



Volume 22



Journal of the Numismatic Association of Australia

The heads and tails of two cities: the coinage of Volterra and Vetulonia

Miriam Gillett

The cities of Volterra and Vetulonia were important Etruscan centres in the region's north-west.¹ They exploited the resources of the *Colline Metallifere*, or metal-bearing hills, providing copper, iron, a small amount of silver and other minerals.² The city of Populonia, on the coast not far from these two cities, produced the largest quantity of coins. Unlike most Greek cities, which chose one or two icons to represent themselves on coins, Populonia's coins display a diverse selection of iconography.³ After Populonia, Volterra and Vetulonia produced the most significant number of coins, however, they tend to have a limited, static, selection of types for their coins, decidedly different from Populonia's example. Etruscan coins were produced to fulfil an administrative role but the types chosen were selected for a reason: they must have been of significance to the local communities. Traditionally Etruscan numismatic research has focused on chronological debates, attribution, weights and metrology. There has been limited focus on the 'big picture' and the issue of individual civic identities. This paper investigates aspects of Volterranean and Vetulonian civic identity through their

coinages, questioning how far we might interpret the images as civic badges or emblems reflecting local values, identities and affiliations. Unfortunately, the nature of Etruscan coinage limits the scope of such an investigation, and this paper can only suggest ideas that might be explored further in the future.

Etruscan numismatics remains a problematic area of study due to substantial difficulties with the evidence.⁴ Only a handful of Etruscan cities adopted coinage. The coinages of these communities differ in production technique, weight and iconography. The disjointed systems of Etruscan coinage possibly reflect the predominantly independent nature of the Etruscan cities. Besides the geographical limitations, Etruscan coins were also limited chronologically (late fifth century BC to the beginning of the second century BC). It is believed that a majority were produced in the third century, including the coins of Volterra and Vetulonia. As there are few coins that can be securely dated by firm archaeological contexts, there is little consensus between scholars on chronological issues.⁵ Both Fiorenzo Catalli and Italo Vecchi have produced several studies on Etruscan

coins and remain the leaders in the field, however, many of their proposed dates differ dramatically, creating significant disparities in Etruscan coinage dating.⁶ With such vague evidence, the function of coinage in the Etruscan world also continues to be debated.⁷

Identity and coins

Fergus Millar wrote that coins were 'the most explicit symbols of a city's identity and status'.⁸ This is not to say that Etruscan coinage functioned only as a status or identity symbol; coinage had a very real function within the administrative and economic spheres of the different cities. The projection of identities was simply a by-product of their development.⁹ Etruscan coins provide unique information about the different cities, including aspects of their self-identity. Of course, we may never understand precisely why a city chose certain images for its coins, nevertheless they depict certain values of the different cities, depicting images that were local concerns and locally understood.¹⁰ The surviving numismatic record, then, can reflect the political and social circumstances that produced it.

The varying images of each city's coins might provide glimpses of distinctly individual civic identities, including aspects of public, official, familial, elite and communal identities.¹¹ More important however, is the Etruscan adoption of coinage. The act of adopting coinage indicates that their societies were not only aware of

foreign administrative ways but, more significantly, that they were willing to alter or add to their existing local means of exchange/administration, and experiment with a foreign practice. This illustrates a significant degree of receptivity to foreign practices of exchange. Influences, both from people overseas and from other Italic communities, helped shape the peoples of ancient Etruria with significant reciprocal influences. In Etruscan coinage we can recognise the fusion of the new practice of coinage with local weight systems and iconography that was made pertinent to the Etruscan situation. The numerous weight systems used by the Etruscan cities could tell us a great deal: who each city was in contact with, whose weight systems they adopted or adapted, what affiliations they had in the Mediterranean. If there was more coinage evidence available, we would be able to better understand the weight systems of Volterra and Vetulonia.¹² It is likely though, that many of the cities maintained their unique localised weight systems in their cast bronze, or aes grave coinage.¹³ Other cities, such as Populonia, created unique fusions of weight standards and values when they adopted foreign silver weight systems.¹⁴

Contemporary thought suggests that one's identity is an actively constructed phenomenon, within a certain historical context and based on subjective criteria.¹⁵ It is a complex process of negotiation and construction in a

permanently fluid state, often resulting in a plurality of identities. From the third century Populonia, Vetulonia and Volterra distinguished their coins with their city names: Pupluna, Vatī/Vatluna, Velathri. These legends not only indicated their origins, but identified the cities as distinctly individual entities, independent from those around them. However, it is important to remember that all of the images on the coins were chosen by those who controlled the mints – presumably members of the elite. They are perhaps more validly considered expressions of the identities or values of these elite moneyers rather than the broader population.¹⁶ There have been many suggestions that Etruscan coins did not circulate outside their city limits. We cannot be certain then if these coins had the power to spread a particular fixed impression of a city's identity.¹⁷ It is possible that Etruscan coins were intended to project their identities to a domestic audience, perhaps to the surrounding local Etruscan communities, but not to the wider 'other' such as Romans and Greeks.

