The paper will in the first place analyse in detail all pre-Imperial individual coin finds (that is, coins issued in or before 31 B.C.) recovered from the area of modern north-west Croatia, more or less corresponding to the area of the later province of Pannonia Savia. In the same time, the corresponding hoards, composed of the same types of coins, found in this region will also be discussed. The rich site of Segestica/Siscia, modern Sisak, has yielded the largest number of finds, but other lesser-known sites have also contributed to the general picture of coin circulation in the area, and the emphasis of this study will be precisely on those finds. The vast majority of coins are stray finds (i.e., fall under Reece’s coin supply category),\textsuperscript{1} while only a few specimens were recovered during archaeological excavations (i.e., fall under Reece’s coin loss category).\textsuperscript{2} The largest number of specimens are Roman Republican coins, as a result of their large concentration in Sisak, but Celtic (Iron Age) coinage is also represented in significant numbers, especially that of the Taurisci. The newly published data, however scanty, allows a revision of some current conclusions with respect to the distribution of certain coin types, as well as a balanced discussion on the coin circulation in this region in the given period.
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\textsuperscript{1} Reece 2003, 141, 165, cf. 141–149.

\textsuperscript{2} Reece 2003, 141, 165, cf. 149–165.
INTRODUCTION

Since a full-scale analysis of pre-Imperial coin finds from Sisak was recently published, I will here only briefly reproduce the conclusions from this study and focus on numismatic material from other sites in the area of the future Pannonia Savia. In archaeological terms, this region represents an eastern extension of the Tauriscan Mokronog group. The circulation at the all-important site of Sisak, it will be shown, differs significantly from the surrounding area, i.e. the region in which it is situated and which more or less gravitated towards it (present-day north-west Croatia and the immediately adjacent parts of Slovenia and Bosnia and Herzegovina). This important fact probably reflects a difference in the level of monetisation or, more generally, in coin use – and thus coin finds – between rural and urban sites, which is best documented in the analyses of respective coin uses in urban and rural monetary zones in the Roman world. However, the period analysed in this study – roughly the period prior to the Roman conquest of Segestica/Siscia in 35 B.C. – certainly incorporates additional elements that determined the nature of these two noticeably different monetary zones occupying the area of the future Pannonia Savia: the great prehistoric urban centre of Segestica/Siscia (later Roman Siscia), which entered the Roman zone of influence as early as the late first half of the 2nd c. B.C., and the largely non-urbanised surrounding region that came under direct Roman rule only with the Augustan wars culminating in the capture of Segestica/Siscia itself more than a century later. I will not discuss these additional elements, although some of them (e.g. the coinage of the Taurisci) will emerge naturally from the analysis of the coins themselves.

SEGESTICA/SISCIA

It has been possible to analyse a total of 140 coins found in the area of modern Sisak. A great majority of the coins are Roman Republican specimens (99 pieces, 70.71%), followed by Celtic, i.e., Iron Age coins (27 pieces, 19.29%). Of the total number of the latter, 55.6% (i.e. 15 pieces) represent Tauriscan coinage, three more (11.1%) represent Norican coinage, and 18.5% (5 pieces) represent the coinage of the Scordisci. Twenty Celtic/Iron Age coins were made of silver (74.1%), and the remaining 7 pieces of billon or bronze (25.9%). No fewer than three quarters of the Celtic/Iron Age coins are tetradrachms (21 pieces, 77.8%), with the remaining 6 pieces (22.2%) representing smaller denominations. Almost all the Roman Republican coins found in Sisak are denarii (92 pieces, 92.93%), with an additional 4 quinarii (4.04%) and a single victoriatus; a single bronze semis and an aureus of Quintus Cornuficius were also found. The diversity of the coin assemblage from Sisak can be explained by mere fortuity, or, perhaps more plausibly, it reflects the “cosmopolitan” nature of the Late Iron Age settlement of Segestica/Siscia. Strong connections with the Scordisci can be discerned in the 1st c. B.C.; the coinage of the Taurisci is also well represented in Sisak, which is hardly surprising due to the proximity of the territory occupied by this people, and Sisak was certainly an important location with respect to the penetration of Roman Republican coinage into the western and central Balkans area, as well as Transdanubia and, perhaps, Dacia.

---

3 This paper is a significantly expanded version – or rather an unabridged version – of Bilić, Nad forthcoming.
4 Bilić 2017.
5 For a geographical definition of the region discussed in this paper see Dizdar 2011, 71 n. 1; 2013, 11 n. 1. Dizdar included, in his survey of the region, the Kordun and Banovina sub-regions; I have further added the Ogulin-Plaški vale, since it is a logical geographical continuation of the territories to its north-east, leaning against a bulwark formed by the Dinaric Alps.
8 Dzino 2010, 72–73.
10 This is a short summary of the discussion in Bilić 2017.
Comparison with the corresponding data on Republican coinage from the two neighbouring sites of Emona (modern Ljubljana) and Celeia (modern Celje, both in present-day Slovenia) reveals the fact that the Republican coinage in Emona reflects the circulation of the late Augustan and succeeding periods, while that from Segestica/Siscia and Celeia reflect the circulation of the 1st c. B.C.\textsuperscript{11} Several Republican coins have actually been recovered in archaeological excavations in Late Iron Age contexts, suggesting that they arrived in the area prior to the conquest of 35 B.C., and it is possible that this coinage in general indeed reflects the circulation of the 1st c. B.C. in Sisak, rather than that of the Imperial period. Furthermore, the structure of Celtic/Iron Age coins also reflects the circulation in the 1st c. B.C., with an occasional earlier type also present. In general, almost all finds suggest a context of the 1st century B.C.

\textsuperscript{11} For Emona and Celeia see Kos 1986, 26, 53–56.

It remains an open question whether the specimens of Celtic/Iron Age coinage, at least the chronologically later types, together with specimens of (at least later types of) Roman Republican coinage found outside a confirmed stratigraphic context, which comprises almost all coinage of this type, actually found in Sisak, remained in circulation after the conquest of 35 B.C. and really reflect the circulation of early or perhaps late Augustan or even later periods, rather than that of the period prior to the conquest.

Finally, it is important to emphasise that a mere eleven coins out of total 140 were recovered in proper archaeological excavations (7.86%). The bias towards the precious-metal coinage and higher denominations shown in the coins from Sisak reflects, I believe, precisely this fact, rather than a specific, less well monetised character of the settlement in comparison to, for example, Emona.
THE FUTURE PANNONIA SAVIA (SISAK EXCLUDED)

Individual finds (see Table 1 at the end of the article)

In stark contrast to the situation in Sisak, the rest of the region analysed in this study shows a high predominance of “autochthon” Celtic/Iron Age coinage (45 pieces, 69.23%), with a relatively minor presence of Roman Republican coins (10 pieces, 15.38%).

