}\). Although the group is too small to allow conclusions on details of coins circulating in Lipari, it nevertheless shows that, except for a specimen of the local mint of Lipara, coins of the

\(^{35}\) Marcellesi 2012, p. 190, no. 1344.

\(^{36}\) Buttrey 1997, p. 29, no. 768.


\(^{38}\) Buttrey et alii 1989, p. 70, nos. 1-6, and pp. 114-118.

\(^{39}\) Buttrey et alii 1989, p. 114, no. 443.

\(^{40}\) Buttrey et alii 1989, p. 114, no. 442.

\(^{41}\) Buttrey et alii 1989, p. 115, no. 456.

\(^{42}\) Buttrey et alii 1989, p. 115, no. 453 (nos. 454-455 listed as Cossyra are Romano-Sicilian coins).

\(^{43}\) Mastelloni 1994; see also Mastelloni 1995, p. 403, n. 3; Puglisi 2009, p. 100.
North Eastern Sicilian coast with specimens of Catana, Leontini and Messana prevail. They are complemented by two *asses* of Sextus Pompey, likewise issued in Sicily, one of them halved. The bronzes of the Sicilian cities date to the period of the Second Punic War or shortly after. Owing to the lack of stratigraphic evidence it is impossible to evaluate when the Cyrenaican coin reached Lipari. Nevertheless, the likely date of the coin suggests that this happened long after 252 BC when ancient Lipara came under Roman rule, and, if it had circulated for some time before being lost or deposited in a tomb, possibly not until the later second or the first century BC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINT</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>Mastelloni 1994</th>
<th>NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipara</td>
<td>2nd cent.-c. 40/30 BC?</td>
<td>Gàbrici 1927, p. 203, nos. 79-82</td>
<td>p. 227, no. 9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Greek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catana</td>
<td>after 211/early 2nd cent. BC</td>
<td>Gàbrici 1927, p. 125, nos. 41-50</td>
<td>p. 226, no. 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontini</td>
<td>after 211/2nd cent. BC?</td>
<td>Gàbrici 1927, p. 142, nos. 17-18</td>
<td>p. 226, no. 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messana, Mamertini</td>
<td>after 211/early 2nd cent.?</td>
<td>Särström 1940, series XI A</td>
<td>p. 227, nos. 10-12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrene, Ptolemies IV-VIII</td>
<td>221-140 BC</td>
<td>SNG, <em>Cop., Egypt. The Ptolemies</em>, nos. 446 ss.</td>
<td>p. 227, no. 23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>300-280/270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicily, Sextus Pompey</td>
<td>43/42-38/36 BC</td>
<td>RRC, no. 479/1</td>
<td>p. 227, nos. 24-25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.2. Sardinia

The slim evidence on Greek coins from Sardinia relates mainly to necropoleis, and to some hoards, e.g. a small hoard or purse of uncertain provenance including eleven Punic bronze coins (*SNG, Cop., North Africa*, nos. 144-178) and a bronze of Hieron II. The specimens from the hoards and from sporadic finds are mainly from Southern Italy and from Sicily, although one coin with head of Athena and tripod is of Massalia. The funerary contexts contain more exotic coins, and as such possibly selected deliberately: a Ptolemaic coin of uncertain type from a tomb from Tharros, and a bronze of Troas (late fifth century BC) from a tomb from Gargara. In the case of the gold stater of Philip II with a suspension hole from Olbia, the coin was certainly used as an amulet, just as the coin of Locri Epizephyrii, also with a hole, found in the

---

44 Polosa 2006, pp. 122-124 e 134-141; the hoard is *IGCH*, no. 2279. Similar data of another possible hoard, said from Ozieri, are less reliable, see Polosa 2006, pp. 122 and 135 (Punic and Hieron II); and Polosa 2006 for further coins of Hieron II from a hoard of uncertain origin.

45 See previous fn.; for the Massaliot coin Polosa 2006, p. 136, no. 1.

46 Giberti 1989, no. 3; Polosa 2006, pp. 123, 134-135 and 141, no. 127 (necropolis S. Marco).


cave of Grotta di Ispignoli which has been interpreted as a ritual site.\footnote{Polosa 2006, p. 135 and 137, no. 16.}

No large group of finds from habitation sites is so far known although some coins from museum collections are said to reflect local finds from Sardinia. If this is correct, as has been suggested for a group of three coins held in the Archaeological Museum G.A. Sanna in Sassari, there would be a bronze of Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II (163-145 BC) and two Alexandrian bronzes from the island.\footnote{Guido 1994, nos. 35-37; Polosa 2006, p. 141, nos. 129-131; Cavagna 2015, pp. 126-127, no. 13.1.12/2, the Cyrenaican coin as \textit{NaCy}, no. 86B.} However, information available so far does not provide any certain evidence, and it is better to treat this assumption with extreme caution\footnote{See also Cavagna 2015, p. 126.} although the Ptolemaic coin from the tomb in Tharros shows that the presence of such a coin would potentially be possible.

\subsection*{2.3. Malta and Gozo}

Although no Cyrenaican coin has been found on Malta or Gozo, I would like briefly to present Malta’s coin finds. The coins we have are essentially from one find place, the sanctuary of Tas-Silġ located in the south-eastern part of the island. The sanctuary of Tas-Silġ, dedicated to Astarte, later Hera, is said to have survived the Romano-Punic Wars without being violated, although later plundered and violated by Verres.\footnote{Cicero, \textit{in Verrem}, 2, 4, 103.} It is noteworthy that the Punic and Hellenistic temple has been built into the prehistoric temple with its apsidal plan.

The coin finds from the sanctuary comprise 134 legible specimens. The other, few, coins from the island are mostly single finds or finds from tombs, and many of them are old finds, and from disturbed contexts, although there are also two hoards of Punic bronze coins of the fourth century BC.\footnote{IGCH, p. 345, no. 2269; Jenkins 1983 (Mqabba); Visonà 1990 (unknown site, hoard in Yale).} Of the 134 coins, 111 are from the northern part of the site which has been intensely excavated by an Italian team from 1963-1970\footnote{Novarese 2006.} whereas the remaining 23 coins originate from excavations conducted by the University of Malta from 1996 to 2005 in the southern part of the sanctuary.\footnote{Frey-Kupper 2015a.} None of the latter coins can so far be identified as being part of a primary deposit in relation to the sanctuary. Most are from secondary deposits, and, for the finds from the northern part of the site, we lack stratigraphic data. I have studied the recent finds along with those of 1963-1970 and reported on them in the final excavation report (tab. 2, fig. 4). 67 specimens of these date to the period from the Second Punic War to the end of the Republican Period (tab. 2).