Volterra

The city of Volterra is interesting given that all the known Volterranean coins – at least three series of bronze with a total of over 600 coins – have the same obverse type: a two-faced head said to be the Etruscan deity Culśans.¹⁸ Though the reverse iconography differs, there are only three recorded variants. The

reverses all display the legend *Velathri* encompassing one of three things: a sign of value, a club or a dolphin.

Series one:

Janiform head, beardless, wearing pointed cap/Mark of value and *Velathri*

These bronzes are seen in dupondius, as, semis, triens, quadrans, sextans, uncia (HNI 108).

Series two:

Janiform head, beardless, wearing pointed cap/Club; mark of value; *Velathri*

These bronzes are seen in dupondius, as, semis, triens, quadrans, sextans, uncia (HNI 109).

Series three:

Janiform head, beardless, wearing pointed cap/Dolphin; mark of value; *Velathri*

These bronzes are seen in dupondius, as, semis (HNI 110).

The repetition of the name of the *ethnos* determines that they are the civic coins and property of those living in Volterra. Despite this, their wide distribution, discovered as far as Livorno, Vetulonia, Roselle and Orbetello, might suggest a wider use for Volterranean issues.¹⁹ This distribution could be due to the wide trade network of Volterranean ceramics over a large part of Etruria. Volterranean ceramics have been discovered throughout central Italy, from the Cecina Valley to Bologna, Populonia, Chiusi, Perugia, Cortona, Arezzo, Siena, Todi and Este.²⁰ It is likely that the coins followed

commercial networks. The city of Volterra was at its peak from the fourth to the first centuries BC, and it was probably from the third to the second century that its coins were minted. *Historia Nummorum Italy* regards the Volterranean standard weight as being half the Roman pound. They are also thought to be contemporary with the production of the Roman libral issues.²¹

The scholarship on Etruscan coins has firmly established these three reverses as *the* reverse types for Volterra and there is no mention of a fourth variation. However, in the *Museo Etrusco Guarnacci* in Volterra, I have located another coin that breaks from these static types. This coin, with the two-faced deity on the obverse, has the regular *ethnos Velathri* around the reverse, but interestingly, displays a ram's head at its centre. The museum suggests that the coin is a fake from the eighteenth century, but until further research to show the circumstances of its accession can be carried out in the museum's archives, the coin should not be automatically discounted.²²

Identity

Volterra's coins present certain aspects of Volterranean civic identity. The repetition of the legend *Velathri* is evidence for the identity of the city: an individual entity, conscious and proud of its independence. It might also be intended to differentiate the city's coins from the increasing number of Roman coins which were beginning to

circulate alongside. The club of Series Two possibly refers to Hercules, who was perhaps venerated in a Volterranean sanctuary.²³ The dolphins and trident surely attest to Volterra's maritime connections. Catalli places great emphasis on the shared and recurring Etruscan symbols of the club and the dolphin on several groups of Etruscan and broader Italian *aes grave*.²⁴ The club is represented on the cast oval series of Etruria/Umbria, on the reverse of many Populonian coins, and on two smaller Italian *aes grave* series.²⁵ Dolphins can be found on coins from Ariminum, Hatria, Cales, and further south in Luceria and Venusia.²⁶ This iconography is not limited to the Italian peninsula.

The two-faced deity, usually identified as Culśans, clearly had a great significance for the people of Volterra. Unfortunately, little is known about the Etruscan Culśans. The deity was supposedly a secondary divine being or *numen* and may be linked to the Roman Janus. But this identification is based on some very light evidence: the name is based on an inscription written on the leg of a bronze statue, a 'talking object', found near Cortona: '*v.cvinti.arnitaś.culśanśl alpan turce*' ['V(elia) Cvinti, daughter of Arnth gave (this) gladly to Culśans'].²⁷ It is also thought that Culśans was associated with doors. On a relief from a tomb, a goddess is shown standing beside the door to the Underworld: she is named Culśu.²⁸ Culśans may have been a deity

of doors and calendars and is described by Bonfante and Bonfante as ‘keeper of the gate’.²⁹ Considering that there was possibly a Roman influence on Volterra’s weight system, the two-faced (or ‘Janiform’) head might also be related to some of the first Roman coins with the head of Janus on the obverse and a ship’s prow on the reverse. Coins of this type circulated in Rome and central Italy in the late third century BC.³⁰ However, given the fact that Volterra remained a strong Etruscan city until sacked by Sulla in 80 BC, and that the legend *Velathri* seems to be declaring its individuality, this seems unlikely.