Italian and Greek coins

The earliest example of Italian currency found in the region is a bar similar to those with the *ramo secco* pattern on their surface (cat. no. 1).12 This piece was found in a mound that was actually part of the fortification system of the Trsište hill fort, which unfortunately cannot be dated with any precision.13 Another bar fragment of the *aes formatum* type was found in 2008 in the River Kupa upstream of Karlovac, near the Vrlovka cave (cat. no. 2).14

These crude Italian (or, more precisely, Etruscan) ferruginous copper bars were already being produced in the 6th c., and also appear in hoards of the 3rd c.,15 together with *aes signatum*, which are Roman oblong, quadrilateral or brick-shaped pieces of leaded tin bronze, carrying various depictions, without any marks of value, issued during the first half of the 3rd c. B.C.16

Their appearance in the region, at Sisak and Trošmarija, and in the Kupa near Karlovac, must be associated with their presence in the so-called Mazin-type hoards, consisting of Carthaginian, Numidian and Egyptian and other Greek and Italic/Roman currency (*aes rude, aes formatum, ramo secco* and associated bars, *aes signatum, aes grave*).17

Several more 3rd- and 2nd-c. bronze coins found in the area of the future Pannonia Savia could be associated with the Mazin-type hoards (cat. nos. 3–7). Even though the Mamertini coinage (cat. no. 3, found in archaeological excavations but in an indeterminate context) was never documented in any of the actual hoards, it seems to belong to this group of coin types both chronologically and typologically. Sicilian (cat. no. 4) and Numidian (cat. nos. 5–7) coins, on the other hand, are well documented in the hoards of the Mazin type.

In concordance with the situation in Sisak, a small number of Apollonia and Dyrrachium coins have also been documented in the region (cat. nos. 8–9). Their normal area of circulation was to the east of the Požega Mountains, which is east of the region discussed here, but immediately adjacent to it. Both specimens are impossible to date more precisely than 280–49/48 B.C.,18 although cat. no. 9 is an AE imitation, which perhaps allows a more precise dating. The drachms of Apollonia and Dyrrachium were indeed sometimes imitated by the Scordisci; they were made of poor quality silver, bronze or silvered bronze, with stylized representations and unintelligible inscriptions, and they usually imitated the coins issued in the third, i.e. the latest period of minting (80s or 70s B.C.–40s B.C.).19 Popović argues that they were in general produced in the Danubian area at the end of the 1st quarter of the 1st c. B.C., before the major input of the original coins of this type.20 To summarise

12 Brunšmid 1896–1897, 48 with n. 1; Mirnik 1987, 386; Balen-Letunić 1999–2000, 24. A *ramo secco* bar was also found at Sisak (Bilić 2017, cat. 32).
14 297.03g; 63x41x33 mm, type IIa Bertol, Farac 2012; it was found by K. Zubčić of the Croatian Conservation Institute in an underwater archaeological survey. I would like to thank him for showing me the piece and allowing me to use the information here.
18 See the review of recent publications discussing the chronology of these issues in Ujes-Morgan 2012, 369–372.
20 Popović 1987, 115; cf. Popović 1976, 16–17, where he offers a similar chronological framework and further associates the production of these imitations with contemporaneous imitations of Republican *denarii*. 

a conclusion reached in Bilić (2017), the appearance of the Apollonia-Dyrrachium coins in the region can be associated with the commercial relations between the local inhabitants and the Scordisci during the mid-1st c. B.C. A Macedonian coin from Križevci (cat. no. 10) probably arrived in the region in the same way, together with the Epirote and Macedonian bronzes from Sisak discussed in Bilić (2017).

Celtic/Iron Age coins

As noted earlier, the great majority of individual finds from the region are of Celtic/Iron Age coins. Although Tauriscan coinage predominates (26 specimens, 57.78% of all Celtic/Iron Age coins, cat. nos. 28–53), other Celtic/Iron Age currency, usually referred to as East Celtic coinage, is also present. A similar situation obtains with hoards: see below. An early imitation of Philip II’s tdr, dating from the first half of...
the 3rd c., was found in Zagreb (cat. no. 11), and some later imitations of the Alexander-type coins of Philip III are known also from Zagreb (cat. no. 12) and Modruš (cat. no. 13). The latter example is very peculiar in its styling and has no real parallels elsewhere. A couple of characteristic imitations of Macedonian coins, called by Pink and Göbl *Baumreiter mit Bartkranzavers*, and by Preda and Popović *Crișeni-Berchieș A*, were found near Klanjec (tdr, cat. no. 14) and Đurđevac (d, cat. no. 15), respectively. Preda and Popović both associate this coinage with north and west Transylvania, and, in its later phase, with south-east Pannonia. Dembski, however, groups these coins among South Serbian types, while Pink is inclined to associate them with Syrmia, and Knöll allows the possibility that this type of coin arrived at the site of Němčice from the Balkans, while Jandrasits suggests the possibility that the Athena/Nike staters of the Boii were issued by the tribes living further south; Kolariková, however, attributes the coinage to the area of the “Middle and Lower Danube region”.

Another interesting phenomenon occurring in the region is the presence of five imitations of staters of Alexander III (cat. nos. 21–24, plus a specimen from the nearby Slovenska Bistrica near Maribor), none of which was found in Sisak. These imitations copy the so-called Athena/Nike stater with a helmeted head of Athena on the obverse and a winged Nike on the reverse. This type of coin was struck relatively frequently in the area occupied by the Boii, but it is entirely possible that the Celtic/Iron Age peoples occupying the area of modern Croatia issued similar imitations. Such coins were indeed attributed by Castelin to the area of the “Middle and Lower Danube region”, Dembski, following Castelin, argues that, in the late 3rd c., the original staters came to Moravia together with imitations produced by the tribes living further south; Kolariková allows the possibility that this type of coin arrived at the site of Němčice from the Balkans, while Jandrasits suggests the possibility that the Athena/Nike staters

21 Forrer 1908, 146 Fig. 268; Pink 1939, 134 no. 3. According to J. Winkler, the coin was produced in the south-east Danubian region (Forrer 1969, 54 no. 171 (J. Winkler)).
22 Forrer 1908, 176 Fig. 336; Pink 1939, 134 no. 3; cf. Pink 1939, nos. 586–588, Preda 1973, Pl. LXXIII.
23 Pink 1939, 118, 140 no. 188; Preda 1973, 338 no. 67.
24 Pink 1939, 58–60; Preda 1973, 97–104 with Fig. 8 on p. 101; Popović 1987, 54–60 with fig. 21 on p. 58.
26 Pink 1939, 60, 139 no. 150.
29 Pink 1939, 58, criticised in Forrer 1969, 55 no. 182 (J. Winkler).
30 Kolariková 2012, 57.
34 Paulsen 1933, i,8; Kos 1977, 138–141 no. 29.
35 Cf. Kos 1977, 48, 71; see also Kolariková 2006, 8 Tab. 2 for a list of finds from Central Europe.
37 Castelin 1965, 6–7, 9, 109–110.
38 Dembski 1972, 55. The Celts of the Czech Republic then started producing their own imitations, which are not easily distinguished from those arriving from the Balkans.
39 Kolariková 2012, 12.
found in Boian territories are perhaps not (all) of local origin, but actually imports from the Balkan area, further dating them to 270–250 B.C. Similar imitations found in the area of the modern Czech Republic and central Germany are dated to LtB2–C1 (320 – 200 B.C.),