Coins of the local mint Melita clearly prevail, and make up more than half of the material. Among the other coins, mints of eastern Sicily are predominant (Catana with 13 coins and Aetna with one specimen). Together with five bronzes of the Mamertini and a coin of Rhegium they form nearly a third of the coins. Two Roman Republican \textit{sextantes RRC}, no. 69/6a (211-208 BC), possibly struck in Catana, may be added to this
group as well as the Sardinian _sextans RRC_, no. 63/6 (211-208 BC) which may have reached Malta also via eastern Sicily. These three specimens comprise 4.5% of the coins found in Tas-Silġ.

The period after the Roman conquest of 218 BC is marked by the total lack of the very common _SNG, Cop., North Africa_, nos. 307-323 Punic type dated to c. 213-203 BC (see fig. 7, 2) in the sanctuary, where however the slightly earlier and rare type _SNG, Cop., North Africa_, no. 260 of c. 241-220 BC (probably 230-220 BC) has been found (fig. 4, 1), and only a few isolated specimens have emerged elsewhere on the Maltese islands. Their scarcity is in sharp contrast to their frequency on Pantelleria (ancient Cossyra) under Roman rule in 217 BC, a year after Malta (see tab. 4). There they make up about one third among a small series of 14 Punic bronze coins discovered in the excavations of 2002-2009 on the acropolis (Collina di S. Teresa on Pantelleria). The reasons for the difference require further research. Yet, some examples of the type have reached the Maltese Archipelago, since isolated examples were documented from at least two sites, one in Birzebbuġa, Malta, as a single find in 191456, and one in Victoria, Gozo, in a funerary context in 190957. They certainly attest contacts with North Africa, as do finds of Carthaginian amphorae from the Belgo-Maltese survey in the north-west of Malta (Ramón T-7.2.1.1)58.

The key to a partial answer certainly resides in the finds of Greek and Roman coins. The coins are from mints in eastern Sicily. They are mostly Roman (_sextantes, RRC_, no. 69/6, possibly struck in Catana, complemented by the Sardinian _RRC_, no. 63/6) and of communities allied or loyal to Rome in the Second Punic War (the Mamertines, Catana, Aetna) who show value marks on their coins (see fig. 4, 2 with Π and fig. 4, 3 with II), and almost all were struck in the period of the war or very shortly thereafter. Catana with its harbour served during the war as a transfer site for grain supply (Livy, 27, 8, 19, regarding 209 BC). Twelve out of the 13 Catanean specimens from Tas-Silġ are of the type “head of Apollo/Isis” (fig. 4, 3). The chronology of the coins with value marks is mainly based on hoard evidence59: the date of the stratigraphic context for a coin of Aetna (fig. 5, 2) found in the recent excavations at Għar ix-Xiħ, Gozo (tab. 3), is wide but does not exclude a date in the late third or second century BC60.

---


57 Visonà 2010, p. 147, fn. 32.

58 Chamber tombs cut into the rock, Sagona 2002, pp. 1121-1122; on the coins Visonà 2010, p. 147, fn. 29.

59 For Catana IGCH, no. 2236 (dated to 200 BC); see also Crawford 1985, p. 111, tab. 4. For the coins of Rhegium and of the Mamertini, Buttrey et alii 1989, pp. 161-170; Crawford 1985, pp. 110-111, 113. The coins of Aetna are absent from hoards, but the structure of the coinage, especially the value marks point also to a chronology in the years of the Second Punic War, also Crawford 1987, pp. 44-46.

60 The coarse wares from US 165 where the coin was found point to a chronology in the late third to the first century BC; however, the presence of many residual fragments of the fourth century BC highlights the need of caution. I thank Maxine Anastasi for this information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINT</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>FIG. 4</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melita</td>
<td>late 3rd cent.-2nd century BC</td>
<td>All types</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Greek &amp; Punic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebusus, regular</td>
<td>late 3rd cent.-c. 1257 BC</td>
<td>CAMPO 1976, Group XVIII, nos. 50-60</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhegium</td>
<td>post 215 BC</td>
<td>HN³, Italy, no. 2550</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aetna</td>
<td>after 211/early 2nd cent. BC</td>
<td>GÀBRICI 1927, p. 112, nos. 10-18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catana</td>
<td>after 211/early 2nd cent. BC</td>
<td>GÀBRICI 1927, p. 125, nos. 41-50</td>
<td>fig. 4, 3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ietas</td>
<td>150/140-130 BC</td>
<td>GÀBRICI 1927, p. 142, nos. 12-14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messana, Mamertini</td>
<td>after 211/early 2nd cent.? BC</td>
<td>SÅRSTRÔM 1940, series XII and XVI</td>
<td>fig. 4, 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romano-Sicilian, Lilybaeum</td>
<td>190/170-130 BC</td>
<td>VON BAHRFELDT 1904, pp. 378-389, no. 39</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Republic, Sardinia</td>
<td>211 BC</td>
<td>RRC, no. 63/3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Republic, Sicily</td>
<td>211-208 BC</td>
<td>RRC, no. 69/6a</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>late 3rd (?) - 1st cent. BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The many eastern Sicilian coin finds from Malta are the only material evidence for contacts between this island and Sicily. They probably provide evidence of Rome’s political and strategic impact on the Maltese Islands as a result of the settlement of the Roman administration in Syracuse in the aftermath of the city’s sack in 210 BC and the integration of eastern Sicily in the *provincia*. The Maltese Islands had a key strategic position, lying as they do between Sicily and North Africa, which was especially important at a time when Carthage was still a real danger for Rome. It is uncertain whether the coins of the western part of Sicily, the Romano-Sicilian coin of (most probably) Lilybaeum and the specimen of Ietas, both with magistrate’s name, arrived via eastern Sicily to Malta. At least, the presence of five Maltese coins on Monte Iato (ancient Ietas), shows that coins travelled in both directions.

The three Ebusan coins are all regular specimens of Campo’s type XVIII (see fig. 3, 2 and 6, 3) and not Italian imitations, and they illustrate the methodological problem of deciding whether a group of coins came directly from the place where they were minted, or via somewhere else, and what the historical implications are. Although absolute proof is impossible, it is likely that these three coins, probably struck in the first half of the second century BC, reached Malta from Campania in the late second or first century BC. It has been shown that Ebusan coins of our type reached Pompeii.

---

61 Bruno 2004, p. 140.
in a block before 130 BC, if not earlier around 140 BC. This is one of the few transfers of old bronze coins identified for antiquity so far, and these coins assumed a role as small change in Pompeii and became so popular that they were imitated on the spot by the 120s BC, or even slightly earlier. Since for Malta contacts with central Italy are also attested by amphorae from Campania and Latium, and since the type Campo XVIII is much more common in central Italy than in Ibiza, this is strong evidence of their having come from central Italy, and not Ebusus.