If indeed Culśans’ role was related to doors or calendars, what relation did he have to the coinage of Volterra or the identity of its people? The figure certainly held a place of importance for the Volterrans, but did he perhaps represent a geographic or urban identity, or something more obscure? To answer such questions we can only speculate. Volterra is placed in the wealthy agricultural land of the Cecina Valley. The Cecina River gave the population transport to the coast and the Tyrrhenian Sea, whilst the Era River gave the city access to the Arno basin and its many tributaries (from the coast at Pisa to inland Fiesole and south-east to the Siena region). Perhaps it was because of their location, and their ability to set their views and travel virtually in every direction that they chose Culśans as a representative for their city and its

territory.

The importance of Culśans might instead be connected to the identity of an aristocratic household within the city who claimed relations to the *numen*. In his *Roman Questions*, Plutarch reveals that the Romans believed Janus to have been a Greek immigrant who crossed to Italy, bringing civilization and coinage to the barbaric Italians.³¹ This idea could be based on an older myth, possibly shared with the Etruscans (as were many myths), and hence explaining the presence of such a figure on Volterra’s coins. It could be possible that Culśans acted as the Etruscan precursor to Janus. Another possibility is that Volterra had a celebrated sanctuary or temple dedicated to Culśans. Excavations have shown that Volterra had two Hellenistic-period temples on its acropolis, but to whom they were dedicated remains unknown. Beneath one of these later temples remains of a fifth century temple were discovered, decorated in a typical Etruscan style.³² Attractive as this hypothesis may be, it remains difficult to prove in the absence of further epigraphic or statuary fragments.

It is undeniable that the deity Culśans held an important position for the people of Volterra, but the specific reasons for representing the two-faced god on all of their coins remains obscure. The likely conclusion is that Culśans was the civic deity of the city. The widespread and shared icons on the reverse – the club and dolphin – associate Volterra with communities further afield, throughout

central and southern Italy, with the club possibly alluding to Herakles/Hercules. Of all the Etruscan coins, Volterra's are the most invariable, suggesting not only a unified civic mint, but also cohesive ideals shared by the town's magistrates and moneyers. Although it is unlikely that Volterranean coins were being exchanged for Roman ones, the possible adoption of the Roman weight system reinforces the fact that continual changing influences and fluctuating power relations were occurring in northern Etruria at this time.

Vetulonia

It is thought that Vetulonia, possibly mimicking the early coinage of other Etruscan centres, coined a rare silver series probably at the end of the fourth century.³³

Silver

Series one:

Male head r., wearing conical helmet; at l., *vatl*/Blank
(HNI 200)

Series two:

Male head r., wearing conical helmet; at l., *vatl*/Trident between two dolphins
(HNI 201)

Only three coins in total remain of these two series. Alongside these two coins, Catalli places a gold coin with the same types, but considers it a fake.³⁴ Vecchi interprets the masculine head to be that of Sethluns, or Vulcan-Hephaestus, 'obviously, the patron of the mint'.³⁵ Based on the two silver

samples, the average weight for these coins is 3.82g, leaving us without enough evidence to align this issue with another system.³⁶ Considering that all of these examples came from the antiquities market and cannot be suitably confirmed as genuine, they will not be considered here. If indeed they are authentic, they act only to uphold the establishment of a Vetulonian iconography, specifically that of the trident and dolphins seen on the reverse of Vetulonia's bronze coins.

Bronze

Series one:

Female head r., hair tied with band and in bun, loop on forehead; at l., sometimes, *vatl*/Blank or caduceus
(HNI 198)

Series two:

Male (?) head r., long hair tied with band; at l., sometimes, *vatl*/Blank or octopus hook (?)
(HNI 199)

Series three:

Male head r., wearing dolphin head-dress; above, three pellets/Anchor; at r., sometimes, legend; at l. or r., three pellets
(HNI 202)

Series four:

Male head r., wearing ketos head-dress; at l., *vatl*; below, two pellets/Trident between two dolphins; usually, two pellets
(HNI 203. For variations see HNI 204-205).