As already mentioned, Tauriscan coinage clearly predominates in the region, which is, as we will see later, supported by the evidence from hoards. It is necessary to discuss here the question of absolute chronology of Tauriscan coinage, which lately received a strong impetus from a number of dated finds. Thus, two mixed hoards containing proto-Tauriscan and Tauriscan coinage together with other types of coins – (1) Hainburg, where the VES-type tdrds were mixed with West Norican coinage, i.e. Kugelreiter tdrds, and (2) the River Ljubljanica, where the Samobor C tdr and 1/4dr were mixed with various Roman Republican coins – completely changed the chronology of minting of the coinage of the Taurisci. Thus, it is convincingly argued they started minting their coinage from at least the mid-2nd century B.C., or at the very end of the 1st half of the 2nd c. The earliest types of Tauriscan coinage, the Varaždin A and, immediately afterwards, Varaždin B (derived from the somewhat earlier VES-type), were minted somewhere in the Varaždin area in the mid-2nd century B.C., either somewhat before, at or after 150 B.C. Moreover, the Ljubljanica hoard proves that the Taurisci simultaneously minted both tdrds and 1/4drds in the earliest period of their minting, that is, with respect to SC 13 and 14, which developed from the Varaždin B type (cf. TKN p. 32, 99, 111 for SC13), and, following those, SC 16 (and, presumably, 23) coins, all minted c. 150 B.C.7
A strong supporting argument for the inferences drawn from the Ljubljanica hoard is provided by the small silver coin found in a grave at Zvonimirovo-Veliko polje dated to the Lt C2 period (200–150 B.C.) (0.44g, cat. no. 31). It is typologically associated with early Tauriscan tdr's and, furthermore, belongs to a group of small silver coins with depictions of a horse on both sides of the coin, which represent the earliest types of Tauriscan small silver coins. It supports the late 2nd half of the 2nd c. B.C. as the date of the appearance of the earliest Tauriscan coins, and proves that they were, from the start, issued together with fractional coins.

When deliberating on the chronology of Tauriscan issues it is necessary to include the hoard from Pokupsko (hoard no. 12) in the discussion, even though it properly belongs to the second part of the study, since it gives an insight into the dating of the earliest issues of Đurđevac coins. Three coins of the Samobor A type (derived from Varaždin A) and three coins of Samobor B (derived, in their turn, from Samobor A or Varaždin A) were found in this hoard, the former being contemporaneously minted from the start with SC 14, and in the course of time with other SC types, as well as with Samobor B and Đurđevac coins, which dates the beginning of the minting of Samobor A coins (especially in the light of the transient nature of Varaždin A – and B, for that matter – coins) to the early second half of the 2nd c. B.C. Moreover, the Pokupsko hoard further comprised two Đurđevac coins, more precisely, the very earliest Đurđevac issues, derived directly from Samobor A (obv.) and Samobor B (rv.) dies. Thus the entire hoard, together with the earliest Đurđevac issues, can be tentatively dated to the early second half of the 2nd c. B.C., probably the 140s. At the other end of the time spectrum, Đurđevac tdr's were in use after 46 B.C. at Gomolava and c. 10 B.C.–10 AD in Dalmatia. Thus their presence in coin circulation covers a long period from the mid-2nd c. B.C. to the mid-Augustan period, which is in stark opposition to other earlier East Norician types, while the area of their distribution is similarly much wider when compared to the latter, although the area of distribution of these other earlier East Norician types is not so reduced as generally believed.

**Roman Republican coins**

The most prominent difference between coin finds from Sisak and those found in the region is not in the presence of Celtic/Iron Age coins in the former, but in an almost complete lack of Roman Republican coins in the latter. A mere ten such coins are documented (cat. nos. 56–65), compared to 99 pieces in Sisak, ca. 70% of all pre-Imperial coins found there. An in-depth analysis of

---

48 I would like to thank M. Dizdar, the head of the excavations, for allowing me the opportunity to study and discuss this coin. For an in-depth study see Bilić, Dizdar 2016. Since coins of this period found in graves are extremely rare in the region (the only other example being cat. no. 45), they are treated here together with individual finds.

49 TKN p. 46; Mackensen 1972, 9; 1975, 255; Kos 1979, 34.


51 TKN p. 31–32.

52 TKN p. 31–32, 100.

53 TKN, Synchronogramm Ostnoriker.

54 Kos, Mirnik 2011, 102, cf. Gorini 2009, 120 for east Norican coinage in general. With respect to the transient nature of Varaždin A/B coins, the presence of a significantly later Augentyp-Stamm coin in the hoard from Krževljan looks suspicious (Kos, Mirnik 2011, 98 no. 35); if it is accepted as fact (which Kos, Mirnik 2011, 106 seriously doubt), it would testify to a far longer presence of Varaždin A/B coins (in circulation?) previous to their concealment.

55 Gorini (2004, 59) dates the production of Samobor A and B coins to between 170 and 150 B.C., while elsewhere (Gorini 2009, 120) he dates them to the period between 160 and 130 B.C. TKN p. 32–33, 102. P. Kos has recently informed me that Göbl’s “earliest Đurđevac issues” (TKN 46–111/112) should be classified under Samobor A coins proper, on the basis of his study of the Samobor hoard itself; if this is true, then the hoard from Pokupsko contained only Samobor A and B coins and is useless in dating the Đurđevac coins (thus pace Kos 2009, 311).

56 Kos (2009, 311), on the basis of the Pokupsko hoard, dates the beginning of the production of Đurđevac coins to the late 2nd c. B.C.; cf. Strobel 2014, 77. I do not see why “late”, especially since he criticizes Gorini’s (2005, 59) assessment of 20 years as the approximate duration of minting of specific groups of Tauriscan coinage (Kos 2009, 309 n. 15, 310). Gorini (2009, 120) dates the production of Đurđevac coins to the period between 160 and 130 B.C., recognising that they are derived from the Samobor A group.

57 Bilić 2017, with references.

these coins is thus not necessary, since they are merely an ephemeral phenomenon in the pre-Imperial coin pool in Pannonia Savia outside Sisak.