In any discussion about contacts or exchange it is important to consider the political and economic realities. If the coins of Carthage and of Rome and their allies, or of other communities loyal to them, present in Malta, to some extent mirror political realities in the periods of contact involved, it is also possible to use the evidence to see how changing political circumstances also favoured new commercial routes and levels of exchange. It has, for example, been shown that the diffusion of goods shipped in North African amphorae, and of amphorae and fine wares from Campania and Latium in the Mediterranean along the North-South axis, resulted directly from Carthage’s loss of her Epicracy in Sicily and her territories in Sardinia. This obliged Carthage

62 Stannard 2013, pp. 139-140 (with tab. 2 for stratigraphic evidence from the House of Adriane); Frey-Kupper, Stannard forthcoming.
63 Stannard 2013, pp. 140-141.
64 Bruno 2004, pp. 140-142 (highlights p. 140 the massive import of Dressel 1 amphorae from the Tyrrenian area from the late second century BC; they indeed seem to outnumber by far any other types of transport containers).
65 Stannard 2013, p. 136, tab. 1 shows that Campo XVIII represents 87% of all Ebusan types found in central Italian finds, whereas Campo XVIII represents only about 8.9% of Ebusan coin finds in Ibiza.
66 For this and the following thoughts Bechtold 2007, esp. pp. 76-77. Since then Babette Bechtold was able to demonstrate that Campanian amphorae and fine war reached the Southern areas of the Mediterranean already from c. 500 BC, see Bechtold 2013, pp. 435-437 and Bechtold 2015, pp. 70-71.
to exploit its hinterland and to diffuse her products more widely, until the city was destroyed in 146 BC. As these trade contacts with central Italy, especially those in the Vesuvian region, expanded, so these areas expanded their exports to Sicily and to North Africa. The three Ebusan coins probably testify to these contacts.

Yet, one should not fall into the trap of assimilating the finds from a sanctuary to those of a settlement. As no other big coin series is yet available from the Maltese Islands, the one from Tas-Silġ is however the only one we have and is, therefore, precious as a reference point. Also, as far I can judge from the coins found outside the sanctuary and elsewhere in the Mediterranean, there is no reason to assume a major distortion due to ritual practices that could lead, for instance, to privileging specific coin types.

Finally, the 37 coins found in the Italian excavations already mentioned account for 55.2% of the specimens datable to the period between the Second Punic War and the end of the coin series. The ratio of local coins is very similar to the one I have documented for Sicilian sites where coins from the local mint (or mints) make up the bulk of the monetary stock in circulation, usually between 50 and 60%. The difference is that Melita was the only and unrivalled mint on the island, complemented to a limited extent by the production of the mint installed on the neighbour island Gaulos, whereas in Sicily many mints were active and thus create a more complex pattern of local circulation. The clear prevalence of the coins from the local mint Melita is undoubtedly one of the features peculiar to the coin series from Tas-Silġ.

The modest coin series from Ghar ix-Xiħ in Gozo which, apart from three Punic coins of the period of 350/340-330 to the early (?) third century BC and a bronze of Hieron II, includes one coin of Malta, one of Aetna and two of the Roman Republic, reveals similar tendencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINT</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>FIG. 5</th>
<th>NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melita</td>
<td>late 3rd-2nd cent. BC</td>
<td>SNG, Cop., North Africa, nos. 461-462</td>
<td>fig. 5, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aetna</td>
<td>after 211/early 2nd cent. BC</td>
<td>GàBrici 1927, p. 112, nos. 10-18</td>
<td>fig. 5, 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Republic, Rome</td>
<td>late 2nd-early 1st cent. BC</td>
<td>quadrans</td>
<td>fig. 5, 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Republic, Rome</td>
<td>83 BC</td>
<td>denarius, RRC, no. 357/1b</td>
<td>fig. 5, 5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Ghar ix-Xiħ, Gozo. Coins issued under Roman rule (Frey-Kupper 2015a, p. 381).

---

67 Frey-Kupper 2013, p. 326, tab. 69.
2.4. Pantelleria

The excavation on the island of Pantelleria (ancient Cossyra) at the Collina di Santa Teresa by the joint team of the University of Tübingen and of Matera has brought to light during the 2002-2009 campaigns 78 coins, among them one Cyrenaican coin of Ptolemy Apion (104/101-96 BC) (below, catalogue no. 3; fig. 7, 1)\textsuperscript{70}. This coin was been found in the abandonment layer of room 10 in trench IV. The layer includes two fragments of black glazed pottery from the context, a Campana B-oid bowl from Cales, Morel 2250, second half of second-first half of first century BC\textsuperscript{71} and a Campana C plate with vertical rim, Morel F 2266, end second-first half of first century BC\textsuperscript{72}. The remaining pottery, such as local plain ware, has not been studied yet\textsuperscript{73}. It is therefore uncertain whether the layer includes more recent materials as in the nearby cistern 19 where materials of the middle Imperial times came to light.

The breakdown of the coin series reveals again strong local features with 65% of coins of Cossyra (fig. 6, 1) complemented by a coin of Ebusus (fig. 6, 3), two Romano-Sicilian coins (fig. 6, 4-5), four of Carthage (fig. 7, 2), a bronze of Numidia of Juba I (fig. 7, 3) and the coin of Cyrene (fig. 7, 1), whereas the Roman coins, among them a specimen of the Sicilian sextans RRC, no. 69/6a (fig. 7, 4), account for 10% (tab. 4)\textsuperscript{74}. A

\textsuperscript{70} The excavations on the site are still going on, and the coin finds will be fully studied and published by Martin Ziegert. I thank him and Thomas Schäfer for allowing me to include the Cyrenaican coin here and to present it in the context of a preliminary overview on the other coins of the 2002-2009 campaigns. The list given in tab. 4 is based on Martin’s preliminary catalogue and on my examination of the casts with him in 2009 which enabled me to identify the corroded materials shown in fig. 6, 2-5 and 7, 1 and 3.

\textsuperscript{71} Fischer 2015, p. 917, Kat. 32.

\textsuperscript{72} Fischer 2015, p. 918, Kat. 37.

\textsuperscript{73} I thank Karin Schmidt, Tübingen, for her kind information.

\textsuperscript{74} The coins of Cossyra listed in the table include the types “female head r. / four berries in wreath”, von Bahrfeldt 1904, pp. 442-443, no. 105, pl. V, 122 (2 coins): “female head l., in front thymiaterion / pellet in crescent, in wreath, four berries in wreath”, von Bahrfeldt 1904, pp. 443-444, no. 106, pl. V,
hoard of 107 Roman denarii found in 2010 highlights however the role of the denarius in storage of large sums of money or in larger transactions.

