Guerra e pace in Sicilia e nel Mediterraneo antico (VIII-III sec. a.C.)

Arte, prassi e teoria della pace e della guerra

vol. II

Abbreviazioni

Autori antichi

Sono state adottate, di norma, le abbreviazioni dell'*Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford-New York 1996³ o del dizionario di H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, Oxford 1968⁹, ad eccezione dei seguenti casi: Aristoph., Demosth., Diod., Hesych., Moschion, Plato, Ps. Hipp., Strabo, Tim.

Opere generali

AE = *L'Annèe épigraphique*, Paris 1888-

BMC = *Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum*.

BTCGI = *Bibliografia Topografica della Colonizzazione Greca in Italia e nelle Isole Tirreniche* (fondata da G. Nenci e G. Vallet, diretta da C. Ampolo), Pisa-Roma 1977-1994, Pisa-Roma-Napoli 1996-

BullEp = *Bulletin Épigraphique*, pub. in *Revue des Études Grecques*.

CEG = P.H. Hansen, *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, Berlin-NewYork 1983-1989, I-II.

CID = *Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes*, Paris 1977-

CIG = *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, Berlin 1828-1877, I-IV.

CIL = *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Berlin 1863-

CIS = *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, Paris 1881-

DGE = E. Schwyzer, *Dialectorum Graecarum exempla epigraphica potiora*, Lipsiae 1923³.

EAA = *Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica, Classica ed Orientale*, Roma 1958-

FGrHist = F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Berlin 1923-

GGM = C. Müller, *Geographi Graeci Minores*, Parisiis 1855-1861.

IDélos = *Inscriptions de Délos*, Paris 1926-1972, I-VII.

IG = *Inscriptiones Graecae consilio et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae editae*, Berolini 1873-

IGASMG = R. Arena, *Iscrizioni greche arcaiche di Sicilia e Magna Grecia*, I-V, 1989- (I² 1996).

IGCH = M.Thompson, O. Mrkholm, C.M. Kraay (eds.), *An Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards*, New York 1973.

IGDGG = L. Dubois, *Inscriptions grecques dialectales de Grand Grèce*, Génève 1995-2002, I-II.

IGDS = L. Dubois, *Inscriptions grecques dialectales de Sicile: contribution à l'étude du vocabulaire grec colonial*, Rome 1989.

ILLRP = A. Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae*, Firenze 1957-1963, I-II; 1965², I-II.

ILS = H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, Berlin 1892-1916.

Inscr. Ital. = *Inscriptiones Italiae*, Roma 1931-

IvO = W. Dittenberger, K. Purgold, *Inschriften von Olympia*, Berlin 1896.

LIMC = *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologie Classicae*, Zürich-München 1981-

LSAG² = L. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece. A Study of the Origin of the Greek Alphabet and its Development from the Eighth to the Fifth Centuries B.C.*, revised edition with a supplement by A.W. Johnston, Oxford 1990.

LSJ = H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1968⁹ [reprint of the 9ᵗʰ ed. (1925-1940) with a new supplement edited by E.A. Barber and others].

OMS = L. Robert, *Opera Minora Selecta*, Amsterdam 1969-1990, I-VII.

PGM = K. Preisendanz *et al.* (hrsgg.), *Papiri Graecae Magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*, Stuttgart 1973-1974², I-II.

PMG = D.L. Page (ed.), *Poetae Melici Graeci*, Oxford 1962.

POxy. = B.P. Grenfell, A.S. Hunt (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus papyri*, London 1898-

RE = G. Wissowa (hrsg.), *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertums-wissenschaft* (neue bearb.), Stuttgart-München 1893-1972.

SEG = *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, 1923-

SGDI = F. Bechtel *et al.*, *Sammlung der Griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften* (hsrg. von H. Collitz), Göttingen, 1884-1915, I-IV.

Syll.² = W. Dittemberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, Lipsiae 1898-1901², I-III.

Syll.³ = W. Dittemberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, Leipzig 1915-1924³, I-IV.

TLE = M. Pallottino, *Testimonia linguae etruscae*, Firenze 1954; 1968².