Hoards
(see Table 2 at the end of the article)

The hoards reflect the inferences drawn from the analysis of individual finds. Twelve out of 15 known finds represent hoards of Celtic/Iron Age coins (hoards nos. 3–14), while another (hoard no. 1) reflects the same horizon of circulation. In fact, the single known hoard of Republican coins is a heavily dispersed and poorly documented (now small) hoard from Sisak itself (hoard no. 15), while the remaining hoard (hoard no. 2) comes from the immediate vicinity of Sisak and represents a hoard of imitations (some AE, mostly AR) of the drachms of Apollonia and Dyrrachium. This hoard can be related to another AE imitation of this same coinage found at Bartolovec-Jalžabet (discussed above) and can similarly be associated with the commercial relations between the local inhabitants and the Scordisci during the mid-1st c. B.C.

A hoard of staters (ca. 10) of Alexander III from Croatia (Plavšić coll.) is mentioned in Gohl (hoard no. 1). Gohl 1922–1923, 6 (not from Zagreb, as in Vasić, Popović, Gaj-Popović 1975, 20 n. 16).
are dated from the late 3rd to the mid-2nd c.
As noted above, the origin of coins of this type is associated with Moldavia, and they
sue, which we have already encountered
Three of the Celtic/Iron Age hoards represent eastern or north-eastern intrusions into the region. First, the hoard from Narta consisted of 3 original Macedonian coins (?) and 33 coins of the Huşi-Vovrişti type (hoard. no. 3), a primarily East Dacian issue, which we have already encountered as a stray find from Zagreb (see above). As noted above, the origin of coins of this type is associated with Moldavia, and they are dated from the late 3rd to the mid-2nd c. B.C. It is nevertheless possible not only that they are somewhat earlier, with a taq of c. 240 B.C. being established by the presence of Hellenistic coins in mixed hoards, but also that they originated in the area of the Scordisci, south of the Danube. However, Ziegaus offers significantly higher dates for this type of coins: end of the 4th – 1st half of the 3rd c. B.C., and Levinski also strongly argues for a 4th c. date for their production. Second, the hoard from Ribniča65 consisted of ca. 112 imitations of tetradrachms of Philip II (hoard no. 4). The Turnierreiter type, representing the majority of coins in the hoard, is associated by Pink with the Scordisci,67 which is rejected by Kos and Mirnik,68 who opt for the Bjelovar region as its area of origin, while Popović believes it should be associated with regions nearer to Macedonia in the southern Balkans.69 A single Turnierreiter specimen was indeed found in Kobaš, near Požega,70 which is in the immediate vicinity of the Bjelovar region, and supports Kos and Mirnik’s conjecture.71 Furthermore, they argue that the second major type of coins in the Ribniča hoard, the Dreieckhals, is actually a development of the Turnierreiter type,72 thus most probably also of local origin.73 However, the question of the autochthony of the

67 Pink 1957, 16–17.
68 Kos, Mirnik 1999, 304.
69 Popović 1987, 38.
70 OTA 120.3; Kos, Mirnik 1999, 305–306 with n. 39.
71 It is apparently accepted by Ziegaus 2010, 221–222.
73 Thus Ziegaus 2010, 224, cf. Allen 1987, 30, 61. A coin of this type ("jüngerer Dreiechhals", without a horseman on the reverse) is described as coming "from Croatia" (Leu Numismatik, Auction 83, lot 540, May 6th, 2002 = Ziegaus 2010, 222 no. 589, cf. 224), which supports Kos and Mirnik’s (and Ziegaus’s) suggestion of north-west Croatia as the place of origin of these coins. However, coins with "jüngerer Dreieckhals" obverse in combination with a reverse with a horseman were found in Kaposvár (Pink 1939, 82, 138 no. 124 = Dessewffy 1910, no. 1228, who, however, does not indicate a find site; Ziegaus 2010, 224) and in Hungary (Forrer 1980, 46, Fig. 85), while "jüngerer Dreieckhals" pieces (without a horseman) were found in the Zemplén county (Dessewffy 1910, no. 1231) and in Stradonice (Pink 1939, 82 Abb. 321; Dembski 1998, 106 no. 1242) (See also the next note).
hoard, or at least the dominant type(s) of coins in the hoard, remains at least partially open. Kos and Mirnik date the coins from the hoard to the first half of the 2nd c. B.C. Finally, the hoard from Sveti Petar Orehowec near Križevci consisted of several coins of the Kapostal type (hoard. no. 5). This type of coin, also found at Sisak, was minted from the mid-2nd c. to the late 1st c. B.C. in Transdanubia, and had a relatively wide distribution. At the site of Balina Glavica in central Dalmatia Kapostal coins were found in a hoard together with coins of the Đurđevac type (see below); both types of coins were found at Gomolava in a layer dated to the 2nd half of the 1st century B.C., together with a small hoard of Republican coins and imitations, while at Szalacska dies of Ka-

74 Two Dreieckhals coins found in and near (Galishegy) Munkács (Mukačeve) in Transcarpathian Ukraine remain enigmatic (Pink 1939, 82, 137 no. 82, 141 no. 194, Abb. 318; Kos, Mirnik 1999, 306. Actually, the coin from Galishegy referred to by Pink is not Dreieckhals type at all, but Audo-leonmonogram type. Ziegaus 2010, 224 refers to the coin from Munkács as a “jüngerer”, even though the piece reproduced by Pink (1939) as Abb. 318 is certainly “älterer”, and adds two specimens from a hoard found in relatively nearby Medieșu Aurit (in the Satu Mare county), one of the earlier and the other of the later phase. Actually, the two coins from the Medieșu Aurit hoard are both of the “jüngerer Dreieckhals” type (without a horseman). (See Gohl 1903, 57; cf. Preda 1973, 289, Pl. LX.4, who, incidentally, refers to this type of coin – the “jüngerer Dreieckhals” type without a horseman – as Medieșu Aurit subtype “a” and adds to it the Schnabelpfed type as subtype “b”). Finally, one Puppenreit-er specimen was found in “northern Hungary” (Leu Numismatik, Auction 83, lot 535, May 6th, 2002 = Ziegaus 2010, 211 no. 560), and this type of coin probably originated in this area (Allen 1987, Map 3 on p. 80; Dembski 1998, 110, north-west Hungary, south-west Slovakia; Ziegaus 2010, 211, between Balaton and the Danube). However, another specimen of this type, from a hoard found in east Slavonia, is recorded in the archives of the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb (1251g).


77 Torbágy 1997, 12–13; 2001–2002, 244, 246 (no precise date); Kos 2002, 152. In Torbágy 2013, 68 she opts for the late 2nd or even early 1st c. as the starting date for this coinage; in 2000, 38 for the 2nd third of the 1st c.

78 Kos 2002.

79 Popović 1971, 147–148; 1978, 20; Mirnik 1981, 43 no. 61a; Dautova-Ruševljanska 1984, 48, 50–51, 60–61, who treats these two coins as part of the hoard; Crawford 1985, 236; Borić-Bršković, Popović 2006, 39.

Thus these two types of coins circulated rather widely and contemporaneously, and were often found together, including at Sisak as individual finds, but in the hoards from the territory of the future Pannonia Savia they do not occur together.

