New data have emerged from H. Göricke-Lukić’s 2004 publication of the extant portion of the Škudljivac hoard, the earliest assemblage of bronze coins minted by the Greeks in the eastern Adriatic. Of the 55 overstriking in the original deposit (found in 1835 on the island of Hvar), only 37 have been preserved in Osijek’s Muzej Slavonije: 35 of them consist of issues with head of Ionios r. / Dolphin r. above three waves, and head of Ionios r. / Dolphin r., which were overstruck by Pharos following a pattern of obverse upon obverse, reverse upon reverse. Two additional coins, overstruck with a bearded head of Ionios l. and a lion’s head r. upon an earlier Ionios issue previously overstruck by Pharos (Osijek 2052), and upon a bronze of Pharos (Osijek 2093), may also belong to the Škudljivac hoard, as W. Kubitschek noted in 1897. Their dark green patina is similar to that of the other overstriking. Since these two coins represent the last group of issues of Ionios bronzes, their inclusion in the deposit would indicate that the hoard was hidden after the Ionios coinage had come to an end. The single obverse die used by the Pharians to overstrike the Ionios bronzes appears on 30 overstriking in museum and private collections that have close affinities with the specimens in Osijek. Some of them may thus also have come from the Škudljivac hoard. Its contents shed light on the dynamics of monetary circulation in central Dalmatia in the third quarter of the 4th century BC.
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In the summer of 1979, shortly before the 9th International Congress of Numismatics, Ivan Mirnik took me to Osijek’s Muzej Slavonije to view what was left of the Škudljivac hoard. I was about to present a paper on the contents of this unique find – the oldest group of bronze issues of the Greek colonies in Dalmatia – and I needed to know whether the largest
part of this assemblage was still preserved in Osijek, where it had been said to be since 1898 (VISONÀ 1982: 152-153). Ivan’s offer to help made this possible, and his name will forever be linked to my quest for the Škudljivac hoard. That my visit to the Muzej Slavonije was brief does not excuse me, however, for some of the errors that I introduced into my essay: the most egregious one was my conclusion that the majority of the 55 overstrikings in the original deposit consisted of «newly minted Pharian coins... acquired by the Issaeans and turned into Issaean money at minimum expense» (VISONÀ 1982: 155). Following the opinions of D. Rendić Miočević (RENDIĆ-MIOČEVIĆ 1970: 354-367), I believed then that the Greeks who settled on Vis had systematically overstruck a bronze issue of Pharos. I know now that I had it backwards, since it was the Pharians who overstruck some of the earliest Issaean issues (= J. Brunšmid’s Joniosmünzen). Brunšmid had already said so. Moreover, the index of illustrations that accompanied my 1979 essay was both inaccurate and incomplete (nos. 6 to 8 were attributed to the wrong museums, and the caption for no. 9 was omitted).

Nevertheless, this trip to Osijek did focus my attention upon the importance of the Škudljivac hoard for the chronology of Issa’s coinage, a topic which continues to be a matter of controversy. It was also through Ivan’s mentoring that Zagreb’s Arheološki Muzej became a familiar venue for my subsequent research on the coinage of Issa and Carthage. Thus, it is very fitting and a great honor to dedicate the following remarks to Professor Mirnik: a dear friend, a lifetime host, and a distinguished scholar, who has made so many contributions to the study of ancient and modern coinage in Croatia and the eastern Adriatic region. Sic semper feliciter, amice!

The Škudljivac hoard has not yet been fully examined, even though H. Göricke-Lukić has published an editio princeps of the surviving coins from this deposit, with superb illustrations (GÖRICKE-LUKIĆ 2004: 109-140). In particular, a complete die study of the coins in Osijek remains a desideratum. Moreover, a concordance between this assemblage and the catalogue published by W. Kubitschek in a seminal article, of which J. Brunšmid himself was unaware (KUBITSCHEK 1897), still needs to be provided. Kubitschek’s essay is not without problems of its own. Some facts are clear, though.