TLG = *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (electronic resource), Irvine, University of California, 1999.

TrGF = B. Snell, R. Kannicht, S. Radt (eds.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Göttingen 1971-1985, I-IV; 1986², I.

Periodici

Sono state adottate, di norma, le abbreviazioni dell'*Année Philologique*, ad eccezione delle seguenti e dei titoli riportati per esteso:

AMuGS = Antike Münzen und Geschnittene Steine.

ArchMed = Archeologia Medievale.

ASSir = Archivio Storico Siracusano.

BCASicilia = Beni Culturali ed Ambientali. Sicilia.

BollArch = Bollettino di Archeologia.

GiornScPompei = Giornale degli Scavi di Pompei.

JAT = Journal of Ancient Topography. Rivista di Topografia Antica.

JbHambKuSamml = Jahrbuch der Hamburger Kunstsammlungen.

JbZMusMainz = Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums Mainz.

IncidAnt = Incidenza dell'Antico: dialoghi di storia greca.

OpArch = Opuscula archaeologica ed. Inst. Rom. Regni Suaeciae.

QuadAMessina = Quaderni dell'Istituto di Archeologia della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Messina.

QuadIstLingUrbino = Quaderni dell'Istituto di Linguistica dell'Università di Urbino.

QuadMusSalinas = Quaderni del Museo Archeologico Regionale «A. Salinas».

SicA = Sicilia Archeologica.

The Oscan Inscriptions of Messana

The Oscan inscriptions from Messana not only serve as eloquent testimony of the seizure of the town by the Mamertini, the outcome of which was the first clash between Carthage and Rome, and the beginning of Roman expansion overseas; they also now allow us to see something of the process of negotiation between two languages and two cultures. In doing so, they provide an element of control over the conflicting accounts of the arrival of the Mamertini, in the Greek sources on the one hand and in the narrative of Alfius, preserved by Festus, on the other. But it is first necessary to establish exactly what there was; and it is one of the purposes of this paper to demonstrate that of the longest text we have not three, but two copies; and that there are no orthographical variants between them. It is also essential to think of the Oscan texts in their Greek context; to be aware of the specificities of different kinds of text, with coins behaving quite differently from stones; and to ask oneself questions about the physical form of the stones.

The fundamental problem relates to the text recording the erection of a building, sacred to Apollo, by two *meddices* in association with the Mamertine people: no-one has doubted that one copy consists of a block containing the left-hand half of the text, reported by Reina in 1658 and subsequently lost (fig. 2), and a block discovered shortly before 1815, containing the right-hand half of the text, that survives to this day[1]; and until 1956 no-one had doubted that a further copy was recorded by Buonfiglio Costanzo in 1613, by Gualtherus in 1624, and by Reina in 1658 (figg. 1-2), and that part of it was rediscovered in 1755 and survives to this day.

The position in 1658 is lucidly expounded by Reina:

L'iniquità del tempo ci permette pure di poter confermare quel che diciamo con due inscrizioni, l'una è quella, che rapporta nelle sue antiche Tauole il Gualtieri: ma prima di lui il Buonfiglio nella III parte delle sue Storie: e l'altra è quella, che i giorni addietro si vidde nella torre ottangolare rouinata da' RR.PP. Giesuiti per la fabbrica del nuouo Collegio […].

In 1956, however, Parlangèli argued that the copy recorded by Buonfiglio Costanzo was different from that recorded from Gualtherus onwards[2]. This hypothesis, however, is demonstrably based on an insufficiently attentive reading of the early literature.

It is important to observe that the work of Buonfiglio Costanzo was published in two stages, Vols I-II in 1604 in Venice and Vol. III in 1613 in Messina, not in two editions; his account of the inscription, printed at the very end of Vol. III, reads as follows:

Qui preterimo le cose di nuouo successe per essere così fresche su gl'occhi, e per le bocche d'ogn'uno, bastando descriuere per compimento dell'opera presente quella pietra che si ritruouò nella strada della Giudecca sul cantonale della Torre vecchia detta di Beuiaceto, mentre cauauano le fondamenta per rifabricar di nuouo vna casa di Gioseppe di Nicoletta, nella quale con caratteri maiuscoli Greci erano intagliate queste parole […].