The date of series one and two is unconfirmed. The coins of series

one are assumed to be Vetulonian, based on their concentration within the city's territory. About fourteen examples are known and have been linked iconographically with red-figure Clusium-Volterra ware, dated to the end of the fourth century BC.³⁷ Series three and four have been dated to c. 300-250 BC.³⁸ Vetulonia's types vary, but much of the iconography has a maritime theme.³⁹ Many of the bronzes display an array of feminine and masculine heads, presumed to represent different deities. As seen in the four series, the reverses tend to display caducei, anchors, and tridents flanked by two dolphins.⁴⁰ By far the most common example is type four, with the characteristic trident with two dolphins decorating the reverse. There are about 300 known pieces from this series. Vecchi suggests that the figure, draped in the *ketos* (sea monster) headdress, represents the deity *Nethuns*/Neptune.⁴¹ In Etruscan art, *Nethuns* is commonly depicted alongside his trident; and similarly on the reverse of these coins.⁴² This evidence, along with the other maritime-themed imagery on Vetulonia's coins and the location of the city near the coast, strengthens the possibility of the figure's identity as *Nethuns*/Neptune. Cristofani suggested that the head draped with spoils of marine animals possibly represents local divinities or an eponymous hero, symbolic of Vetulonia.⁴³ This seems plausible because it is so incomparable with other divinities. In addition, it is stylistically less Hellenised than

depictions of deities represented on Populonia's coins. The deities on Vetulonia's coinage suggest a diverse and dedicated civic relationship with religion. Although the city preferred the image of *Nethuns* (series four) on most of the coins, other male and female gods were clearly venerated by the community.

The bronze weight system used in Vetulonia remains a problem for numismatists. *Historia Numorum* suggests that the bronze unit was the same at Vetulonia and Populonia, originally c.72g, and then reduced to c. 36g.⁴⁴ This weight reduction could be connected with Roman bronze reductions from the third century, but the evidence remains unclear: the two bronze series with values of sextans and uncia have massive variations. The maximum weight for series four is 16.62g and the minimum 3.28g with a median between 9.75 and 10g on 261 examples.⁴⁵ The uncia of the same type has a maximum weight of 8.48g and a minimum of 3.6g with a median of 5.08 based on 25 examples.⁴⁶ Catalli has suggested that as the majority of the sextantes weigh between 9.75g and 10g with the unciae corresponding (the majority weighing between 5-5.5g), this should indicate the weights in use. Catalli argues against weight reductions. He claims that, despite the vast variations, the examples outside the median weight ranges are outliers, and are visibly isolated.⁴⁷ There are too few examples from other series to

produce any measurable pattern within the weight system.

Identity

It is likely that Vetulonia's minting was limited to the third century. During this time many of its coins display the city's name, *Vatl* or *Vatluna*, suggesting a local identification as a distinct civic body. At this time, Roman coins were circulating alongside local coins within Vetulonia's territory.⁴⁸ Even with a strong Roman presence, the city's population continued to mint its own bronze coins for local public expenditure. These bronze coins were intended for use by the Etruscan inhabitants of Vetulonia and had to be accepted by the local population. In the choice of imagery, the *Velathri* legend, and the weight system, we can see a declaration of their Etruscan identity and their civic uniqueness. Apart from the three silver examples, all of Vetulonia's coins were bronze, and with values of unciae and sextantes, the coinage was of little actual value. Despite this, their production was an opportunity to exhibit civic pride, displaying images related to local Vetulonian identity. The most noticeable aspect of these coins is the repeated reverse design of the trident with two dolphins: this design and the legend *Vatl* are almost static features. The coinage of Vetulonia indicates that this was an important Etruscan centre, with enough resources to produce its own bronze coinage, however the city is little-mentioned in the literary

evidence: Livy makes no mention at all of Vetulonia in the *Ab Urbe Condita* and the city is mentioned once by Dionysius of Halicarnassus.⁴⁹

Conclusion

Due to the small amount of evidence, it is difficult to draw secure conclusions about the self-identities of these two Etruscan cities. This reflects a much wider problem in Etruscan studies. One thing however, seems clear: these coins are passive proclamations of the inherent Etruscanness of both Volterra and Vetulonia. Whether consciously or not, these coins' types were chosen for the value they held for the communities and help reflect the social conditions that created them. These two cities chose to mint coins at a pivotal time in the Roman conquest of Etruria. Rome was involved in war in Etruria for much of their shared history, but especially in the late fourth and early third century.⁵⁰ Volterra had become a Roman ally by the late third century BC but its population maintained a desire to be Etruscan and preserve its traditions, and it is likely that they did this successfully until Augustan times.⁵¹ The coins of both cities espoused their autonomy, using local weight systems and unintentionally advertising their Etruscanness through the use of the Etruscan alphabet in the name of the *ethnos*. The moneyers and elites of the two cities presented their communities as Etruscan, upholding aspects of the Etruscan language, religion and values.