1. The Škudljivac hoard offers a snapshot of the coinage circulating in central Dalmatia at a pivotal moment in the region’s history — after Syracuse had ceased to be the main player and before Issa emerged as an independent polity. At this time Pharos was possibly the most organized, and perhaps even the dominant Greek colony in the area.\(^1\)

---

2. Nos. 7 and 9 are overstrikings from the Škudljivac hoard in Osijek’s Muzej Slavonije: see GÖRICKE-LUKIĆ 2004: 125, no. 388 and 122, no. 379, respectively.
4. Cf. DUKAT – JELIČIĆ-RADONIĆ 2009; JELIČIĆ-RADONIĆ 2010. It is hard to reconcile J. Jeličić-Radonić’s ideas about the foundation of Issa by Dionysius I of Syracuse, and her dating of Issa’s earliest civic issues to the first half of the 4th century BC, with the archaeological evidence from Vis known at present: see the data from Issa’s Martvilo cemetery recently assembled by ČARGO 2010: 47-48, 68-69, 268-269; cf. KIRIGIN 2006: 21-22.
5. Also see the essay by H. Göricke-Lukić in this volume.
6. Cf. BRUNSMD 1898: 37, footnote 25a. The weights in Göriec-Lukić’s catalogue also need checking.
7. This was correctly pointed out by GORINI 1976: 16.
2. The original deposit found in 1835 by »Nicolò Burattov, detto Massan, quondam Tommaso« (KUBITSCHEK 1897: 161), included only coins of Herakleia, Pharos, and Joniosmünzen (all of which were overstruck); there were no ΔΙ overstrickings in it.⁸ Except for two fractions of Herakleia,⁹ one of which is noticeably worn (Osijek 2132), the hoard contained examples of the largest denomination in bronze struck by the principal Greek mints or minting authorities in Dalmatia in the second and third quarters of the 4th century BC.¹⁰

3. The Ionios overstrickings in the hoard may have included two specimens bearing a bearded head of Ionios l. and ΙΟΝΙΟΣ on the obverse, and a lion’s head r. on the reverse. These were listed by Kubitschek (KUBITSCHEK 1897: 166, nos. 58-59), and are fortunately preserved among the coins in Osijek’s Muzej Slavonije (GÖRICKE-LUKIĆ 2004: 127, nos. 391-392).¹¹ One of them (Osijek 2052; weight: 15 g) was overstruck twice: first by Pharos upon the Issaean issue with Head of Ionios l. / Dolphin r. above three waves, then with the latest types of the Ionios’ series (which I have identified as group 4 in an earlier essay) (VISONÀ 2010: 32). Its slightly larger module (26 mm) is characteristic of the earliest Ionios issues (my groups 1-2).¹² The second specimen (Osijek 2093; weight: 14.9 g) was overstruck once with these latest types upon the standard issue of Pharos bearing the head of Zeus l. on the obverse and a goat standing l. on the reverse. In my INC essay I was skeptical about Kubitschek’s inclusion of these coins in the original assemblage, and I cited as negative evidence the lack of any mention of such distinctive coin types in P. Nisiteo’s letters about the hoard (VISONÀ 1982: 154).¹³

But this argumentum ex silentio has limitations (how reliable were Nisiteo’s first impressions, after all?), and the photographs provided by H. Görcke-Lukić leave open the possibility that both these overstrickings were found together with the rest of the hoard. Their patina is similar to that of the other overstrickings, and the traces of the bearded portrait l. and of the lion’s head r. of the Ionios types are not immediately detectable.

Therefore, some new conclusions are in order: 1) the Škudljivac hoard was probably concealed after the Ionios coinage had run its course; 2) the deposit apparently contained both early Issaean coins (examples of groups 1-2 of the Joniosmünzen) overstruck by Pharos (representing 53 of the 55 overstrickings) and at least two coins (both examples of group 4 of the Joniosmünzen) presumably overstruck by Greek settlers on Vis. These settlers produced the Ionios coinage before the start of Issa’s civic issues with Female head / Star (c. 320 BC) (VISONÀ 2007: 489, n. 54).