One of the Romano-Sicilian coins is of the rare issue by the quaestor L. Alp(ius)? De(-) with head of Apollo and kithara (fig. 6, 5); for this coin only five specimens are known and this is the first one with known provenance. This coin raises the intriguing question whether this magistrate may have produced coins outside Sicily, a question which remains unanswered until we have more evidence. All we know is that a type with head of Apollo and kithara with on either side the ethnic ΛIΛΥBAI-ITAN was produced by the city of Lilybaeum, probably in the later second until the mid-first century BC or slightly later. The same magistrate also signed coins of the series with head of Janus and wreath, most probably issued in Lilybaeum where the seat of the Roman praetor was, and of which a fraction has come to light in the excavations of the German Archaeological Institute in Carthage (fig. 8, 5). Overall these links seem rather to be in favour of an attribution of the kithara type issued by the quaestor L. Alp(ius)? De(-) to Lilybaeum, and this would be supported by the fact that two of the unprovenanced specimens were in Sicilian collections (one each in Trapani and in Palermo). However, the recording of the spread of the rarer Romano-Sicilian types will hopefully provide more information on the circulation area of these coins and ultimately help to identify the location of mints.

A very rare small bronze with a janiform bust and a picture commonly described as pine cone represents also the first find of that type. The pine cone however resembles perfectly the berries depicted on coins of Cossyra of the type with head of Heracles and two clusters of berries within wreath visible on well preserved specimens. It is therefore not unlikely that the type with “pine cone” belongs to the issues of Cossyra, although more evidence is needed to attribute it to the island with any confidence.

The coin of Cyrene is one of very few coins from outside the island among those found at Pantelleria and, like the bronze of Juba I, it originates from North Africa.

123 (8 coins); “male head r. / two grapelike fruits in wreath”, von Bahrfeldt 1904, pp. 438-439, no. 95 (2 coins) which must be a fraction to the types with female head. The attribution of the types to Cossyra is certain due to their frequent presence on the island; see also Morelli 2006, 327-329 for specimens from a local collection which contains probably many finds.

Ziegert 2011; Ziegert 2015.

Inv. PN03 ACR VIII 874-77, 4775: g 7,37, 165°. The four others (also listed in Frey-Kupper 2013, p. 641) are: von Bahrfeldt 1904, pp. 362-363, no. 18 (now lost, formerly in the collection Seriopoli at Trapani; g 7,13); Mini 1979, p. 354, no. 84 (private collection formerly Palermo, g 7,50); British Museum, 1948, 4-2-1 (g 5,90); collection RBW (g 6,83). The issue and its magistrate are discussed in Frey-Kupper 2013, pp. 213-214, 248 and 251 with fig. 54, 2.

The issue (Gàbrici 1927, p. 144, nos. 1-11, discussed Frey-Kupper 2013, pp. 290-292) may have lasted until 36 BC when L. Sempronius Atratinus, the Antonian general who led a fleet sent by Octavian in the conflict that opposed him to Sextus Pompey, issued heavy bronzes in Lilybaeum, see RPC, I, no. 655; Gàbrici 1927, p. 144, nos. 15-18.


See above fn. 76.

von Bahrfeldt 1904, pl. IV, 76.

von Bahrfeldt 1904, pl. V, 112. The attribution of the type to Cossyra is certain due to its presence among the finds from the island.

von Bahrfeldt 1904, p. 438-439, no. 95 (see e.g. the specimen held in Berlin 6052 JF, g 1.86).
It is possible that it reached Pantelleria from Cyrenaica, maybe via Carthage, where Cyrenaican coins were circulating in significant numbers as will be shown. Just like the coin of Ebusus, it may however attest to contacts with Italy, since Cyrenaican bronzes are found there in significant number\textsuperscript{83} although Ebusan coins were also circulating in Carthage as we shall see.

\textsuperscript{83} See the contributions of Barbato and Stannard, Ranucci in this volume.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Figs. 6-7</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cossyra</td>
<td>late 3rd cent.-1st century BC</td>
<td>All types</td>
<td>fig. 6, 1</td>
<td>72.90</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek, uncertain, (Cossyra?)</td>
<td>late 3rd cent.-2nd century BC</td>
<td><strong>Von Bahrfeidt 1904, p. 419, no. 70</strong></td>
<td>fig. 6, 2</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Greek &amp; Punic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebusus, regular</td>
<td>late 3rd century-c. 125? BC</td>
<td><strong>Campos 1976, Group XVIII, nos. 50-60</strong></td>
<td>fig. 6, 3</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romano-Sicilian, Lilybaeum</td>
<td>190/170-130 BC</td>
<td><strong>Von Bahrfeidt 1904, p. 372, no. 27</strong></td>
<td>fig. 6, 4</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romano-Sicilian, Lilybaeum2</td>
<td>190/170-130 BC</td>
<td><strong>Von Bahrfeidt 1904, p. 362-363, no. 18</strong></td>
<td>fig. 6, 5</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrene, Ptolemy Apion</td>
<td>104/101-96 BC</td>
<td><strong>NAeCy, no. 113</strong></td>
<td>fig. 7, 1</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carthage</td>
<td>213-202 BC</td>
<td><strong>SNG, Cop., North Africa, nos. 307-314 (3 ex.), 330 (1 ex.)</strong></td>
<td>fig. 7, 2</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauretania, Juba I</td>
<td>60-46 BC</td>
<td><strong>SNG, Cop., North Africa, nos. 532-633</strong></td>
<td>fig. 7, 3</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek, uncertain</td>
<td>3rd-1st century BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roman</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Republic, Rome</td>
<td>after 211 BC</td>
<td><strong>RRC, no. 56/2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Republic, Sicily</td>
<td>211-208 BC</td>
<td><strong>RRC, no. 69/6a</strong></td>
<td>fig. 7, 4</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Republic, Rome</td>
<td>2nd century BC</td>
<td><strong>2+1 denarii, 3 asses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>5+1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70+1?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Pantelleria. Coins issued under Roman rule (Zieger forthcoming; Frey-Kupper 2015b, p. 460, fig. 4).

2.5. Carthage

As for Carthage, a significant presence of Cyrenaican coins has been highlighted in the past, namely by Paolo Visonà who has systematically recorded finds of Greek coins from the site, including from old excavations84. A hoard of four gold tetrobols from Tunis has been recorded in 1899 by Gauckler and another one includes gold issues of Cyrene and Ptolemaic Egypt, together with an electrum and a gold coin of Carthage85. Both hoards date from around 300 BC and fall outside the timeframe discussed in detail here, but they attest to earlier use of Cyrenaican coins for storage of value or for larger transactions. A bronze issue by Magas has been documented as early as in 1901 by Père Delattre86 and many other specimens, all bronze, have been found in excavations since then. We now have the finds by the many international teams active on the site under the auspices of the UNESCO heritage program from

85 IGCH, p. 345, no. 2265 (Gauckler, BTCH 1899, p. clv); Visonà forthcoming.
1972. In order to assess the importance of these bronzes in the monetary stock, it is necessary to consider them in the context of the overall pattern of all coins found on the site. It is difficult, if not impossible, to get figures from old excavations since coin types, especially Punic coins, are generally not accurately enough described to allow us to identify them according to current classification standards. On the other hand, classification, or more elaborate classification and dating, of major coin issues, such as Punic coins (by G. Kenneth Jenkins in SNG, Cop., North Africa and Paolo Visonà in many articles), Ebusan coins (CAMPO 1976, for imitations STANNARD 2013), Massaliot coins (DEPEYROT 1999, PY 2006; FEUGÈRE, PY, 2011), and Cyrenaican coins (NAeCy) has started only in recent years and, in any case, not earlier than the time at which the UNESCO excavations were launched.