Ultimately, these coins illustrate how two cities continued to maintain their local Etruscan identities in the face of increasing Roman influence and expansion.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Kenneth A. Sheedy of the Australian Centre for Ancient Numismatic Studies at Macquarie University, Professor John Melville-Jones of the University of Western Australia and Dr. Gil Davis for their very valuable discussion and notes on this paper. I received many invaluable suggestions for improvements but all errors remain my responsibility alone. In addition, I am grateful to Dr. Fiorenzo Catalli and Dr. Paolo Visonà for their personal help in Etruscan numismatic affairs.

Abbreviations

Atti del V Convegno = *Contributi introduttivi allo studio della monetazione etrusca. Atti del V convegno del centro internazionale di studi numismatici, Napoli 1975 (Ann. Ist. It. Num. suppl. 22, 1976).*

Catalli (1990) = F. Catalli, *Monete Etrusche* (Rome 1990).

HNI = N.K. Rutter (ed.) *Historia Nummorum. Italy* (London 2001).

SNG France = A.R. Parente (ed.) *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, France, Département des monnaies, médailles antiques. Italie, Etrurie-Calabre* (Paris 2003).

Notes

1. On the early development of the two cities, see Maggiani, A. (2010) 'Volterra. Formazione della città e del territorio' in

Fontaine, P. (ed.) *L'Étrurie et l'Ombrie avant Rome: Cité et Territoire. Actes du colloque international. Louvain-la-Neuve, Halles Universitaires, Sénat académique, 13-14 février 2004*, Bruxelles: 35-61; Michelucci, M. (1981) 'Vetulonia' in Cristofani, M. (ed.) *Gli etruschi in maremma. Popolamento e attività produttive*, Milano: 137-151. cf. the edited volume: Maetzke, M. (ed.) (1995) *Aspetti della cultura di Volterra Etrusca fra l'età del ferro e l'età ellenistica e contributi della ricerca antropologica alla conoscenza del popolo etrusco. Atti del XIX convegno di studi etruschi ed italici, Volterra, 15-19 ottobre*, Firenze.

2. Cristofani, M. (1986) 'Economia e società' in Pallottino, M. et al (eds) *Rasenna: storia e civiltà degli Etruschi*, Milan: 79-156; Tripp, D. (1986) 'Coinage' in Bonfante, L. (ed.) *Etruscan Life and Afterlife: a Handbook of Etruscan Studies*, Detroit: 202-214; Boni, M. and Ippolito, F. (1975) 'Provenienza dei metallic per la monetazione etrusca', *Atti del V convegno*: 51-54; Scullard, H. (1998) *The Etruscan Cities and Rome*, Baltimore: 69-72; Forsythe, G. (2005) *A Critical History of Early Rome: from Prehistory to the First Punic War*, Berkeley: 39-40.
3. Scholarship on Populonia's coins is extensive. For an overview, see Serafin, P. (1975) 'Le serie monetazione di Populonia', *Atti del V convegno*: 105-139; Catalli (1990): 41-66; Catalli, F. (1995) *Monete dell'Italia Antica*, Roma: 47-75; Rosati, F. (2000) 'Monetazione preromana in Italia: Gli inizi della monetazione romana in Italia e la monetazione romano-campana', in Rosati, F. (ed.) *La Moneta Greca e Romana*, Roma: 79-93; HNI: 24-25, nos. 111-197.
4. For the problems relating to Etruscan coins, see Rosati, F. (1975) 'Gli studi e la problematica attuale sulla monetazione etrusca', *Atti del V convegno*: 25-49; Vicari, F. (1991) 'Materiali e considerazioni per uno studio organico della monetazione