Most of the hoards, nine in all, are of Tauriscan coins: one hoard of Varaždin A and B types (hoard. no. 6), one of Samobor A and B types (hoard. no. 7), and no fewer than four hoards of Đurđevac type (hoards nos. 8–11, with no. 10 doubtful), with the mixed Pokupsko hoard, the single inhomogeneous example, discussed above. In all these hoards, except the Pokupsko find, only a single type of exclusively Tauriscan coins was found (ignoring the Varaždin and Samobor A/B distinction), and their value for chronological distinctions is thus minimal. However, they indicate a relatively high level of coin production in the region, reveal the relations of various types and their relative chronology, and, with their concealment and non-recovery, testify to some turbulent events – or processes – that transpired in the region in the second half of the 2nd c. B.C. Since a lot has been written on these hoards, especially the three largest ones (Varaždin – but actually Križovljan; Samobor – but actually Okić; and Đurđevac – but actually Šemovec) they will not be discussed in detail here. I would only like to point out that it was probably local mints that issued these coins, or, perhaps it is safer to say, the coins were minted in the vicinity of Varaždin, Samobor and Đurđevac, respectively. However, an unpublished hoard from Bartolovec-Jalžabet, kept at the AMZ, deserves to be discussed in further detail (hoard no. 11). This is the only Đurđevac postal small silver coins and drachms were found together with a Đurđevac coin. Thus these two types of coins circulated rather widely and contemporaneously, and were often found together, including at Sisak as individual finds, but in the hoards from the territory of the future Pannonia Savia they do not occur together.

80 Torbágy 2000, 38; 2001–2002a, 244; Kos 2002, 150 n. 6, 153.


82 Cf. Miškec 2012, 382–383.

83 For reference see Bilić 2012, 362, 364. For the Đurđevac hoard, add Kos 2009 and Mirnik 2016.


85 AMZ Num. G2308_1–11, 2309_1.
hoard that consists of bronze tetradrachms, which suggests a later date for both its production and concealment, perhaps as late as the late 1st c. B.C. – early 1st c. AD, thus after the conquest of the region in Octavian’s campaign. (We cannot, however, exclude an earlier date for either the production of the coins or their concealment). Furthermore, the coins were made of low-quality metal, with two specimens having a visible silver coating. Also, the poor workmanship further suggests that we are dealing here with “irregular” issues, i.e. imitations of “regular” Đurđevac coins. The average weight of all twelve coins is 9.57g (excluding one heavily worn and corroded specimen, G2308_7, of 6.53g, which significantly deviates from other weights, the average weight is 9.85g), which is fairly close to 9.64g, representing the average weight of Đurđevac coins added by Göbl, and also to the average weight of early Đurđevac coins, estimated by Kos at nearly 10g. Thus these “irregular” issues follow fairly closely the “official” weight of Đurđevac issues, suggesting their contemporaneous production, and thus a somewhat earlier date than the one suggested above – perhaps even mid-2nd c. B.C. (See the discussion above on the chronology of Đurđevac coins).

CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

The analysis of individual coin finds and hoards consisting of coins minted prior to the Augustan conquest of the area of the future Pannonia Savia – taking into account the fact that the chronological position of later Celtic/Iron Age coins is problematic, i.e. some of these issues could have been struck in an early post-conquest period – has shown a stark difference in coin use between the undisputed centre of the region, Segestica/Siscia, and the surrounding area between the Sava and Drava rivers. There are several possibilities that could explain this difference, but the model distinguishing between urban and rural (or non-urban) monetary zones, successfully applied to the analysis of Roman socio-economic relations, probably represents the best possible conjecture for a solution of the problem at the moment. The predominance of Roman Republican coins in the La Tène urban centre of Segestica/Siscia – the majority of which we have contextualised in the pre-conquest period – and its almost complete lack outside it, suggests that this coinage was in widespread use in the city itself, but played a reduced role outside it. On the other hand, it seems that the region produced a solid number of its own issues in this period, starting perhaps with the Turnierreiter and Dreieckhals coins (1st half of the 2nd c. B.C.), produced in the Bjelovar region, and closely followed by major groups of Tauriscan coinage from the mid-2nd c. B.C. onwards, produced in the Varaždin, Samobor and Đurđevac areas. Similarly, some of the later types of Tauriscan coinage were probably in part minted in this same region. A number of fractional coins, securely dated to the very beginning of the minting of Tauriscan coins by the Zvonimirovo find, suggest that these coins were indeed used, besides having an obvious function as a hoarded store of wealth, in everyday local transactions as means of payment and medium of exchange and, as some evidence suggest, also as an inter-regional medium of exchange. The presence of a horizon of...
early local imitations of gold staters of Alexander III (Athena/Nike type), which must be dated as early as Lt B2 (probably 1st half of the 3rd c. B.C.), also suggests an early impulse in the local population to produce coins, although their use as money remains problematic.

The main problem remains the chronological affiliation of these coins, i.e., whether they were in use during the pre-conquest period or only after the introduction of Roman rule. Several points should be emphasised with regard to this problem:

1. Both Roman Republican and some Celtic/Iron Age coins were definitely in use in the post-conquest period in the region, the latter at least up to the Tiberian or Claudian period, the former well into the reign of Marcus Aurelius, with legionary denarius circulating up to the early 3rd c. A.D. Thus their appearance at certain sites does not immediately signify their pre-conquest use;

2. However, we have previously argued that the pre-Imperial coin assemblage from Sisak indeed reflects the circulation of the 1st c. B.C. This conclusion was in the first place reached on the basis of an analogy with the situation obtaining in Celeia, but was further supported by the coins found in proper archaeological context. Thus a Syrmian phase C tdr was found in a Late Iron Age layer at the Dunavski Lloyd site in Sisak, while a late Đurđevac tdr was similarly found in a Late Iron Age, i.e. pre-conquest layer at the Frankopanska ulica bb site, also in Sisak. Three Republican coins were also recovered from Late Iron Age layers at the Dunavski Lloyd site, one of these in a layer of burning immediately underneath an early Roman layer. On the other hand, a late Đurđevac tdr was apparently found in an early Imperial layer at the Frankopanska ulica bb site, but due to the early phase in the analysis and publishing process of this site it is impossible to draw any definite conclusions from this information. Furthermore, a Samobor A tdr was found in a Roman layer mixed with earlier material at the Povijesni arhiv site in Sisak, which is similarly inconclusive. Finally, a Republican denarius was actually found in an early Imperial layer at the Kukuljevićeva ulica site, while another was found in a Claudian/Neronian or even early Flavian layer at the Train station site. Outside Sisak, the situation is similarly ambiguous, although generally favouring the argument supported here. Thus the small Celtic/Iron Age silver coin from Zvonimirovo (cat. no. 31), as discussed above, was securely dated to the Lt C2 period, while a Samobor C (AE?) tdr (cat. no. 51) found at the Zagreb Upper Town site was found in the context of a late La Tène settlement; other archaeologically contextualised finds are of little value, since their stratigraphic position is undeterminable. Thus a Mamertini bronze (cat. no. 3) found at the Zagreb Upper Town site cannot be precisely contextualised at all; the stratigraphic position of a Republican denarius found at the Ošječenica hill fort is similarly indeterminate, since it was found in a layer with mixed Roman and prehistoric material, or a purely Roman layer (cat. no. 57). However, a Đurđevac tdr was found in a Roman-period grave at Ščitarjevo (cat. no. 45), while a legionary denarius was found at the same site (cat. no. 63), surely in a Roman context. These two finds suggest an extended period of use.