I have assembled the coin finds from the major international excavations in Carthage. The 157 coins I was able to gather for the period between the Second Punic War and the end of the Republic originate from different find spots across the site where the many international teams were active (tab. 5). The bulk of coins (131 specimens) originate from the German excavations conducted from 1974-1997 in the area between the sea and the hill of Byrsa, in the sections of the cardo maximus, Quartier Magon, Rue Ibn Chabâat and other places. Apart from the material from the cardo maximus, these coins are still unpublished, although assembled in a draft catalogue by the late Hans Roland Baldus, henceforth called “unpublished list”, whose amended edition and study will be included in the Karthago series of the German Archaeological Institute. A small group (5 coins) was found during the 2002-2005 excavations of the Belgio-Tunisian bilateral project, likewise to be presented and discussed as part of the excavation report. The rest (21 coins) has been published.

The breakdown of the coins is not unlike that of those from Pantelleria (tab. 4). Most specimens (68%) are of the local mint, i.e. Carthage. Interestingly the coins of Cyrene make up the biggest bloc of foreign coins. With 15 specimens they form 9.5% of the coins of the period between the second Punic War and the end of the Roman Republic and even outnumber the 14 Roman coins, although we should take into account here the fact that the latter include silver coins which are of higher value. All of the Cyrenaican coins are of the type with head of Libya and due to poor conservation can mostly be attributed only roughly to the period of Ptolemy IV to

---


88 BALDUS 2007.

89 I thank the colleagues of the German Archaeological Institute responsible of the excavations, Philipp von Rummel and Christof Flügel, who have invited me to accept the task after Baldus’ premature passing away in 2011.

90 I am indebted in particular to Roald Docter, and to Fethi Chelbi and Boutheina Maraoui Telmini to entrust me with the study of these coins.

91 See above fn. 87.

92 Since the study of the coins is still on going the figures given may change.
VIII, i.e. belonging essentially to the period 204-140 BC. Unfortunately the coins of the German excavations are not documented by photographs, and casts exist only for some of the coins; moreover, the numismatic finds have not been located in the Musée de Carthage’s storerooms for some years. It is noteworthy that no coin of Ptolemy Apion with Isis headdress appears so far to have been documented. I was wondering if this was due to the fact that these small coins, if badly conserved, could easily be taken for coins of the Vandals. On the other hand are they thinner than Vandalic coins, and the Isis headdress is also quite distinctive.

Figure 8. Carthage, various excavations by the German Archaeological Institute. 1. Gaul, Ambiani, c. 70/60-30/20 BC; 2.-3. Massalia, 49-27 BC; 4. Brundisium, second century BC; 5. Romano-Sicilian, Lilybaeum, fraction, signed by the quaestor L. Alp(itus)? De(-) Q 190/170-150/140 BC.

For eight of the nine Cyrenaican coins from the German excavations (see below, for all except catalogue no. 4, 6) there are archaeological data on the context. One was found in a context dated around 150 BC (see below, catalogue no. 4, 7). Another specimen is from a stratum below the layer created by early imperial levelling activities (= RBPS, “Römisch bewegter Punischer Schutt”93, with Punic and early imperial finds, generally up to Claudius), possibly the destruction layer of 146 BC (see below, catalogue no. 4, 3). This shows that at least two Cyrenaican coins must have circulated there before Cyrenaica came under Roman rule. A further specimen came to light in an Augustan/early imperial stratum (see below, catalogue no. 4, 2) and all the other coins are from the massive levelling layer above the 146 BC destruction layer, with Punic and early imperial finds (= RBPS) (see below, catalogue nos. 4, 1 and 4-5 and 8). The chronologies are based on the handwritten inventory made at the time by Mercedes Vegas, the prominent expert in pottery94.

The presence of most coins in the RPBS layer seems to be an argument for a circulation in the first century BC or later. There is no proof, but my feeling is that many of these coins came to Carthage after 96 BC when Cyrenaica was bequeathed to

93 For the levelling and the layer, see Rakob 2000, 77-78.
94 I thank Christof Flügel, Karin Schmidt and Ralf Bockmann for their information on the contexts. Karin Schmidt has checked the inventory of pottery made by Mercedes Vegas at the time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINT</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>FIG. 8</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carthage</td>
<td>221-c. 200 BC</td>
<td>SNG, <em>Cop.</em>, North Africa, nos. 302 ff.</td>
<td>28,00</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>307-314 (3 ex.), 330 (1 ex.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carthage</td>
<td>c. 200-146 BC</td>
<td>Various types</td>
<td>34,40</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Greek &amp; Punic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaul (Gallia Belgica), Ambiani</td>
<td>c. 70/60-30/20 BC</td>
<td>Schears 1977, pp. 534-535, no. 79, pl. XIV, no. 386; de La Tour 1892, nos. 1976-1978</td>
<td>fig. 8, 1</td>
<td>0,64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebusus, regular or irregular</td>
<td>late 3rd cent.-c. 80/70 BC</td>
<td>Campo 1976, Group XVIII, nos. 50-60 or imitation</td>
<td>1,27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massalia, regular or irregular</td>
<td>c. 225-50 BC</td>
<td>small bronzes of the bull series</td>
<td>1,27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massalia</td>
<td>c. 49-27 BC</td>
<td>see Feugère, Py 2011, pp. 150-160 (12 ex., fig. 8, 2-3) and SNG, <em>Cop.</em>, <em>Spain-Gaul</em>, no. 830 var. (2 ex.)</td>
<td>fig. 8, 2-3</td>
<td>8,92</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brundisium</td>
<td>2nd century BC</td>
<td><em>HN</em>, Italy, no. 749; SNG, <em>Munich</em>, 3, nos. 558-569</td>
<td>fig. 8, 4</td>
<td>0,64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman-Sicilian, Lilybaeum</td>
<td>190/170-130 BC</td>
<td>Von Bahrfeldt 1904, pp. 362-363, no. 18</td>
<td>fig. 8, 5</td>
<td>0,64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria, Ptolemy VIII</td>
<td>c. 150-before 115 BC</td>
<td>Picard, Faucher 2012, pp. 76-80 and 80-84 (Group VII)</td>
<td>0,64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrene, Ptolemy IV-VIII</td>
<td>221-140 BC</td>
<td>SNG, <em>Cop.</em>, Egypt. <em>The Ptolemies</em>, nos. 446 ff.</td>
<td>9,55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Republic, Rome</td>
<td>211-210 BC</td>
<td><em>RRC</em>, no. 72/7</td>
<td>0,64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Republic, Rome</td>
<td>2nd century BC</td>
<td>4 denarii, 1 quinarius, 7 asses, 1 quadrans</td>
<td>8,29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>157</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Carthage, various excavations. Coins issued c. 220/210-first century BC (see fn. 87).