4. Only one obverse die was used by Pharos to overstrike the Ionios issues of groups 1 and 2, which represent 53 of the overstrickings in the hoard. The perfunctory style of this die, which seems to be relatively late in the Pharian sequence, is very distinctive.¹⁴ As many as 35 of these overstrickings are preserved in Osijek.¹⁵ Since virtually all of them exhibit a dark

---

¹⁰ The Škudljivac hoard did not contain Issaean overstrickings of bronzes of Dionysius I of Syracuse with Head of Athena / Starfish between dolphins, which comprise the earliest Joniosmünzen: see GORINI 1976: 17, Pl. 1-5 and VISONÀ 2010: 27-30.
¹¹ Osijek 2052 and 2093.
¹² See ad hoc VISONÀ 2005b: 452.
¹³ Nisiteo was the first owner of the Škudljivac hoard.
¹⁴ For good examples of this obverse die see GÖRICKE-LUKIĆ 2004: 131, no. 404 (Osijek 2053) and 133, no. 414 (Osijek 2070). For a tentative chronology of Pharos’ largest denomination in bronze based upon stylistic considerations, cf. GÖRICKE-LUKIĆ 2004: 128-130, nos. 393-402 and 133, nos. 411-413.
¹⁵ At least 45% of the hoard had already been dispersed by 1897: see VISONÀ 2005b: 452.
green patina, some of the original specimens acquired by Nisiteo from his »miserabile... contadino« (Visonà 1987: 127), may perhaps be recognizable among the Ionios coins overstriked by Pharos kept in other museums, and in private collections.

The following catalogue lists the overstrikings upon Ionios coins of groups 1 and 2 known thus far. Many of them share a patina similar to that of the 35 overstrikings from Škudlijvac in the Muzej Slavonije. Admittedly, since there were 55 overstrikings in the hoard, whereas this list comprises 64 coins (and may be incomplete), some of them do not come from the original deposit. But the very fact that more overstrikings than those known to have been in the hoard have been tracked down is significant. It reveals that the overstriking was probably more extensive than one would think if the Škudlijvac hoard were the only evidence for it. In other words, the Pharians may have systematically overstruck at one time as many Ionios coins of groups 1 and 2 as they could have gotten hold of. This does not look like an attempt to increase their own supply of bronze coinage because of a lack of metal, contrary to what I myself proposed decades ago (Visonà 1982: 154-155). Perhaps the overstriking points to a very different scenario – one that must remain entirely speculative for now – such as a deliberate move by Pharos to obliterato a rival’s circulating medium.

Coins overstruck by Pharos upon undertypes of group 1:

O/ Head of Ionios r. R/ Dolphin r. above three waves

1. Berlin 28901                     25 mm  18.35 g
2. Berlin (ex Imhoof-Blumer 1900)   26 mm  13.95 g
3. Berlin alter Bestand             26 mm  13.20 g
4. London17                        26 mm  14.02 g
5. Osijek 2051                      26 mm  15.60 g
6. Osijek 2057                      26 mm  18.80 g
7. Osijek 2075                      27 mm  16.40 g
8. Osijek 2076                      26 mm  17.30 g
9. Osijek 2077                      26 mm  15.20 g
10. Osijek 2078                     26 mm  15.50 g
11. Osijek 2081                     27 mm  15.70 g
12. Osijek 2091                     27 mm  19.80 g
13. Osijek 2092                     28 mm  15.80 g
14. Osijek 2163                     28 mm  18.30 g
15. Osijek 2164                     27 mm  16.90 g
16. Split 1327918                   26.3 mm 15.27 g
17. Split (ex Stockert)             27 mm  16.50 g
18. Split                          25.6 mm 13.89 g
19. Split (ex Stockert)             25.8 mm 13.67 g
20. Zagreb 2341                     25 x 28 mm 15.51 g
21. Zagreb 2342                     26.25 mm 16.00 g

16 Cf. the observations by Kubitschek 1897: 162 about »l’eguale stato di conservazione e […] l’eguale fino strato di patina verde-oscura« of a lot of 92 coins in the T. Unger sale (26.4.1897) which comprised the remnants of the Škudlijvac hoard. Kubitschek erroneously believed that 3 ΔI overstrikings belonged to the original deposit. For this sale see both Cubasch 1897 (vidi) and Egger 1897 (non vidi). I cannot explain why the Unger coins were offered for sale by two auction firms simultaneously.


18 The axis of the second types is at 90°.
22. POZZI p. 164, no. 2953 and Pl. CXXXI
23. Zivaljić Collection, Podstrana
24. Zivaljić Collection, Podstrana

27 mm 15.08 g
27 mm 14.64 g

Coins overstruck by Pharos upon undertypes of group 2:
O/ Head of Ionios r.; on r., IONIO R/ Dolphin r.