---

92 Kos 1977, 34; 2006, 72. For the presence of Celtic/Iron Age coins (both tdrs and fractions) at Magdalensberg up to and including the Claudian period see Krmnicke 2010, 96–97 Tab. 43 with cat. nos. 11–763. See also Mackensen 1975, 267 and Ruske 2012, 102–103.
93 Bilić 2012, 374–375.
94 Cat. no. 7 in Bilić 2017.
95 Cat. no. 18 in Bilić 2017.
96 Cat. no. 25 in Bilić 2017.
97 Cat. nos. 34, 53 and 57 in Bilić 2017.
for both Tauriscan and Republican coins, which is unsurprising (see above). Nevertheless, the most important information in this context is provided by the Kuzelin hill fort site, north-east of Zagreb. In systematic excavations of the site seven Celtic/Iron Age tetradrachms were found in total. All coins were found in a secure archaeological context of the La Tène stratum of the site, widely distributed throughout the hill fort. More specifically, a Samobor B (AE?) tdr (cat. no. 37) was found along a Celtic/Iron Age rampart wall; an Augentyp-Stamm tdr (cat. no. 48) was found in the flooring of a Celtic/Iron Age house and the remaining five Celtic/Iron Age coins (three Đurđevac tdrs, a Samobor A tdr and a Zickzackgruppe tdr) were all found in the same layer. It seems that the archaeological material from the site belongs exclusively to the La Tène D1 phase, i.e. c. 150/130–70/50 B.C., which would thus make the latter date the taq for the appearance of these types of coins. All coins, except the Zickzackgruppe tdr; were actually dated by the excavator, together with other archaeological material from the same layer (fibulas, rings, ceramics etc.), to the middle and 2nd part of the 1st c. B.C. (70–15 B.C.), but only in the second half of the 2nd century. The Celtic/Iron Age coins – almost exclusively Tauriscan – at Kuzelin were thus found in a secure archaeological context; moreover, there is no documented continuation of monetary activity at the site until the second part of the 2nd c. Therefore, it is safe to presume that those coins were used exclusively by the La Tène population settled on the site in a pre-conquest period, which is strong support for our argument. A similar conclusion can be reached with respect to another archaeologically excavated Iron Age site, the Gradina at Donja Dolina on the right bank of the River Sava downstream of Sisak, situated in present-day Bosnia and Herzegovina. Here several Republican coins were found, together with a Syrian drachm of phase B or C, a Đurđevac (tetra?) drachm and a bronze coin of Hiero II. Even though Marić (1964, 47, 49) distributed the coins from earlier excavations into settlement occupation phases (IIb, 250 – 150 B.C. and IIIc, 125 B.C. – early 1st century A.D.), he had done this according to the dates he presumed the coins were issued at, so his classification has no value. However, since there is no post-La Tène material on the site, all coins found at Donja Dolina must have been used and lost in a pre-Roman period. Therefore, although the precise archaeological context of these coin finds from Donja Dolina is unfortunately lost, it is still possible to associate them, similarly to the situation obtaining at Kuzelin, with the La Tène population settled on the site in a pre-conquest period.

105 Sokol 2001a, 14.
106 Sokol 2001a, 8 (picture), no. 3; 1994a, no.3.
107 Mirnik 1998, 487.
108 Cat. nos. 17, 34, 40, 41 and 43; Sokol 1994a, nos. 1, 2, 4; 2001, nos. 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7.
109 Sokol 2001a, 14.
111 Sokol 2001b, 17 (figure 1–2); 2003, 200.
114 Marić 1964, 47, 49, pl. XXII.2–3, 6: RRC 190.1 (169–158 B.C.), 222.1 (143 B.C.) and 254.1 (131 B.C.).
115 Marić 1964, 49, pl. XXII.5; Popović 1987, 50.
116 Marić 1964, 49, pl. XXII.4. Other Tauriscan coins from Donja Dolina are mentioned by various authors: Pink (1939, 136), citing Sergejewski (without further reference), mentions 9 Samobor coins (his reference on p. 113 is ambiguous, mentioning only a "closed find" of the "Croatian-group" coins), Truhelka (1904, 73) mentions 10 coins in total, five of which he excavated himself, while on p. 74 (figs. 53–56) he illustrates the four best-preserved billon Đurđevac tetradrachms (Kos 1977, 46; Mirnik 1998, 487, both referring to four pieces illustrated by Truhelka in figs. 53–56; probably also Liščić 1977–1978, 237, referring to the same pieces). These coins were rather light (between 8.2 and 9.2g, Truhelka 1904, 73) and small (between 21 and 24 mm, Truhelka 1904, 74; according to Marić 1963, 72 the four coins illustrated by Truhelka 1904, 74 figs. 52–56 (and reproduced by himself, Marić 1963, 73 T.III.11–15), have diameters between 19 and 22 mm).
117 SNG Cop. 844–856 (Marić 1964, 47; Mirnik 1987, 383).
118 Marić 1964, 49–51.
Finally, both individual coin finds and hoards from future Pannonia Savia, with their almost complete lack of Republican coins, also suggest a pre-conquest date for the coin use they reflect;

3. Lastly, while it was previously possible to conjecture a late, post-conquest, date for the use of locally produced Celtic/Iron Age coins, drawing such inferences from the low dates attributed to their production, in light of new and archaeologically well-established dates for their production and use, it seems much more plausible to argue for their use during the pre-conquest period. Kos and Šemrov have indeed persuasively argued for the existence of a market-based monetary economy as early as the mid-2nd c. B.C. in the south-east Alpine region, and their conclusions can equally persuasively be applied to the adjacent region to the east that would much later be known under the name of Pannonia Savia. This is far from claiming that these particular coins were produced for and used only – or even predominately – in market exchange, but that one of their functions probably was indeed market exchange.

119 Kos and Šemrov 2003, 387, 390–391. However, there are no small bronze denominations in this region in this period, especially not in considerable numbers, which would certainly facilitate a market-based monetary economy, and make Kos and Šemrov’s conclusion more convincing (Wigg-Wolf 2008, 36).

120 For an overview of possible uses of coins traditionally referred to as Celtic, but now more often Iron-Age, see Howe 2013, 26–31, who is rather sceptical of the idea of use of these coins in market exchange, although he does not exclude it completely. Harl (1996, 5–6, 293) is a bit more sympathetic. This work has been supported in part by the Croatian Science Foundation under project no. 1549. I would also like to thank M. Nađ for his help in preparing this article.