Rome, or, perhaps more likely, after its annexation by Rome in 75 BC, though some obviously arrived earlier. It leads inevitably to the question to what extent the latter coins attest to economic exchange between the two cities, Carthage and Cyrene, and their respective surrounding areas in the second century BC.

The question has been discussed for earlier coins, namely of the later fourth and the third centuries BC, and for a long time both areas were considered to be economically isolated from each other. Indeed, no large group of Punic coins has been found in Cyrenaica, which we would expect if there were regular trade between Carthage

---

95 See e.g. Buttrey 1997, p. 7; see also Visonà forthcoming.
and Cyrene. Among the coin finds from Cyrene and Apollonia, the port of Cyrene\(^6\), no Punic coin has been documented, and, so far, only one Punic coin of the type \textit{SNG, Cop., North Africa}, nos. 94-97 ("male head/prancing horse") has been recorded from the excavations in Euesperides\(^7\); a second specimen, possibly of the same type, is reported from Sidi Kreibsh, Benghazi/Berenice\(^8\). A few more coins from Cyrenaica, mainly from the area of Benghazi, comprise three more specimens of the same type (\textit{SNG, Cop., North Africa}, nos. 94-97), and four later coins down to the period 200-146 BC\(^9\). Overstrikes of coins of the Euesperidan issue with gazelle and silphium issued by Ptolemy I in the late fourth century BC on the Carthaginian \textit{SNG, Cop., North Africa}, nos. 94-97 bronzes (dated to 350/340-330 BC and common in strata of the last quarter of the fourth century\(^10\)) also show that these coins must have been more frequent in the monetary stock than one might expect from the excavation evidence\(^10\). In a forthcoming paper Paolo Visonà points out that the aforementioned hoards from Carthage (dated to around 300 BC), which include Cyrenaican gold coins, point to connectivity across the Syrtes\(^10\). Similar evidence may be provided by a large hoard of around 1000 bronzes of Cyrene or more (kg 5,9) deposited in the mid-third century BC and reportedly found at Tripoli in 1899\(^1\). There was clearly a relationship, and exchange both ways, but the degree of activity cannot be measured by coin evidence alone, and will be easier to evaluate with the help of ceramic evidence\(^10\).

The stratigraphic context of our two coins from Carthage is an important step forward in order better to assess the penetration of coins from Cyrene to Carthage and vice versa in the course of the second century BC. In the light of earlier finds, the presence of these two specimens may indeed reflect continuing or renewed commercial contacts between the two areas. On the basis of the other numismatic and the ceramic finds from Carthage, contacts with Italy must also be considered as a possible explanation of the presence of at least some of the Cyrenaican coins in Carthage, maybe, in particular, of those from post 146 BC contexts.

Several of the other coins, such as the Ebusan coins, the bronze of Brundium and the coins of Rome, could indeed reflect trade with Italian \textit{negotiatores}. The recent study of the pottery from site 2 at Bir Messaouda excavated by the Belgio-Tunisian team shows that c. 60-70\% of the fine ware vessels of the first half of the second century was imported from Campania, mainly from workshops in the area of Naples, and the Hamburg excavations show similar tendencies\(^10\). This is in contrast with a low

---

\(^6\) Buttrey 1976a.

\(^7\) Buttrey 1997, p. 7 and 61, no. E23.

\(^8\) Buttrey 1997, p. 7.

\(^9\) \textit{NAeCy}, pp. 24-25, fig. 4.


\(^10\) Buttrey 1997, pp. 6-7, 55-56.

\(^10\) Visonà forthcoming; I thank Paolo Visonà for having shared his paper and thoughts with me.

\(^10\) \textit{IGCH}, p. 238, no. 1686 (the bulk of the hoard seem to be coins of Magas in Revolt (282-262 BC) similar to \textit{NAeCy}, no. 76.


\(^10\) Bechtold 2010, pp. 48-50. A bronze coin of Neapolis found in the German excavations as \textit{HN3, Italy}, no. 597 (inv. 1982/115) dated to c. 250-225 BC could still have been in circulation at the time. The coin series of Bir Messaouda does not include coins from Southern Italy but a trident bronze of Hieron II.
percentage of imported amphorae (from anywhere), and the few recovered specimens originate either from Campania or from Rhodes; the bulk of the material is local North African amphorae which attest to a strong dependence on goods from the area around the Capital in the last decades of its life before it was destroyed in 146 BC. On the other hand, there seems also to be considerable evidence of North African amphorae in Pompeii, which attest to a flow of goods in both directions.

It would be tempting to consider the small late Massaliot coins (49-27 BC) which date to the period after the foundation of the Roman colony Colonia Iulia Concordia in Carthage in 44 BC as resulting from trade with Massalia, which undoubtedly remained an important trade centre for a long time. There is indeed evidence for the import of wine in amphorae from Gaul and of mortaria from Massalia but the quantities at least of the amphorae are so modest in Carthage (c. 2%) that other major routes must be considered for the arrival of the late Massaliot coins. The striking presence of such bronzes in Ostia, where they form about a third of Greek coins recorded there so far, point indeed to Italy being the route. Only one of the Massaliot coins of the older bull type has been identified there. Late Massaliot bronzes seem to occur also in Rome and in the river Liri in significant number. Thus the presence of at least a part of the late Massaliot coins in Carthage could be explained by contacts with Italy. Moreover, there is evidence of an increased import of Italian wine from Italy to Carthage in the second half of the first century BC; especially in the period between 22 and 15 BC, although importing must have started soon after the foundation of the Roman colony Colonia Iulia Concordia at Carthage in 44 BC.