The text is then printed in majuscule distributed over 8 lines, a point to which I return below.

Buonfiglio Costanzo seems to have selected one of a number of recent discoveries, and the stone was presumably therefore discovered say in 1612, not between 1604 and 1613, *contra* Parlangèli, p. 35; and there is thus a maximum of 12 years between Buonfiglio Costanzo and Gualtherus. The

latter discusses the text twice, first printing it at p. 3 of the main body of his work, assigning it the same provenance as Buonfiglio Costanzo («cantonale» = *angulus*), adding in minuscule from Buonfiglio Costanzo that part of the text which was not preserved, and recording that this part had also been seen by Leon. Paté:

In foro Giudeca, ad angulum veteris turris Vivicito. minoribus literis Philosophiae, typographorum voce, anterius tabulae membrum ex Iosepho Bonfilio adscripsi, quod et Leon. Paté Graecarum litterarum doctissimus vidit (fig. 2).

At p. 8 of his *Animadversiones* Gualtherus goes on to say:

Hunc lapidem multi eruditissimi linguae Graecae, quos Messana habet, et peregre venientes conspexere, sed nullus germanam eius mentem huc usque explorauit, quare cuius idiomatis sit, Graecis characteribus sculptus, diu nos fugit. Recens tandem aliud agendo illa opinio illuxit, num Oscae linguae monumentum, quae adeo exaruit, vt nullum fere pauperis sit spicilegium, et vix sciatur, an fuerit, vnde olim Latina creuit, vt ipsa finiret […] Oscum itaque hunc lapidem fuisse suspicatus sum […].

The view of Parlangèli, p. 33, that Gualtherus transcribes a different stone from that in Buonfiglio Costanzo and confuses the two, is excluded by the statement of Gualtherus that the language of his stone had long been obscure, that is, it had been a matter of curiosity and controversy since 1612.

Parlangèli also argued that the Buonfiglio Costanzo stone was different from the Gualtherus stone in part because the former was complete, the latter was not; but the left-hand side of the stone could easily have been broken off between 1612 and 1624, in precisely the same way as the right-hand side was broken off at some later stage before it was re-found by C.D. Gallo[3].

The other arguments of Parlangèli depend on a comparison between the texts printed by Buonfiglio Costanzo and by Gualtherus.

Buonfiglio Costanzo:

ΣΤΕΝΟΙΣ ΚΑΛΕΙΝΙΣ
angusta pulchra
      ΣΤΑΤΤΙΗΗΣ
ad stationem
ΜΑΡΑΣ ΠΟΜΠΤΟΙΕΣ
maritimarum
      ΝΙΗΜΣ ΔΙΕΠΣ
navium,
ΜΕΔΔΕΙ ΤΟΥ ΠΣΕΝΣ
imperatarum
      ΗΝΟΙΜ ΤΩΕ
ab
ΤΟ ΜΑΜΕΡΤΙΝΟ ΑΓΓΕΛΟ
      ΥΝΗΙΣ ΑΚΟΡΟ
appello Inijsacoro Mamertino

Gualtherus:

[στε]νισ καλινισ σταττιηισ
[μαρ]ασ πομπτιεσ νιυμσδιηισ
μεδδειξ ουπσενσ
[εινε]ιμ τωϝτο μαμερτινο
[α]ππελλουνηι σακορ[ο]

Parlangèli claimed: 1) that his first stone, unlike his second stone, had interpuncts, which Buonfiglio Costanzo followed; but Buonfiglio Costanzo systematically jumbled the words from *niumsdihis* onwards;

2) that the two texts are different in spelling; but Buonfiglio Costanzo was clearly desperate to find Greek words, such as ΤΟΥ and ΤΟ; in the light of his translation, it is this search, not an actual difference, that explains, for instance, ΣΤΕΝΟΙΣ rather than *stenis*; other variants may easily be attributed to the consequences of copying a text in a known alphabet, but that made no sense;

3) that the two texts are different in layout; but the printer in any case put ΓΓ for ΠΠ in ΑΓΓΕΛΟ and may have been responsible for the layout, which Buonfiglio Costanzo may in any case never have seen on the stone (I do not understand why Parlangèli claims that Buonfiglio Costanzo put P for Π).