SAŽETAK

U radu se u prvom redu detaljno obrađuju svi predcarski pojedinačni nalazi novca (tj. novca iskovanog prije 31. pr. Kr.) s područja suvremene sjeverozapadne Hrvatske, što više ili manje odgovara području koje je u kasnijim razdobljima obuhvaćala rimska provincija Panonija Savija. Istovremeno se analiziraju i suvremene ostave novca, čiji sastav odgovara pojedinačnim nalazima, pronađene na istom području. Na bogatom nalazištu Segestici/Sisciji, suvremenom Sisku, pronađen je najveći broj kovanica, ali i druga, manje poznata nalazišta također pridonose općoj slici cirkulacije novca na ovom području, a ovaj se rad usredotočuje upravo na te nalaze. Velika većina nalaza predstavljaju slučajni pojedinačni nalazi (koji potpadaju pod Reeceovu kategoriju coin supply), dok je samo nekoliko nalaza pronađeno u arheološkim iskopavanjima (tj., potpadaju pod Reeceovu kategoriju coin loss). Najveći broj nalaza predstavljaju rimski republikanski novci, što je uvjetovano njihovim velikim brojem u Sisku, ali i keltski (željeznodobni) novac je zastupljen u nezanemarivom broju, osobito novac Tau-riska. Novoobjavljeni podaci, kolikogod bili šturi, dozvoljavaju reviziju nekih trenutno važnijih spoznaja o rasprostranjenosti nekih tipova novca, kao i balansiranu raspravu o cirkulaciji novca na ovom području u navedenom razdoblju.

121 Reece 2003, 141, 165, cf. 141–149.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Date (B.C.)</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“ramo secco” bar</td>
<td>Cu + Fe</td>
<td>6th–3rd c.</td>
<td>Trošmarija</td>
<td>300,8</td>
<td>arch. exc.</td>
<td>AMZ A5738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>aes formatum Bertol, Farac 2012 Type IIa</td>
<td>Cu + Fe</td>
<td>6th–3rd c.</td>
<td>the Kupa near Karlovac (Vrlovka cave)</td>
<td>297,03</td>
<td>arch. survey</td>
<td>Croatian Conservation Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>after 288</td>
<td>Zagreb Upper Town – Grič Park</td>
<td>9,13</td>
<td>pierced; found in a mixed layer, arch. context indeterminate</td>
<td>City Museum Zagreb; Dukat, Mašić 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>274–216</td>
<td>Kiringrad</td>
<td>5,51</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMZ G1190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MAA 18a</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>148–118</td>
<td>Glina</td>
<td>15,42</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMZ A5411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MAA 18</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>148–118</td>
<td>Plešivica-sedlo</td>
<td>11,42</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMZ Class. ant. 9376; Dukat 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>148–118</td>
<td>Kiringrad</td>
<td></td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Individual pre-Imperial coin finds from north-west Croatia

TOMSLAV BIĆ: Coin circulation in the pre-Imperial period in north-west Croatia, VAMZ, 3. s., L (2017)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Date (B.C.)</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apollonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>dr</td>
<td>250-49/48</td>
<td>Brezova Ravna at Miljana near Klanjec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mirnik 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dyrrachium imitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>AE dr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bartolovec-Jažabet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AMZ G2309_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SNG De, Tübingen 2, 1218-1221; SNG Öst, Dreer 3, 645-649</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>after 167-166 (Tübingen); 158-150 (Dreer)</td>
<td>Križevci area</td>
<td>16.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMZ A11235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Celtic/Iron Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>late imitation of Philip III (Alexander’s type)</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td>mid-to-late 2nd c. Preda 1973, 330, 343, 448</td>
<td>Zagreb</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Forrer 1908, fig. 336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>late imitation of Philip III (Alexander’s type)</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td>mid-to-late 2nd c. Preda 1973, 330, 343, 448</td>
<td>Modruš</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>OTA 590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Denomination</td>
<td>Date (B.C.)</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Weight (g)</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Baumreiter mit Bartkranzavers, group B2 (Pink 1939, no. 142) / Crişeni-Berchieş A</td>
<td>dr</td>
<td>2/II 3rd c. Preda 1973, 104</td>
<td>Kraljevec near Durdevac</td>
<td>3,36</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pink 1939, 60, 139 no. 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Zickzackgruppe (cf. OTA 459-461)</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td>late 3rd – 1st half of the 2nd c.</td>
<td>Kuzelin</td>
<td>10,1</td>
<td>arch. excavations, 1991</td>
<td>Museum of Prigorje Sesvete 166/94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scordisci