The Celtic coin from Gaul (fig. 8, 1), assignable to the region around Amiens could have reached Carthage along with the coins of Massalia. If it is correct that the obverse type of the Celtic bronze is inspired by the denarius of M. Plaetorius Cestianus struck in 67 BC as proposed by Simone Scheers, and I think she is correct, the chronology of the coin would support this possibility, and this all the more as the
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106 Bechtold 2010, pp. 59-62; see also above, section 2 with fn. 66.
107 See e.g. Pascual Berlanga et alii 2007, pp. 502-505.
108 Apart from the 5 unpublished coins from the German excavations (unpublished list by Hans Roland Baldus) the following are listed in tab. 5: Metcalf, Hitchner 1980, p. 190, n. 6 (given as uncertain); Metcalf 1982, p. 68, nos. 7-8 (given as uncertain); Visonà 1988, p. 387, no. 5; Visonà 2009, p. 187, no. 1; Houghtalin, Mac Isaac 2005, p. 184, nos. 9-10; Brenot 2012, p. 584, nos. 5-6.
110 Spagnoli 2007, p. 315, nos. 2-7 (6 out of 20 identified Greek coins); Pardini 2014 (one specimen, the only Greek coin identified). All coins are from contexts of the third and fourth centuries AD.
111 Spagnoli 2007, p. 315, no. 1 (uncertain type of the small bronzes with bull, either regular or irregular).
112 Marta Barbato has recorded 4 late bronzes, 8 bronzes with the butting bull and 9 with the standing bull (Feugère, Py 2011, pp. 146-148, type PBM-67) among the material of the “sottosuolo romano”, i.e. old finds from the city of Rome, held in the Capitoline Museum. Clive Stannard has recorded 27 (or 16.5%) out of 164 Massaliot bronzes from the river Liri. I thank both Marta Barbato and Clive Stannard for their information.
113 Martin-Kilcher 1993, pp. 270-280, 286-290; thanks to the tituli picti with consular dates on the vessels built into the so-called “mur à amphores” excavated by Père Delattre.
114 See Scheers 1977, p. 535, fig. 128 (spread map).
115 RRC, no. 409/1; Scheers 1977, p. 535.
bronze seems to be slightly worn. Overall the presence of at least part of the Cyrenaican coins in Carthage may also be best explained by commercial contacts with Italy and ultimately by the increasing influence of Rome on the political situation in North Africa. Just as with coins of Massalia, Cyrenaican bronzes turn up in not negligible number in all major find places in Central Italy. The little stratigraphic evidence available from there shows that coins were in circulation at least in the early first century BC (Pompeii, votive deposit from Vicolo Narcisi, insula VI 2, 16 and at Privati, Castellammare di Stabia, deposit). From Italy a coin may have also reached the oppidum La Cloche in Southern Gaul, a site which was abandoned in 49 BC and where a group of coins from Italian mints were found including an imitation of the Massalia coins with head of Apollo and butting bull.

Data from ancient excavations in Carthage that have yielded coins of Cyrene, Massalia, Ebusus and from Sicily provide evidence similar to that derived from the coins found in the recent excavations. The coins also comprise a wide range of Greek coins from Sicily and Italy and also coins from Greece throughout all relevant periods implying that Carthage was well connected with other areas in the Mediterranean. Since there is normally no context for old finds, we, unfortunately, do not know when they reached the Punic Capital.

3. Conclusions

Although the evidence of our materials is still sparse, it has been possible to identify a Cyrenaican coin from a second century filling in a house at Monte Iato, Sicily, and one from an abandonment layer of the second half of the second to the first half of the first century BC in a building on the Acropolis of Pantelleria. For a third coin, from Lipari, no stratigraphic data is available. In Carthage two hoards including coins of Cyrene show that gold issues of Cyrene were stored either separately or together with gold coins of Ptolemaic Egypt, and with Carthaginian gold and electrum specimens around 300 BC. A large find consisting of around 1000 coins reportedly found at Tripoli in 1899 attests hoarding of bronze coins in the mid-third century BC. Moreover, at least one Cyrenaican bronze was found in a pre-146 BC stratum in Carthage, and a second one belongs possibly to the destruction layer of 146 BC. This is interesting evidence, especially in the light of the dearth of Punic coins in Cyrenaica, although one specimen of a Punic bronze coin of 350/340-330 BC has been found each in Cyrene and in Euesperides. If more coins from similar contexts were to turn up in future, one could assume that the two cities, Carthage and Cyrene, were economically

---

117 Ranucci 2001 and Ranucci 2008, pp. 155-157; Cantilena 1997, pp. 42-49; see Stannard, Ranucci, in this volume; a further coin from Pompeii, Hobbs 2013, p. 151, no. 62 and p. 184 is listed as from phase 5 (pre 89 BC) but maybe phase 6 (post Sullan, mid to late first century BC); the coin is badly corroded (Cyrenaican?), and Stannard, Ranucci above (p. 170, fig. 5, with p. 171, no. 21) consider it uncertain.
118 Py 2006, p. 698 (LYB-442); see also Stannard, Ranucci, pp. 185-186 in this volume.
119 See also the contribution by Stannard, Ranucci in this volume, pp. 185-186 with fig. 8.
121 See previous fn.
more permeable, not only in the fourth and third century BC, but also from the time of the Second Punic War than hitherto assumed.

However, most Cyrenaican bronzes from Carthage were collected in the massive levelling layers (above the 146 BC destruction stratum) which are mixed with imperial finds, and one is from an early imperial stratum. These bronzes may have reached Carthage after the 96 BC bequest of Cyrenaica to Rome or, perhaps more likely, after 75 BC, when it was made a Roman province. Ceramic evidence has shown that exchange between Carthage and Italy took place before and after Carthage’s destruction and it is hence not excluded that Cyrenaican coins moved with other goods between North Africa and Italy. The presence of Cyrenaican bronzes in Italy would support this view. The activities of Roman *negotiatores* attested in Cyrenaica from 67 BC by epigraphic evidence and by finds of Roman pottery undoubtedly created new dynamics in North Africa and may explain part of the specimens found in Carthage. The presence of isolated specimens is always difficult to explain and those from the islands may have arrived there either from Carthage or from Rome, although provenance from Cyrene itself cannot be excluded. The Cyrenaican coins and (later?) Massaliot bronzes may have served as small change at a time when Carthage had stopped issuing her own coins.¹²²

Last but not least, the overview of our materials increases our knowledge of the pattern of small coins circulating in the Western Mediterranean islands. Notwithstanding the small sample available, the islands and Carthage show a similar pattern of monetary stock for the period between the Second Punic War and 30/20 BC. Local coin prevails, and, among the “foreign” coins, Roman coins from Rome make up c. 10% in Sicily, 4.5% in Malta, 7% in Cossyra and 8% in Carthage. The small number of coins from Malta and Cossyra may skew the picture slightly, as demonstrated by the two Roman Republican coins found among four coins of the period between the Second Punic War and the first century BC found in Ghar ix-Xir, Gozo. It is all the more noteworthy that among the small amount of foreign coins found in the islands and in Carthage, the coins of Cyrene represent, along with the coins of Massalia and (less important) Ebusus, a significant part of the circulating bronzes and are about as common (9.5%) in Carthage as the Republican coins from Rome and as later Massaliot coins (each 8.9%). Interpretation of this data has again to be cautious since the coins of Massalia are later than the Cyrenaican coins. They may nonetheless reflect trade with Italy as well as we have seen. Future finds and the final publication of the coins from Pantelleria and Carthage taking into account their archaeological contexts will hopefully allow further insights into the monetary provision and use in the Western Mediterranean before from the Julio-Claudian period, when patterns of circulating coins gradually change.

¹²² See also Visonà forthcoming.
The dates of the Cyrenaican coins below and in the commentary above are based on NaEcy.