We have, therefore, two copies of a single text, one originally on a single block, one split between two blocks, perhaps on two of the walls of a building such as a *gymnasium*, without orthographic variants; the text thus provides no basis for inferences about the development of the Oscan language in Sicily. For the sake of completeness, the text split between two blocks is as follows[4]:

στεν<ισ> [κ]α<λ>[ιν]/ [ισ στ]αττιηισ
μα[ρα]σ [πο]μ[π]/[τι]εσ νιυμσδιηισ
    με[δδει]/[ξ ουπ]σενσ
εινειμ τω<F>τ/[ο μ]αμερτινο
αππελλ[ο]/[υ]νηι σακορο

I would not want to date the inscriptions other than generically to the third century; it would be useful to be able to institute a comparison with the inscriptions of Hieron of Syracuse.

The most obvious manifestation of the presence of the Mamertini in Messana is of course the coinage in their name, significant not only for its legend, but also for its typology[5]. The coinage consists of a range of denominations in bronze, arranged by Särström in 23 series, from 288 to 70 B.C.[6]. To consider the typology first, much has been made of the appearance of Apollo, and it has even been claimed that the cult of Apollo replaced that of Ares[7]. Series I-IX of the coinage use only the types Ares/Bull, Ares/Eagle, Ares/Eagle's head, Zeus/Bull, Zeus/Eagle, Ares/Nike, Heracles/Eagle, Adranus/Dog, concentrated on war and victory; if Marchetti is right to hold that the next issue is Series XV, B-F, when Apollo appears, perhaps in the early part of the Second Punic War, he does so along with Zeus, Hermes, Aphrodite, Artemis, and Ares; and the impression given of the succeeding series is of diversity, rather than 'Apollinism'. The Mamertine charter myth recorded by Alfius of course involves the appropriation of Apollo; but the process is part of a wider process of appropriation of the Olympian *pantheon*, and of negotiation with the Greek world, to which we shall return below.

The legend on the coinage is throughout ΜΑΜΕΡΤΙΝΩΝ (sometimes abbreviated as ΜΑΜ), with the exception of one series, on part of which it is in Oscan, and a few specimens on which it is blundered, i.e., accidentally mis-engraved on the die[8]. The series in question is Series XIV, where the legend on the *pentonkion* is ΜΑΜΕΡΤΙΝΩΝ and on two issues of *onkia* and the *hemionkion* ΜΑΜΕΡΤΙΝΟΥΜ; in both cases the legend is from left to right[9]:

Series XIV, B, nos. 255-260, *onkion*, Head of Apollo r./Athena advancing r.;
Series XIV, C, nos. 261-264, *onkion*, Head of Herakles r./Nike facing;
Series XIV, D, nos. 265-268, *hemionkion*, Head of Artemis r./Omphalos.

Series XIV is treated as unitary by Marchetti and placed after the adoption of the sextantal standard by Rome in c. 211 B.C.; the issues with Oscan legend are separated from the issue with Greek legend by Pinzone and placed before the adoption of the sextantal standard[10]. For present purposes, it does not matter: we are in the period of the Second Punic War, and in a period of otherwise increasing 'Greekness' of the typology of the coinage.

Not only, then, is the ethnic almost always in Greek, the legends beside the heads of Ares, Zeus and Adranos are in Greek also, as are the letters and monograms which occur on some issues, with one exception, namely the Oscan letter *d* on Särström, Series V, C, nos. 105-10 (280-278 B.C.) (the mark which appears on Series XIV, B-D, nos. 255-68, is a knot, rather than a letter). We should be hesitant, however, about inferring much from the nearly universal use of Greek in the legends of the coinage of the Mamertini: coinage in the early Hellenistic world was a primarily Greek institution, and its Greekness may well have brought with it the use of the Greek language in the legends used, as conspicuously in the cases of Cumae and the Brettii. The Mamertini may well also have used largely Greek-speaking craftsmen to produce the coinage. What of the isolated appearances

of Oscan? They may well be the casual result of the need, in circumstances now irrecoverable, to make temporary use of Oscan-speaking craftsmen. Similarly, the tiles produced in large quantities in the name of the Mamertini, with μαμερτινων, μαμερθινων and μαμερτινουμ, suggest that at the craft level no-one was much bothered which language was used; and μαμερθινων is perhaps more likely to be the mistake of an Oscan-speaker using Greek than of a Greek-speaker.