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Date (B.C.)</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Syrmian phase C?</td>
<td>AE tdr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Repušnica</td>
<td>6,57</td>
<td>heavily worn</td>
<td>AMZ G362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Syrmian phase C?</td>
<td>AE dr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Samobor</td>
<td>1,9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coll. Lanz 515 (Kostial 1997, 96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Syrmian phase C?</td>
<td>AE dr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Samobor</td>
<td>1,74</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coll. Lanz 516 (Kostial 1997, 96)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Imitations of staters of Alexander III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Date (B.C.)</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>3rd c.</td>
<td>Radoboj</td>
<td>8,46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AMZ A1188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>3rd c.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>8,34</td>
<td>probably NW Croatia</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMZ A1187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Denomination</td>
<td>Date (B.C.)</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Weight (g)</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd c.</td>
<td>Ludbreg</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMZA4674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd c.</td>
<td>Varaždin area</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMZA13427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Muschelstater</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>1st half of the 2nd – 1st half of the 1st c. (2nd half of the 2nd c.)</td>
<td>near Zagreb</td>
<td>5.89 or 6.89</td>
<td>Dessewffy 1910, no. 485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Magdalensberg</td>
<td>scs</td>
<td>2nd c. – before 16/15</td>
<td>Đurđevac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GR 50059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Magdalensberg</td>
<td>scs</td>
<td>2nd c. – before 16/15</td>
<td>Đurđevac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GR 50060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Varaždin A</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kalnik</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>priv. coll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Varaždin A/B</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vaganac (Ogulin)</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMZA915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Varaždin B</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Križevci</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMZA909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>early Tauriscan</td>
<td>obol</td>
<td>Lt C2, 200 – 150 B.C.</td>
<td>Zvonimirovo – Veliko polje</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>grave find</td>
<td>PN 1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Samobor A</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>probably NW Croatia AMZA8868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Denomination</td>
<td>Date (B.C.)</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Weight (g)</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Samobor A</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>10,85</td>
<td>probably NW Croatia</td>
<td>AMZ A9582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Samobor A</td>
<td>AE tdr</td>
<td>Kuzelin</td>
<td>7,96</td>
<td>arch. exc.</td>
<td>Museum of Prigorje Sesvete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Samobor B, TKN 45-109</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td>Sv. Marija near Okić</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMZ A10436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Samobor B</td>
<td>(AE?) tdr</td>
<td>Kuzelin</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>arch. exc. 1983</td>
<td>Museum of Prigorje Sesvete 168/94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Đurđevac</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td>Varaždin</td>
<td>10,42</td>
<td></td>
<td>BP/16/1955.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Đurđevac</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td>Bjelovar county</td>
<td>10,30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nemzeti (Dessewffy 1910, no. 90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Đurđevac</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td>Kuzelin</td>
<td>9,6</td>
<td>arch. exc.</td>
<td>Museum of Prigorje Sesvete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Đurđevac</td>
<td>AE tdr</td>
<td>Kuzelin</td>
<td>9,45</td>
<td>arch. exc. 1981</td>
<td>Museum of Prigorje Sesvete 167/94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Đurđevac</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td>Varaždin</td>
<td>8,84</td>
<td></td>
<td>priv. coll. (lost)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Đurđevac</td>
<td>AE tdr</td>
<td>Kuzelin</td>
<td>8,17</td>
<td>in the floor of a Celtic house, arch. exc. 1984</td>
<td>Museum of Prigorje Sesvete 169/94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Đurđevac</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td>Veliki Kalnik</td>
<td>7,24</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMZ A917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Đurđevac</td>
<td>AE tdr</td>
<td>Ščitarjevo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roman-period grave (SU 328, grave 2, quadrant a2, special find no. 493); Bilić 2012, 364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Denomination</td>
<td>Date (B.C.)</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Weight (g)</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Frontalgesicht</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tounj</td>
<td>7,59</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMZ A918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Brezelohr B</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td></td>
<td>near Varaždin</td>
<td>9,83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Augentyp-Stamm</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td>2nd/1st c.</td>
<td>Kuzelin</td>
<td>8,67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Augentyp-Stamm</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zagreb-Stenjevec</td>
<td>9,36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Wuschelkopf, TKM</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zagreb Upper Town – the Town Museum of Zagreb</td>
<td>7,88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Samobor C</td>
<td>AE (Skoberne 1994, 32 or AG Mirnik 1998, 40) tdr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zagreb Upper Town – the Town Museum of Zagreb</td>
<td>7,88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Samobor C (SC23)</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Malično near Karlovac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Tauriscan? Samobor?</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Osijek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Petrijanc</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Petrijanc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Cerje Tužno near Ivanec</td>
<td>tdr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cerje Tužno near Ivanec</td>
<td>8,47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Denomination</td>
<td>Date (B.C.)</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Weight (g)</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>RRC 245.1</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Drežnik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AMZ B678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>RRC 335.1b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>late 90s</td>
<td>Osječenica</td>
<td></td>
<td>arch. exc., mixed Roman and prehistoric material or a Roman layer</td>
<td>Durman 1992, 127; 2009: 11, 13; Ožanić 1998, 29, 36-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>RRC 400.1a</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Kiringrad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AMZ B1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>RRC 403.1</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Međimurje</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AMZ B1405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>RRC 422.1b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Končanica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AMZ B1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>RRC 443</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>49–48</td>
<td>near Prelog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Museum of Međimurje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>RRC 494.9a</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>the Lonja at Prelošćica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AMZ B716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>RRC 544</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>32–31</td>
<td>Ščitarjevo – župna livada</td>
<td></td>
<td>arch. exc., unknown layer</td>
<td>Museum of Turopolje A-402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>RRC 544</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>32–31</td>
<td>Ludbreg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>RRC ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dubovac</td>
<td></td>
<td>information from a news portal</td>
<td>Čučković 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Classified by P. Kos (pers. comm.).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Date (B.C.)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>c. 10 AV staters of Alexander III</td>
<td>last 3rd of the 4th c.</td>
<td>undisclosed precise location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apollonia and Dyrrachium imitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Odra Sisačka</td>
<td>70 or 72 AE imitations of Apolloniate and Dyrrachian drachms</td>
<td>end of the 1st quarter of the 1st c. or later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barbaro-Celtic/Iron Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Narta</td>
<td>33 Huși-Vovriești tdr, 3 original Macedonian coins (?)</td>
<td>end of the 3rd – mid 2nd c. or earlier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ribnjačka</td>
<td>112 imitations of tdr of Philipp II (44 Turnierreiter, 20 Dreieckhals, 6 Puppenreiter)</td>
<td>first half of the 2nd c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sveti Petar Orehovec near Križevci</td>
<td>&gt;2 Kapostaler tdr</td>
<td>mid 2nd c–late 1st c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Križovljana near Varaždin</td>
<td>109 tdr of Varaždin A and B + Augentyp-Stamm</td>
<td>end of the 1st half of the 2nd c.</td>
<td>the presence of Augentyp-Stamm coin questionable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Okić near Samobor</td>
<td>c. 1300 tdr of Samobor A and B type</td>
<td>early 2nd half of the 2nd c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Šemovec near Đurđevac</td>
<td>c. 400 tdr of Đurđevac type</td>
<td></td>
<td>perhaps also contained a specimen of Samobor A type</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Pre-Imperial coin hoards from north-west Croatia

TOMISLAV BILIĆ: Coin circulation in the pre-Imperial period in north-west Croatia, VAMZ, 3.s., L (2017)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Date (B.C.)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kozarevac near Koprivnica</td>
<td>7 tdr of Đurđevac type</td>
<td></td>
<td>perhaps part of the Đurđevac hoard (not included in Kos 2009) Pink 1939, 139 (7 pieces, but notes only 6): Dessewffy 1910, nos. 90, 477-480, 734; TKN, nos. 12, 60, 68, 70, 84, 103; the only possible correlation is Dessewffy 1910, no. 478/TKN, no. 84; BP 27A/1898/1-3, 31A/1898/1898/1, 3, R. I. 6062 + 31A/1898/2 (a letter from K. Biró-Sev of 11th of July, 1988, AMZ archives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Špišić Bukovica near Virovitica</td>
<td>12 AR, undisclosed no. of coins of Đurđevac type</td>
<td></td>
<td>the presence of Đurđevac coins questionable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bartolovec-Jalžabet</td>
<td>12 AE tdr of Đurđevac type</td>
<td></td>
<td>possible presence of other types of coins; low quality metal and poor workmanship (irregular issues); two specimens silvered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pokupsko</td>
<td>2 early Đurđevac tdr, 3 Samobor A tdr, 3 Samobor B tdr</td>
<td>140s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Đurđevac 1905</td>
<td>1 Augentyp-Stamm</td>
<td></td>
<td>KHM Wien 26977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Banjščina near Varaždinske Toplice</td>
<td>&gt;2 AR Celtic tdr: Varaždin or Ribnjačka (i.e., Turnierreiter?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>attribution by Zmajić 1967, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roman Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sisak 1878</td>
<td>4 d</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABBREVIATIONS
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