1. Osijek 2064 29 mm 15.00 g
2. Osijek 2066 26 mm 18.50 g
3. Osijek 2070 27 mm 16.90 g
4. Osijek 2074 26 mm 15.90 g
5. Osijek 2071 27 mm 16.60 g
5. Osijek 2079 28 mm 15.30 g
6. Osijek 2080 27 mm 15.90 g
8. Osijek 2082 26 mm 14.19 g
9. Osijek 2083 29 mm 17.30 g
10. Osijek 2084 27 mm 15.60 g
11. Osijek 2085 26 mm 17.90 g
12. Osijek 2086 27 mm 18.30 g
13. Osijek 2087 25 mm 15.80 g
14. Osijek 2088 27 mm 16.10 g
15. Osijek 2089 25 mm 15.90 g
16. Osijek 2094 30 mm 14.00 g
17. Osijek 2162 26 mm 17.50 g
18. Padova, Museo Bottacin 27.5 mm 19.65 g
19. Split (ex Stockert) 27.2 mm 16.07 g
20. Split 13280 25.4 x 26.3 mm 14.82 g
21. Vienna KM 11752 29.4 mm 18.03 g
22. Vienna KM 11753 25.4 mm 15.24 g
23. Zagreb 2340 26 mm 14.21 g
24. Zagreb 2343 26 mm 17.25 g
25. Zagreb 2393 25.9 x 26.4 mm 17.19 g
26. Zagreb 2345 28 mm 17.60 g

19 Ex MM GmbH (DE) and Nomos 13, sale 09.10.2003, lot 146; cf. VISONA 2005a: 32, Ph 10. The weight was provided by B. Zivaljić.
20 Undertypes: 60°; second types: 90°.
Coins overstruck by Pharos upon uncertain undertypes of group 1 or 2

1. Osijek 2069 28 mm 17.50 g
2. Osijek 2070 27 mm 16.70 g
3. Osijek 2072 27 mm 12.10 g
4. Osijek 2090 26 mm 15.10 g
5. Osijek 2165 27 mm 16.80 g
6. Osijek 2166 27 mm 15.40 g
7. Osijek 2166 26.8 mm 15.57 g
8. Paris, Cabinet des Médailles 31724 26.8 mm 15.57 g
9. Split 27.5 mm 15.37 g
10. Split 26.69 mm 15.07 g
11. Split25 26 mm 14.61 g
12. Split 26.1 mm 14.51 g
13. Vienna KM 1175726 26.9 mm 16.77 g
14. Vienna, Institut für antike Numismatik27 27 mm 12.65 g

5. The overstriking always followed a precise pattern: obverse upon obverse, reverse upon reverse, as the publication of the specimens in Osijek has shown.28

6. The combined weight of the 91 coins from Škudljivac in Osijek (89 large denominations + 2 fractions of Herakleia, Osijek 2150 and Osijek 2132) is 1,499.7 kg. Since the original deposit contained 162 coins (160 large denominations and 2 fractions), 71 of which have been dispersed, and since the average weight of the 89 large bronzes in Osijek is 16.699 g, the total weight of the hoard was c. 2,685.329 kg. This suggests that the hoard was portable and could have been carried in a bag or sack; there is no evidence that it was hidden in a pot or a similar container.

Unresolved problems persist. Why was the hoard lost or concealed in the Pharian chora, within walking distance (c. 4 km.) from ancient Pharos? What was the purchasing power of this assemblage of coins? And who owned it? Does it represent a savings deposit, a merchant’s stash of cash, or loot from an episode of violence in the asty? Perhaps some clues that might yield answers to these questions still lie buried near the findspot.29

A final note about the chronology of the Ionios coinage is called for. Thus far, my terminus post quem for the Ionios overstrikings upon Syracuse and the start of the Ionios issues has been 344 BC, the year of the ouster of Dionysius II (Visónà 2007: 485; 2010: 30-31).