There are two other pieces of evidence, neither hitherto deployed in an attempt to understand the processes of negotiation between Greeks and Mamertines. The first is the inscription [μ]αμερεκσ κλαϝδισ μαμερεκηισ [-?-] (Rix 2002, n. 1, Messina 5), unhelpfully described as a *lapis*. It is rather the front of the top half of an altar, and presumably stood on top of a symmetrically placed bottom half, with the continuation of the text. But the real puzzle is why the inscription is cut in the stucco which fills a rectangle cut away from the surface of the stone; and the perhaps too obvious answer is that when the Mamertini occupied Messana, they chose this way of replacing a Greek dedication with an Oscan one. The obvious parallel is the way in which the Oscan dedication of L. Mummius at Pompei was covered with stucco and replaced with a Latin one.

The Mamertini did not, however, as we have seen, eliminate all Greek presence at Messana. Secondly, then, what other Greek epigraphic evidence is there? Already in 1979, L. De Salvo had argued for pulling back *IG*, XIV, 401, a dedication to Aphrodite, from the Imperial to the Hellenistic period[11]. And a new discovery has allowed G. Manganaro to pull back another inscription from Aigeai to Messina, *IG*, XIV, 402, a. The inscription in question is a dedication to Asclepius and Hygeia on one side of a circular altar, bearing on the other side a much later dedication to Antoninus Pius, 402, b. Louis Robert had argued in 1973 that the stone had come only in the Middle Ages to Messina, from Cilicia[12]. But a further dedication with the same text, Messina, Museo Regionale,

inv. A 227, would seem to make this improbable: we have rather two Greek dedications to Asclepius and Hygeia from Messina, *IG*, XIV, 402, a, perhaps of c. 100 B.C., the new one perhaps of the Augustan age. The two cults may of course have been borrowed, like that of Apollo, from Rhegium across the water[13]. But the record we have is from Messana and in Greek.

Moving on from dedications, bits of pot can travel, but there is surely no reason to detach from Messina a graffito, υγιειασ, of about 250 B.C., found in a kiln in Via dei Mille[14]. And Jonathan Prag informs me that of the twenty or so Greek epitaphs from Messina, up to five might be pre-Augustan. That record compares with one other certainly Oscan inscription, [μαρ]ασ στεννιηισ [α]πελλουνηισ (Rix 2002, n. 1, Messina 5), a brick with λ. πααπ[-?-] that might be Oscan or Greek, depending on what the termination was (Rix (n. 1) Messina 2), and a pot with πακια πομπτια, an Oscan name in impeccable Greek (*SEG*, XLIV, 773). Only more, and much better dated, evidence will allow us to write a real story of Mamertini and Greeks in Messana; but there is already enough to show that the process of negotiation between them was a complex one.

Michael Crawford

---

[1] Rix 2002, Messina 1.

[2] Parlangèli 1956, 28-38; the hypothesis of three copies in all is accepted by Lejeune 1970, 271-316; Pinzone 1981, 5-54 (= Id. 1999, 121-172) (I cite the 1999 edition); Morandi 1982, 141, no. 37.

[3] Gallo 1755, built into a wall at Via Cárdines, 152; the stone was moved to the museum in 1909 (Parlangèli 1956, 35).

[4] I have taken careful account of the spacing in Reina, and regard his incomplete *omega* as representing [an *iota* and] an incomplete *sigma*; Parlangèli 1956, 35, n. 13, is inaccurate.

[5] The only full account remains that of Särström 1940; Marchetti 1978, 497-500, refers his readers to Särström for details, but in fact includes without references coins that are not in Särström; and unjustifiably criticises Särström for using «la seule typologie numismatique» as a criterion for her arrangement, but himself uses only the criterion of metrology; of his unidentified or not adequately identified series, the first is Series X, the second may perhaps be a garbled version of Series XX, his third is Series XV, A. The whole problem is ripe for re-study, in the light of the new archaeological and hoard evidence.