Excavations by the Missione Archeologica di Monte Iato, Archäologisches Institut der Universität Zürich
Westquartier, House with courtyard; Trench (Sondage) 450, room 9
From a Hellenistic context (Frey-Kupper 2013, pp. 19 and 520-521; second century BC)

Ptolemy V Epiphanes-Ptolemy VI Philometor (204-163 BC)

Group VII, module C (fig. 2, 1)

Obv. Diademed head of Ptolemy r. with aegis.
Rev. [ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ]; diademed head of Libya r., below chin cornucopia.
AE g 3.57 345° mm 17.2 Inv. M 2270
NaEcy, no. 76.


From same layer, south of room 9 (fig. 2, 2-4):
Hieron II, litra (small flan series), 240-215 BC; gåbrici 1927, pp. 184-185, nos. 442-489 (type); g 5.12, 150° = Frey-Kupper 2013, p. 410, no. 650; p. 521. Inv. M 1906.

2. Lipari, Contrada Diana (Proprietà Zangani) (1979)
Excavations by the Soprintendenza Archeologica della Sicilia Orientale

Ptolemy IV-VIII (221-140 BC)

Obv. Diademed head of Ptolemy r. with aegis.
Rev. [ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ]; diademed head of Libya r., below chin cornucopia.
AE g 2.72 Inv. 15683

Publ.: Mastelloni 1994, p. 220 (given as a bronze of Ptolemy VIII) and 227, n. 23 (catalogued as belonging to one of the Ptolemies IV-VIII with the reference to SNG, Cyp., Egypt. The Ptolemies, nos. 446 ss., which I retain here). No stratigraphic data is mentioned for the coin but most numismatic finds from the necropolis seem to be either sporadic or from later contexts, see Mastelloni 1994, p. 217; Mastelloni 1995, p. 403, n. 3; Puglisi 2009, p. 100; Cavagna 2015, p. 141, no. 13.5.10/1.

Excavations by the University of Tübingen and the Università della Basilicata.

Ptolemy Apion (104/101-96 BC)

(fig. 7, 1)
Obv. Diademed head of Zeus Ammon r.
Rev. ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ [BAΣΙΛΕΩΣ Ά] (or similar); Isis headdress.
AE g 1.60 360°? mm 13.4 Acropolis, PN-03-ACR-MO-IV-1229-14036
NaEcy, no. 113.
For two fragments of black glazed pottery from the context, see Fischer 2015, p. 917, Kat. 32 (Campana B-oid from Cales, bowl Morel 2250, second half of second-first half of first century BC) and p. 918, Kat. 37 (Campana C, plate with vertical rim, Morel F 2266, End second-first half of first century BC). The other pottery, such as local plain ware, has not been studied yet.

I thank Karin Schmidt for her information on the context.

4. **CARthage**

Excavations by the German Archaeological Institute: Area Magon (1977, 1980, 1984 and 1987: Identifications according Hans Rudolf Baldus (unpublished manuscript); the coins are lost, no casts and no photographs are available).

**Ptolemies IV-VIII (221-140 BC)**

**Obv.** Diademmed head of Ptolemy r. with aegis.

**Rev.** ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ; diademmed head of Libya r., below chin cornucopia.

1) AE g 3,41 1977/16 = Baldus (unpublished list) no. 376
2) AE g 2,10 1977/203 = Baldus (unpublished list) no. 377
3) AE g 2,93 1980/7 = Baldus (unpublished list) no. 378 (SNG, Cop., Egypt. The Ptolemies, no. 445)
4) AE g 2,88 1980/8.1 = Baldus (unpublished list) no. 379 (SNG, Cop., Egypt. The Ptolemies, no. 451 type, identification uncertain?)
5) AE g 2,10 1980/9 = Baldus (unpublished list) no. 380 (SNG, Cop., Egypt. The Ptolemies, no. 445)
6) AE g 1,01 1980/65 = Baldus (unpublished list) no. 381 (SNG, Cop., Egypt. The Ptolemies, no. 445 type; but here smaller, see no. 664ss)
7) AE g 2,30 1984/1 = Baldus (unpublished list) no. 382 (SNG, Cop., Egypt. The Ptolemies, nos. 449-453, esp. 449s. On the reverse, no cornucopia is visible)
8) AE g 1,67 1987/19 = Baldus (unpublished list) no. 383 (SNG, Cop., Egypt. The Ptolemies, nos. 445ss and 449ss)

The coins nos. 3 and 7 are from relevant archaeological contexts:

no. 7 is from a stratum (layer 21) dated around 150 BC; 

no. 3 was found in a layer below the RBPS horizon: destruction layer of 146 BC.

no. 2 is from an Augustan/early imperial layer; 

nos. 1, 4, 5 and 8 are from the RBS strata.

The context of no. 6 is uncertain due to the impossibility to currently locate the stratum in the inventory sheets.

Excavations by the German Archaeological Institute: *Decumanus Maximus* (1999):

**Ptolemies IV-VIII (221-140 BC)**

**Obv.** Diademmed head of Ptolemy r. with aegis.

**Rev.** ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ; diademmed head of Libya r., below chin cornucopia.

9) AE g 3,69 91/129 Inv. 6801

Publ.: Baldus 2007, p. 826.

The coin was found in the Punic destruction layer, disturbed in the Roman period (= RBPS, “Römisch bewegter Punischer Schutt”).

I thank Christof Flügel, Karin Schmidt and Ralf Bockmann for their information on the contexts. Karin Schmidt has checked the inventory of pottery made by Mercedes Vegas at the time.
Excavations by the University of Michigan (1975-1976 and 1978):

**Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II (163-145 BC)**

Group VIII (α), module C 3 specimens

**Obv.** Diademed head of Ptolemy I r. with aegis

**Rev.** Diademed head of Libya r.; beneath chin cornucopia; beneath truncation of neck monogram ELY.

NaeCy, no. 100; BMC, Cyr., p. 86, no. 71


12) AE g 1,75 ° Inv. 574 Buttrey 1975, p. 167, no. 4 (Michigan 1975): BMC, Cyr., p. 86, nos. 71 ff.

**Ptolemy Apion (104/101-96 BC)**

Group IX, module E (“neat work”) 2 specimens

**Obv.** Diademed head of Ptolemy I r. with aegis

**Rev.** ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ; diademed head of Libya r.

NaeCy, no. 111A; BMC, Cyrenaica, p. 87, no. 84


14) AE g 2,26 360° Inv. 731 Metcalf 1982, p. 68, no. 2 (Michigan 1978): BMC, Cyr., p. 87, nos. 84 ff.’

Group IX, module E (‘‘crude work, larger head on rev.”) 1 specimen

**Obv.** Diademed head of Ptolemy I r. with aegis

**Rev.** ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ; diademed head of Libya r.

NaeCy, no. 111C; BMC, Cyr., p. 88, no. 94

Group IX, module E (‘‘crude work, larger head on rev.”) 1 specimen

**Obv.** Diademed head of Ptolemy I r. with aegis

**Rev.** ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ; diademed head of Libya r.

NaeCy, no. 111D; BMC, Cyr., p. 88, no. 95
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