- etrusca' *RIN* 93: 3-78; *HNI*: 23ff; Burnett, A. (2004-2007) 'Etruscan Numismatics – An Introduction', *Etruscan Studies* 10: 81-5. cf. discussion on this topic in Gillett, M. (2010) 'A closer look at the Etruscan coins at ACANS, Macquarie University (*SNG Australia* 1, 4-13)', *JNAA* 21: 24-40.
5. For the issues surrounding difficulties of attribution, the Thezi/Thezle series is a good example; we cannot definitively attribute these coins to a particular community as their provenances are so unclear. See Bruni, S. (1986/1087) 'Le monete a leggenda Thezi or Thezle', *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, Università degli Studi di Perugia* 24: 83-103. Similarly, for coins discovered in the vicinity of Tarquinia, it is necessary to rely on vague 'archaeological' descriptions from the 19th century for information concerning provenance. See Catalli, F. (1988) 'La produzione monetaria tarquiniese', *Studia tarquiniensia*, Roma: 33-40. These issues make it near impossible to supply either a date or attribution.
 6. Catalli tends to date the first Etruscan coins to the fifth century BC, whilst Vecchi opts for a later date of the third century BC. In more recent publications Vecchi has conceded that a dating of the first Etruscan coins to the fifth century 'is plausible', though rare, and possibly influenced by the Greeks of Cumae: see Vecchi, I. (2003) 'A Reassessment of the Dating and Identification of Etruscan Coinage', *The Celator* 17: 6-12. This is reiterated in his 2007 publication which is essentially a reproduction of his 2003 publication: Vecchi, I. (2007) 'Etruscan Numismatics: a Notorious Dating and Identification Problem', *Etruscan Studies* 10: 87-91. Vecchi has published a series of five articles on Etruscan coins entitled 'The Coinage of the Rasna - a Study in Etruscan Numismatics', parts 1-5 in *Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau* = *Revue suisse de numismatique* (*SNR*), (1988): 43-73; (1990): 5-25; (1992): 91-110; (1993): 63-73 and (1999): 5-18. Catalli has published many works on Etruscan coins, the most substantial of which is *Monete Etrusche* (1990). These are not the only disagreements between Etruscan numismatists. For an overview see *SNG France*: xvi-xviii.
 7. Rosati, F. (1988) 'Le monete etrusche: alcune note', *Rivista Italiana di Numismatica e Scienze Affini* 90: 45-9. On the circulation of coins within a city's territory, see particularly the work on Volterra: Catalli, F. (1975) 'La zecca di Volterra', *Atti del V convegno*: 141-52; Catalli, F. (1976) 'Sulla circolazione dell'aes grave volterrano', *Studi etruschi* 44: 97-110; Bruni, S. (1999) 'Sulla circolazione dell'aes grave di Volterra: nuovi contributi', *Rivista Italiana di Numismatica e Scienze Affini* 101: 47-56. For a brief investigation into the purpose of coinage, see Cristofani, M. (1981) 'Le attività produttive', in Cristofani, M. (ed.) *Gli etruschi in maremma. Popolamento e attività produttive*, Milano: 208-218; Cristofani (1986) and Parise (1985), 'La prima monetazione etrusca: fondamenti metrologici e funzioni', in *Il commercio etrusco arcaico. Atti dell'incontro di studio, 5-7 dicembre 1983*, Roma: 257-261.
 8. Millar, F. (1993) *The Roman Near East, 31 B.C. – A.D. 337*, Cambridge, MA: 257, cf. p. 230 where Millar also describes coins as "the most deliberate of all symbols of public identity". Millar's discussion, however, focuses on a much later period in the Near East for which the circumstances surrounding coinage were very different.
 9. Due to the lack of firm evidence, including archaeological information on many coins, we can only surmise on the role of coinage in Etruria. More can be said about the silver and gold issues of Populonia, but Vetulonia and Volterra only minted bronzes (besides the possible silver series of Vetulonia). These were evidently produced by a civic organization with an official role in the