[6] Särström 1940, 183.

[7] Pinzone 1999, 126, 135.

[8] Särström 1940, Series XIII, A, 236, has the blundered legend MAMAEPTINΩN; Series XV, C, 287, has a retrograde Greek legend; Series XV, C, 285, seems to have a die-flaw, rather than the retrograde *rho* alleged by Särström.

[9] *Contra* Conway 1897, 2; Series XIV, B was known to Corssen in a single specimen (= Särström 1940, no. 255), on which the *rho* happened not to be visible; this was misunderstood by Conway as an attestation of a different legend, which has maintained a phantom existence ever since.

[10] Pinzone 1999, 145, n. 77.

[11] De Salvo 1979, 57-68 (= *SEG*, XXXVI, 851).

[12] Robert 1973, 161-211 (= *OMS*, VII, 225-275).

[13] Manganaro 1996, 82-84 (= *SEG*, XLVI, 1264).

[14] Bacci Spigo 1993-1994, 367 (= *SEG*, XLIV, 773bis = Bitto 2001, no. 38).

Bibliography

Gallo 1755 = C.D. Gallo, *Apparato agli «Annali della città di Messina»*, Naples 1755 (nuova ed. con correzioni, note e appendici del sac. A. Vayola, Messina 1877) [rist. dell'ed. 1755, Messina 1985, a cura di G. Molonia], 29-32.

Bitto 2001 = I. Bitto, *Le iscrizioni greche e latine di Messina, I*, Messina 2001 (Pelorias, 7).

Costanzo Buonfiglio 1604 = G. Costanzo Buonfiglio, *Historia siciliana nella quale si contiene la descrittione antica et moderna di Sicilia…, I-II*, Venice 1604 (*III*, Messina 1613).

Conway 1897 = R.S. Conway, *The Italic Dialects, I*, Cambridge 1897.

De Salvo 1979 = L. De Salvo, *A proposito di alcune iscrizioni di* naukleroi *in Sicilia*, in «ASM», s. IIIa, XXX, 1979, 57-68.

Gualtherus 1624 = G. Gualtherus, *Siciliae, obiacentiumque insularum et Bruttiorum antiquae tabulae*, Messanae 1624.

Lejeune 1970 = M. Lejeune, *Phonologie osque et graphie grecque*, in «REA», LXXII, 1970, 271-316.

Manganaro 1996 = G. Manganaro, *Asklepios e Hygieia «divinità» salvatrici e protettrici della città*, in «ZPE», CXIII, 1996, 82-84.

Marchetti 1978 = P. Marchetti, *Histoire économique et monétaire de la deuxième guerre punique*, Bruxelles 1978.

Morandi 1982 = A. Morandi, *Epigrafia italica*, Rome 1982.

Parlangèli 1956 = O. Parlangèli, *Le iscrizioni osche (mamertine) di Messina*, in «Bollettino del Centro di Studi Filologici e Linguistici Siciliani», IV, 1956, 28-38.

Pinzone 1981 = A. Pinzone, *Per la storia di Messana mamertina, 1*, in «ASM», s. IIIa, XXXII, 1981, 5-54.

Pinzone 1999 = A. Pinzone, *Provincia Sicilia: ricerche di storia della Sicilia romana da Gaio Flaminio a Gregorio Magno*, Catania 1999 (Testi e studi di storia antica, 7).).

Reina 1658= P. Reina, *Delle notizie istoriche della città di Messina, I*, Messina 1658, 229-230.

Rix 2002 = H. Rix, *Sabellische Texte: die Texte des Oskischen, Umbrischen und Sudpikenischen*, Heidelberg 2002.

Robert 1973 = L. Robert, *De Cilicie à Messine et à Plymouth*, in «JS», 1973, 161-211.

Särström 1940 = M. Särström, *A Study in the Coinage of the Mamertines*, Lund 1940.

258. Inscription as recorded by Gualtherus

259. Inscription as recorded by Reina.