24 Second types: 300°.
25 Undertypes: 30°; second types: 60°.
27 Flan nearly broken half.
28 Cf. Visónà 1982: 154, n. 44.
29 For the location of Škudljivac see Gaffney et al. 1997: 162, 257; Kirgin 2004: 145. The site lies to the north of the Stari Grad Plain and is a low hill topped by a prehistoric mound.
Yet, there is no evidence that the Syracusan fleet was in the Adriatic later than 357/356 BC, and there is no reason why events in central Dalmatia had to unfold according to a timetable set by Greeks in southern Italy and Sicily. I now realize that the chronological sequence of the Ionios issues of groups 1-4 is possibly too compressed to fit within a twenty-year period. It seems best to entertain the possibility that there were at least two distinct phases in this coinage, the first of which would comprise only the overstrikings upon Syracusan bronzes with Head of Athena / Starfish between dolphins, and those with Head of Athena / Hippocamp. The earliest Ionios coins could have been entirely overstruck upon these Syracusan issues at any time between c. 356 and 344 BC. This coinage system would have had two denominations, the smaller of which may be represented by the bronzes bearing a Female head r. with polos / Dolphin r. Subsequently, after 344 BC, the Ionios coins of groups 1 and 2 could have been introduced, in this sequence. Their fractions could be the rare small bronzes with Male or Female head l. / Dolphin r. and l. above waves, of which a growing number of specimens is known (VISINA 1995: 61, 6-6x, and 62, 7). Although the precise dating of the Ionios coins of groups 3 and 4 is uncertain, the evidence from the Škudljivac hoard indicates that these issues pre-date the start of Issa’s autonomous coinage.

J. Brunšmid was uncannily prescient when he wrote that »[…] die issaeischen Joniosmünzen… stehen in stilistischer und technischer Hinsicht offenbar in nahen Beziehungen zur syrakusanischen Münzprägung des vierten Jahrhundertes […]« (BRUNSMD 1898: 38). Pharos may have modeled its bronze coinage upon that of Dionysius I of Syracuse, its larger denomination with Head of Zeus / goat possibly representing one-half of the Syracusan issues with Head of Athena / Starfish between dolphins, which circulated in the eastern Adriatic and have been found on Hvar. In turn, when Issa began its own civic coinage, in the last quarter of the 4th century BC, her earliest issues with ΙΣΣΑ Female head / Star seem to have been minted on the same weight standard as the Syracusan bronzes with Head of Athena / Hippocamp, that had been the main circulating medium in central Dalmatia after Syracuse took an interest in the region.

30 D.S. XVI.11.3; see VISINA 2007: 482.
31 Some these coins are overstruck upon Syracusan bronzes with Head of Athena / Hippocamp: see VISINA 1995: 58-59.
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Hermine Göricke-Lukić objavila je 2004. g. postojeći dio ostave iz Škudljivca, najranije skupine brončanog novca kojeg su iskovali Grci na istočnoj obali Jadrana, iz čega su proizišli su novi podaci. Od 55 prekova u izvornom nalazu (pronađenom na otoku Hvaru 1835. g.), u osječkome Muzeju Slavonije sačuvano je samo 37: od toga su 35 novci s Jonijevom glavom d. / dupinom d. iznad triju valova, te s Jonijevom glavom d. / dupinom d., koje je prekovao Faros slijedeći obrazac prekova aversa preko aversa, a reversa preko reversa. Dodatna dva novca, prekovana Jonijevom bradatom glavom l. i lavljom glavom d. preko ranijeg Jonijeva izdanja koje je prethodno prekovao Faros (Osijek 2052), te preko farskog brončanog novca (Osijek 2093), također bi mogla pripadati ostavi iz Škudljivca, kao što je to 1897. g. primijetio W. Kubitschek.

Tamno zelena patina slična je onoj na drugim prekovima. Budući da ta dva novca predstavljaju posljednju skupinu otkova Jonijeva brončanog novca, njihovo uključivanje u ostavu upućivalo bi na to da je ostava bila skrivena nakon što se Jonijev novac prestao kovati.

U muzejskim i privatnim zbirkama nalazi se 30 prekova na kojima se pojavljuje isti žig na aversu koji su rabili Farani za prekov Jonijeva brončanog novca, njihovo uključivanje u ostavu upućivalo bi na to da je ostava bila skrivena nakon što se Jonijev novac prestao kovati.

Sadržaj ove ostave rasvijetlio je dinamiku kolanja novca u srednjoj Dalmaciji u trećoj četvrtini 4. stoljeća pr. Kr.