- public administration or economics of the cities. Generally, see Howgego, C. (1990) 'Why did Ancient States Strike Coins?', *The Numismatic Chronicle* 150: 1-25. See Catalli's conclusion on the first Etruscan coins: Catalli (1990): 38; cf. Cristofani (1986): 143ff.
10. Harl, K. (1987) *Civic Coins and Civic Politics in the Roman East A.D. 180-275*, Berkeley: 13.
 11. See Howgego's discussion of coinage and identity: Howgego, C. (2005) 'Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces', in Howgego, C., Heuchert, V. and Burnett, A. (eds) *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, Oxford: 14-17. "What coinage most obviously provides is an enormous range of self-defined and explicit representations of public/official/communal identities, principally civic in nature" (p. 1).
 12. Catalli, F. (1971-1972) 'Sull'organizzazione ponderale dell'aes grave volterrano', *AnnIstItNum* 18-19: 73-89; Catalli (1975); Camilli, L. (1975) 'Le monete a leggenda Vatī', *Atti del V convegno*: 181-197; Catalli (1976); Catalli (1990): 81-95; Catalli (1995): 76-77 and 95-96; *HNI*: 24, nos 108-110 and 198-205.
 13. Maggiani's recent study on the Etruscan pound, based on stone and lead weights found around Etruria, suggests that several localized weight systems were used by the Etruscans: Maggiani, A. (2002) 'La libbra etrusca. Sistemi ponderali e monetazione', *Studi Etruschi* 65-67: 163-99.
 14. Most commonly, Etruscan silver coins are aligned with the Euboean-Attic system, and even it is claimed, the Persian weight system. For some examples see Rosati (1982): 286; Rosati, F. (1982) 'Note di numismatica etrusca: La monetazione etrusca in rapporto alla monetazione magnogreca e siceliota', *Aparchai: Nuove ricerche e studi sulla Magna Grecia e la Sicilia antica in onore di Paolo Enrico Arias*, Pisa: 285-290; Sambon, A. (1903) *Les monnaies antiques d'Italie*, Paris: 16-29; *HNI*: 25; Vicari, F. (1991): 6-7. Some of the early bronze systems, such as the *Peithese* coins, are likely based on pre-existing indigenous weight systems. For the *Peithese* series see Sambon (1903): 33; Catalli (1990): 111-113; Vicari (1991): 19.
 15. Modern scholarship on ancient identity and ethnicity is extensive. For overviews see: Barth, F. (1969) 'Introduction', in Barth, F. (ed.) *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, London: 9-38; Hall, J. (1997) *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge: 17-33; Jenkins, R. (1997) *Rethinking Ethnicity: Arguments and Explorations*, London: 53-56; Levine, H. (1999) 'Reconstructing Ethnicity', *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, Vol. 5.2: 165-180; Hall, J. (2002) *Hellenicity: between Ethnicity and Culture*, Chicago: 1-29.
 16. See discussion on the elite, albeit from a later date, in Harl (1987): 31-32.
 17. For more on this concept in relation to coinage see Howgego (2005).
 18. On the possible relationship between Janus and Culśu/ Culśans, see Simon (1989) 'Culsu, culsans e ianus'. In: *Secondo Congresso Internazionale Etrusco*, Firenze: 1271-1281.
 19. See Catalli (1975): 150-151.
 20. *HNI*: 24.
 21. Catalli (1990): 92; Catalli (1995): 95. For the historical debate on the weight system in use, see Catalli (1971-1972).
 22. With great thanks to Dr. Arianna Traviglia of Macquarie University who has provided overwhelming help with formal correspondences with the Museo Guarnacci and Volterranean officials, I will soon be gaining access to the coin in question as well as the museum archives.
 23. For the reference to Hercules, see Cristofani, M. (1975) 'Problemi iconografici ed epigrafico-linguistici della monetazione in bronzo', *Atti del V convegno*: 357.
 24. Catalli (1975): 143.
 25. For cast oval series (of Etruria/Umbria): *HNI* nos 51-55; see Thurlow and Vecchi

- (1979) *Italian Cast Coinage: Italian aes grave, aes rude, signatum and the aes grave of Sicily*, London: esp. 39, nos 169-173, the 'almond shaped aes grave', uncertain Umbrian mint. cf. Ambrosini (1997) 'Le monete della cosiddetta serie 'ovale' con il tipo della clava', *Studi Etruschi* 63: 195-225 and Crawford, M. (2002) 'Provenances, attributions and chronology of some early Italian coinages', in Meadows, A. and Wartenburg, U. (eds) *Coin Hoards IX*, London: 269-274. For Populonian coins see the silver Second Gorgoneion Series and the Hercules series. *HNI* no. 149 (Gorgoneion/Club) and 156 (Hercules/Club); *SNG France*, nos 38-40 (Hercules/Club). For Italian *aes grave* series: Catalli (1975): 143.
26. See Thurlow and Vecchi (1979).
 27. See Simon (1989): 1274-1275; cf. Bonfante, G. and Bonfante, L. (2002) *The Etruscan Language: an Introduction*, Manchester: 166.
 28. Simon (1989): 1273-1274
 29. Bonfante and Bonfante (2002): 197.
 30. For some examples, see Crawford, M. (1974) *Roman Republican Coinage*, Cambridge: nos 35.1, 36.1 and 38.1, all with the Laureate head of bearded Janus/Ship's prow. These were minted by Rome, but others are known from the mint at Luceria: nos 43.1 and 59.2 (these have hammer and apex on the reverse, alongside the prow).
 31. Plutarch *Roman Questions*, 22 and 41.
 32. Haynes, S. (2000) *Etruscan Civilization: A Cultural History*, Los Angeles: 374. cf. Bonamici, M. (1997) 'Santuario dell'acropoli: relitti di un tempio tardo-arcaico', in Maetzke, G. (ed.) *Aspetti della cultura di Volterra Etrusca fra l'età del ferro e l'età ellenistica e contributi della ricerca antropologica alla conoscenza del popolo etrusco. Atti del XIX convegno di studi etruschi ed italici, Volterra, 15-19 ottobre, 1995*, Firenze: 237-252; Bonamici, M. (ed.) (2003) *Volterra: l'acropoli e il suo santuario. Scavi 1987-1995*, Pisa: Bonamici, M. (2009) 'L'acropoli prima del santuario', in Camporeale, G. and Maggiani, A. (eds) *Volterra: alle origini di una città etrusca. Atti della giornata di studio in memoria di Gabriele Cateni. Volterra, 3 ottobre 2008*: Pisa: 225-268.
 33. Little work has been done on Vetulonia's coinage, but for a fourth century date, see Rosati (2000): 84. Vecchi dates these coins to c. 215-211 BC: I. Vecchi (1999) 'The Coinage of the Rasna: a Study in Etruscan Numismatics. Part Five', *SNR* 78: 8. For the dating of Vetulonian coins see Camilli (1975); Catalli (1990): 84; Vecchi (1999): nos 6-7.
 34. Catalli (1990): 84. cf. Camilli (1975): 191-193.
 35. Vecchi (1999): 8.
 36. Catalli (1990): 84.
 37. Camilli (1975): 190-191; Catalli (1990): 81-82; Catalli (1995): 76.
 38. Based on its weight, Vecchi dates this series to the end of the third century (215-211 BC), claiming that the weight standards at this time were as diverse as Roman standard: Vecchi (1999): 12. This date provides him with the opportunity to reinforce what he supposes was an Etruscan dependency on Roman coin fashions. Other numismatists have dated Vetulonia's bronzes to after the first Punic War.
 39. Vecchi (1999): 7.
 40. For examples see *HNI* nos 198-202; Vicari (1991): nos 158-163.
 41. Vecchi (1999): 12, nos 8-13. This had previously been suggested by L. Ross Taylor in 1923: Taylor, L. (1923) *Local Cults in Etruria*, Rome: 173. cf. Cristofani (1975): 353.
 42. For representations of Nethuns, see de Grummond (2006) *Etruscan Myth, Sacred History, and Legend*, Philadelphia: 144-145. Note also that Vicari (1991): 16 believes the head to represent a local divinity.
 43. Cristofani (1975): 354. cf. Banti, L. (1931)

- ‘Una probabile divinità Vetuloniese’, *Studi Etruschi*. 5: 185-201.
44. *HNI*: 31. There is also a suggested link between the second silver phase of Populonia and the Vetulonian bronze issues.
 45. Catalli (1990): 82-83. I thank Professor John Melville-Jones for his questioning of the variable Vetulonian weights, suggesting that they might be explained by small reductions in weight comparable to the reductions in weight of Roman bronze coinage of the same period. Cf. Catalli (1995): 77 for one brief mention of a possible relationship to the Roman weight reductions.
 46. *Ibid*.
 47. Catalli (1990): 83.
 48. Rosati (2000): 84.
 49. Dionysius of Halicarnassus 3.51.3-4. Due to the lacunae in Livy’s annals, other Graeco-Roman references to the city should be considered. Sources such as Silius Italicus, 8.468-494 and Florus 1.1.5, show that the Romans understood the importance of Vetulonia’s role in Etruria, and indeed the city’s influence on Rome.
 50. These wars were fought particularly in the years 311-308, 302-292 and 284-280 BC. Harris, W. (1979) *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome 327-70 BC*, Oxford: 179. cf. For more on the locations and histories of the cities, see Scullard (1998): 134-151. cf. Settis, S. (ed.) (1985) *The Land of the Etruscans: from Prehistory to the Middle Ages*, Firenze: 54-56 and 61.
 51. Hohti, P. (1975) ‘Aulus Caecina the Volaterran: Romanization of an Etruscan’, in Bruun, P. (ed.) *Studies in the Romanization of Etruria*, Roma: 405-433; Harris, W. (1971) *Rome in Etruria and Umbria*, Oxford: 264 and Terrenato, N. (2001) ‘A tale of three cities: the Romanization of northern coastal Etruria’ in Keay, S. and Terrenato, N. (eds) *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*, Oxford: 54-67. cf. Terrenato, N. (1998) ‘*Tam firimum municipium*: the

Romanization of Volaterrae and its cultural implications’, *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 88: 94-114.

Miriam Gillett is nearing the end of her PhD in the Department of Ancient History at Macquarie University. Her thesis is entitled ‘Inventing the Etruscan: Graeco-Roman constructions of Etruscans and the formation of an identity’ and includes research on Etruscan numismatics and identities.

miriam.gillett@students.mq.edu.au